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Abstract: When Jesuit missionaries went to China in the seventeenth century, they discovered that Chinese history was in many regards apparently longer than the history as presented by the Bible. Subsequently, they started to translate Chinese histories, which they sent back to Europe, and which in the eighteenth century were adopted by Enlightenment thinkers for their own purposes. The European side of this story is quite well known, but what about the Chinese side? What sources did the Jesuits use and how did these sources interpret ancient history?

As part of a larger project, these questions about the Chinese sources are answered from an intercultural perspective. The missionaries not only used classical Chinese histories written during the Song dynasty (960-1279), but also numerous newly edited or newly composed works from the seventeenth century. While they themselves originated from a Europe in which the *ars historica* was in full transition, they met a situation in China where new approaches to history had emerged. They used comprehensive histories, such as the one by the late Ming scholar Nan Xuan 南軒, or the more wide-spread genres, such as gangjian 綱鑑 (outline and mirror) histories, which from the late eighteenth century fell into oblivion. In fact, the sources used by the Jesuits not only throw light on their own compilations that
were ultimately sent to Europe, but also on the writing of history in China in the late Ming (1368-1644) and the early Qing dynasties (1644-1911).

1. Introduction

When the members of the Académie Royale des Sciences met with Philippe Couplet in Paris in 1684, they composed a “Questionnaire” that would become the basis for the investigations by the Jesuits who were sent to China by Louis XIV (r. 1643-1715). The first two requests for more information in this questionnaire concerned Chinese chronology and history. In the decades that followed and well into the eighteenth century these “Mathématiciens du Roy” and their successors corresponded with academicians in Paris and St. Petersburg about the origins of Chinese history and chronology. This circulation of information resulted in a vast amount of European publications, the most famous being probably the Histoire générale de la Chine by Joseph-Anne-Marie de Moyriac de Mailla, published in thirteen volumes between 1777-1785. With its ca. 6500 pages of text (and ca. 1100 of indexes and supplements), it is, two and a half centuries later, still the most comprehensive history of China compiled by an individual European author to date.

The efforts of these missionaries to publish texts about Chinese history and the ways in which they related their investigations to astronomical sciences are quite well known. Indeed, when Jesuit missionaries went to China in the seventeenth century, they discovered that Chinese history was in many regards apparently longer than the history as presented by the Bible. Subsequently, they translated Chinese works on history that they sent back to Europe, and which in the eighteenth century were adopted by Enlightenment thinkers for their own purposes. In Europe these writings intruded into a context of similar discussions on the antiquity of the

---


2 The only work coming close to it is the (incomplete) history by Otto Franke, Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches, 5 vols., Berlin: De Gruyter, 1932-1952 (cf. Haenisch [1956], p. 41). See also Wilkinson (2000), p. 500, n. 10: “It [=Mailla] was the largest general history of China available in a Western language for two centuries (until the publication of the Cambridge History of China) and it was used by many later textbook writers.”
Chaldeans, Egyptians, and the ancient populations of the Americas, and provoked significant changes. During an initial phase it obliged European scholars to reconsider their reference sources, and for some this meant the replacement of the chronology of the Latin Vulgate translation of the Bible by the one of the Greek Septuagint. The latter contained a longer chronology so that, for instance, Chinese history could be integrated into Biblical history without seriously altering the status of the Bible. Yet, in a second phase, scholars such as Voltaire in his Essai sur les mœurs et l’esprit des nations (1756) simply attributed to China primary place in antiquity, assigning to it a date earlier than the Biblical chronology. Thus the chronology recorded in historical books of a foreign country became ultimately more reliable than the European chronology as recorded in a sacred book such as the Bible. This story has become a classic example of how China seriously modified the European worldview.

The European side of this story has been extensively documented. But what of the Chinese side? What sources did the Jesuits use and how did these sources interpret ancient history? As part of a larger project, this article will try to answer this question by identifying the major Chinese sources. Yet, this simple question has proved much more difficult to answer than originally expected. For instance, as suggested by the title page of Mailla’s Histoire générale de la Chine, the work is presented as a translation of the Tong-Kien-Kang-Mou. This subtitle is in fact misleading in three regards. First, Mailla covers a history that is longer than the one covered by Zhu Xi’s (1130-1200) Zizhi tongjian gangmu (The Outline and Detail of the Comprehensive Mirror for the Aid of Government). While Zizhi tongjian gangmu treats the history of China from 403 BC until 959 AD, Mailla goes back to the very earliest history and continues until the reign of the Yongzheng emperor. Second, it is more than a translation of Zhu Xi’s text, since Mailla also used other historical works. As will be shown in this contribution, some of these sources, such as a comprehensive history by the late Ming scholar Nan Xuan or the more widespread genres such as gangjian (outline and mirror) histories, cannot easily be found in present-day treatises on Chinese history. Finally, at least as far as the transla-

---

3 On European chronological representations, see among others, the recent work by Rosenberg & Grafton (2010). By 1606 Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609) had already shown that the earliest Egyptian dynasty began before the Creation (Rosenberg & Grafton (2010), p. 65).

4 Besides the secondary sources mentioned in subsequent notes, one should refer to the book by Virgile Pinot (1932; also translated into Chinese), which is still the best study on the topic. See also the overview article by Florence C. Hsia (2008).
tion of the **Tongjian gangmu** is concerned, Mailla’s treatise is not based on the Chinese but on the Manchu version of it.

Thus, this question of sources will be answered from an intercultural perspective. It seems that the sources used by the Jesuits not only throw light on their own compilations that were ultimately sent to Europe, but also on the writing of history in China in the late Ming and the early Qing dynasties. The missionaries, indeed, not only used the classic histories written in the Song dynasty, but also numerous newly edited or composed works from the seventeenth century. While they themselves originated from a Europe in which the *ars historica* was in full transition, they met a situation in China where new approaches to history had emerged. They consulted the most significant contemporary sources that later, due to the *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 (*Complete Library of the Four Treasuries*) project of the late eighteenth century, fell into oblivion.

This article will first present a succinct overview of the major Chinese works on history circulating at the end of the Ming and the beginning of the Qing. Next it will investigate the major European texts and their Chinese sources. In order to do so, it will take as an example Emperor Ku (Di Ku 帝嚳). This relatively early emperor may be surpassed in fame by several of his sons, such as Yao 堯 and Hou Ji 后稷 (the "Prince Millet"), but an important reason for choosing him is that he is counted among the earliest emperors who can be found in European works on Chinese history. In order to gain an insight into views on the earliest period of Chinese history it was important to choose an emperor prior to Yao, since several Chinese works only start with him. Thus, they do not discuss this early history and cannot have served as sources for European writings on the subject.

---

**Huangdi 黃帝**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changyi 昌意</th>
<th>Shaohao 少昊</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhuanxu 纣頊</td>
<td>Qiaoji 蟜極</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Ku 帝嚳</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Xie 契</th>
<th>Houji 后稷</th>
<th>Yao 堯</th>
<th>Zhi 摯</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancestor of Taiyi 天乙</td>
<td>Ancestor of Wenwang 文王</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founder of Shang 商 dynasty</td>
<td>Founder of Zhou 周 dynasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Succinct Textual Overview of Chinese Knowledge about the Ancient Past

2.1 Pre-Song and Song Texts

In the late Ming and early Qing two pre-Song dynasty texts were among the more important of those containing something like a chronological treatise on the earliest emperors, including Emperor Ku. The first *juan* of Sima Qian’s 司馬遷 Shiji 史記 (Records of the Historian) discusses the basic annals of the five emperors (wudi 五帝), starting with Huangdi 黃帝 (Yellow Emperor). In it there is a description of Emperor Ku that is quoted in many later writings. From the eleventh and twelfth centuries, *Shiji* was generally produced with its commentaries included, in much the same way as the present day *Zhonghua shuju* edition is. These commentaries are important because they were often quoted *verbatim* by later texts. Yet Ming editions of *Shiji* share a characteristic with other Ming works on history, namely the more recent it is, the more it tends to extend history back to more remote times. Thus, in several Ming editions of *Shiji* the first *juan* (on the five emperors) is preceded by a short *juan* (usually not more than four to five folios) on the preceding three sovereigns (sanhuang 三皇). It is entitled *Bu Shiji* 補史記 (Supplement to *Shiji*) and was written by the Tang scholar Sima Zhen 司馬貞 (Xiao Sima 小司馬).5

Another important pre-Song text is *Zhushu jinian* 竹書紀年 (Bamboo Annals), found in the tomb of Prince Xiang 襄 of Wei (BC 318-296) in 284 AD and so named because it was written in lesser seal script on bamboo slips. A version was subsequently produced with annotations by Shen Yue 沈約 (441-513). This relatively short text records events from Huangdi until King You幽 of Zhou (781-771). It is arranged in chronological order according to the year in which the events during a particular reign took place. The work is particularly useful for its chronology and therefore one finds extensive reference to it in Ming and Qing works, including those of the missionaries.

*Shiji* can be considered foundational, in the sense that most works on ancient Chinese history produced in the late Ming or early Qing contain many passages directly copied from it and its commentaries, implying that it was considered as the main authoritative text. *Zhushu jinian* can also be considered foundational to a certain extent because its chronological struc-

---

5 See e.g. HYL: T 2511 1273b: edition of Ming Jiajing gengxu [29 nian, 1550]; T 2455 21: version in the *Ershiye shi* 二十一史, Beijing: Guozijian: 國子監, Ming Wanli 23-34 [1595-1606]. In the SKQS version, *Bu Shiji* is put at the end, see SKQS, vol. 244, pp. 964-966 (separate *juan*).
ture with enumeration of precise years is copied by later works. The missionnaires had access to this knowledge, as well as an understanding of the different works that were involved, but they did not necessarily use them as primary sources for their translations or compilations, since they relied more on contemporary works that copied from these original sources.

The next group of texts about history that were used in the Ming and Qing were Song works. A major development in the Song dynasty was the compilation of “comprehensive mirrors” (tongjian 通鑑) following the “annalistic arrangement” of events (biannian 編年). As is well known, the two most important works in this genre are Sima Guang’s 司馬光 (1019-1086) Zizhi tongjian 資治通鑑 (Comprehensive Mirror for the Aid of Government; 1067-1084) and Zhu Xi’s 朱熹 (1130-1200) Zizhi tongjian gangmu 資治通鑑綱目 (The Outline and Detail of the Comprehensive Mirror for the Aid of Government; 1172). The latter was both an outline (gang 綱; 59 juan instead of 294 juan) and a standardised Neo-Confucian judgment of the history treated in the former, and it was arranged by details (mu 目), in the same way as Zuozhuan 左傳 (Commentary of Zuo) was for Chunqiu 春秋 (Spring and Autumn Annals). In terms of format, the Zizhi tongjian gangmu distinguishes more clearly than its predecessor the short main text, arranged in chronological order and printed in large characters, and the more extensive explanation and commentary printed in smaller characters. These works, however, do not include the history of the earliest times. Zizhi tongjian treats the history from Zhou Liewang 周烈王 23 (= 403 BC; 425 beginning of reign) until 959 AD, the last year of the Five Dynasties (Wudai 五代; 960 is the foundation of the Song). There were some attempts in the Song to extend this history to earlier times. These include, among others, Liu Shu’s 劉恕 (1032-1078) Zizhi tongjian waiji 資治通鑑外紀 (Additional Chronicle to the Comprehensive Mirror for the Aid of Government; 1078), an uncompleted project by one of Sima Guang’s chief assistants not only to extend history back into the earliest times but also forward to his own period. It, however, was later criticised for paying too little attention to canonical writings. The most important was Jin Lüxiang’s 金履祥 (1232-

---

6 Hervouet, Sung Bibliography, pp. 69-70. SKQS, vols. 304-310.
7 Hervouet, Sung Bibliography, pp. 75-76. SKQS, vols. 689-691 (the imperially approved edition; see also Franke (1930), p. 132).
8 On the relation between the two works, see Franke (1930), Cang Xiuliang (2007), Lee (2008), ch. 2, and Lee (2009).
10 Hervouet, Sung Bibliography, pp. 69, 75.
1303) Zizhi tongjian (gangmu) qianbian 資治通鑑（綱目）前編 (Prologue to (The Outline and Detail of) the Comprehensive Mirror for the Aid of Government; 1264)12. This spans the years from the beginning of King Yao’s rein to the year BC 403. Yet, it does not include the preceding period (to which Yao’s father Emperor Ku belongs). The Song also saw summaries of the Tongjian in order to make the text more accessible.13 Worth mentioning is Jiang Zhi’s 江贄 (fl. 1111) Shaowei tongjian jieyao 少微通鑑節要 (Summary of the Comprehensive Mirror by [Master] Shaowei), which is a succinct summary of Zizhi tongjian (from BC 403-960 AD). It contains a supplement (waiji 外紀) covering the early period of history starting from Fuxi.14 Characteristic of this summary is that the text, just like in Shiji, takes the form of a narrative with merely a few interlinear notes from Shiji commentaries and without (moral) annotations.15 This composite style was clearly different from the texts of the type of Zizhi tongjian gangmu, which followed the tradition of Chunqiu — Zuozhuan. Another biannian work is Hu Hong’s 胡宏 (1106-1162) Huangwang daji 皇王大紀 (The Great Record of Emperors and Kings; 1141)16. This work is important in several regards. It initiated the tradition to start the biannian with Pangu, and it finishes with the end of the Zhou. The style is very similar to Shiji in the sense that Hu Hong presents a straightforward description of the emperors. The main narrative is followed by the author’s own comments (lun 論). They are always indented, setting them off from the main text.17 Hu Hong thus initiated a new tradition of personal com-


17 SKQS, vol. 313, pp. 29-30. This type of comments is also present in Sima Guang’s Zizhi tongjian (chen Guang yue 臣光曰) analogous to the Zuozhuan (junzi yue 君子曰) (cf. Franke (1930), p. 112). Zhu Xi’s Zizhi tongjian gangmu also included comments arranged under the same typography as the “details” (mu) (see Lee (2009), p. 67). Yet, Hu Hong’s arrangement was adopted by Ming authors (see below).
mentaries in which he regularly draws his own conclusions about the contents of even the most venerated texts.\textsuperscript{18}

Regarding the Song, reference should also be made to Luo Bi’s 羅泌 (？- after 1176) \textit{Lushi (A Grand History)}\textsuperscript{19}. Traditionally classified as \textit{bieshi} 別史 (separate history), this privately compiled history of China from the mythical era to the Eastern Han dynasty (25-220) was intended to follow the style and form of dynastic histories.\textsuperscript{20}

Missionaries were well informed about these Song dynasty works. They used them when they compiled histories of the more recent periods (from late Zhou to Tang), but since these writings did not discuss early history, they were of little help to the missionaries who wanted to discuss ancient Chinese history. Most missionaries were to reject the \textit{Lushi} interpretation, but some were very much inspired by it (see later in this article).

\subsection*{2.2. Ming\textsuperscript{21}}

Among the comprehensive histories produced in the Ming dynasty one can distinguish between those belonging to the mainstream tradition and those of the \textit{gangjian} (outline and mirror) tradition. Missionaries were to use both genres extensively.

\subsubsection*{2.2.1. Ming Mainstream Tradition}

In the Ming the compilation of the comprehensive mirrors (\textit{tongjian} 通鑒) continued to develop. There were in fact two developments. One was the effort to extend history to more recent times. Thus, in the late Yuan and early Ming a supplement to \textit{Zizhi tongjian} covering the Song period was written by Chen Jing 陳桱 (late fourteenth century, fl. ca. 1350), \textit{Zizhi tongjian xubian} 資治通鑒續編 (Sequel to the \textit{Comprehensive Mirror} for the \textit{Aid of Government}). It was soon superseded by the chapters of Shang Lu’s 商辂 (1414-1486) \textit{Song Yuan tongjian gangmu} 宋元通鑒綱目 (Song and Yuan Outline and Detail of the \textit{Comprehensive Mirror}) also entitled \textit{Xu Zizhi tongjian gangmu} 續資治通鑒綱目 (Sequel to the \textit{Outline and Detail of the \textit{Comprehensive Mirror}}), which were ordered as a supplement to the Imperial edition of the \textit{Gangmu} published in 1476. These chapters cover the whole of the Song and Yuan dynasties, carrying the story up to 1367.\textsuperscript{22} They were

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Schirokauer (2004), p. 139.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Hervouet, \textit{Sung Bibliography}, pp. 87-88.
\item \textsuperscript{20} \textit{SKQS}, vol. 383, pp. 156-175 (juan 18 and 19).
\item \textsuperscript{21} A much more detailed account of the two major historical genres in the late Ming and early Qing will appear elsewhere.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Franke (1930), p. 132-133. \textit{Dictionary of Ming Biography}, p. 1162.
\end{itemize}
also used by the missionaries for the corresponding periods. But there was another development, namely the effort to extend such histories to the most distant past. Thus, it was only in the Ming that the Tongjian tradition included works that were fully “comprehensive”, covering the period from Pangu until the Yuan. It was Chen Jing who added a chapter on the history from Pangu to Gao Xin shi (= Emperor Ku) entitled Zizhi tongjian (gangmu) qianbian waiji 資治通鑑 (綱目) 前編外紀 (Supplementary Record to The Prologue to the Comprehensive Mirror for the Aid of Government). It is also often mentioned as a preceding chapter (shou yi juan 首一卷) to Jin Lüxiang’s Zizhi tongjian (gangmu) qianbian 資治通鑑綱目前編. This became one of the most important texts on the earliest period of history and proved to be seminal for later writings on Emperor Ku. Chen Jing adopted the Chunqiu-Zuozhuan structure of a brief main text and annotation, which is also the basis of the Zizhi tongjian. In the sixteenth-century an edition of his text includes more notes and also commentaries, such as those by Hu Hong, were added to it.²⁴

Though with Chen Jing’s chapter early history seemed to be complete, in fact it was still not the end of tongjian writings on the period. An important work in the sixteenth century was Li Dongyang’s 李東陽 (1447-1516), Lidai tongjian zuanyao 历代通鑑纂要 (Summary of the Historical Comprehensive Aid; 92 juan).²⁵ This was one of the first projects emanating from the court to make the Tongjian more accessible, also for the emperor.

A further step took place at the end of the sixteenth century and led in two directions that ultimately joined in the early Qing. The first followed the line of the Tongjian gangmu tradition, and tried in a more consistent way to fill the gaps in the account of early history. Nan Xuan’s 南軒 (jinshi 1553) Zizhi tongjian gangmu qianbian 資治通鑑綱目前編 (Prologue to The Outline and Detail of the Comprehensive Mirror for the Aid of Government; 1595) is a case in point.²⁶ It traces the history from Fuxi to Zhou Liewang, that is,

---


²⁴ It was entitled Zizhi tongjian gangmu qianbian 資治通鑑綱目前編 and included besides Chen Jing’s Wai ji 外紀, Jin Lüxiang’s Zizhi tongjian (gangmu) qianbian 資治通鑑綱目前編 (together with his Ju yao 舉要). It was dated 1506 (with the Ju yao dated 1560), thus the exact date of publication is not very clear. See copy in Naikaku bunko 284-27.

²⁵ WSSK 4-12, pp. 1-833. This is the reprint of Guangxu 23 (1897) (it is not clear whether this is the revised version made in the 1760s; I was not yet able to compare it with an earlier version). Zhongguo guji shanben shumu, vol. 2, pp. 128, n. 1304-1308.

²⁶ CMCS, shi 史 vol. 9, pp. 1-41; 25 juan, 1595 (pref. Wanli yixue); ed. 1630 (Chongzhen 3) by Chen Renxi 陳仁錫 (pingyue 評闢). See also Qinding Siku quanshu
up to the year when the *Zizhi tongjian* started, the same period covered by the additional chapters by Chen Jing and Jin Lüxiang. Consisting of a short main text and longer annotations, it is in line with the *tongjian* tradition, but the text is different in places from that of Chen Jing.  

Nan Xuan was critical of Chen, and was of the opinion that it contained much “uncanonical talk” (*bujing zhi tan* 不經之談) and as a result was not to be considered reliable. Nan Xuan began his treatise with Fuxi because he considered much of the data dealing with the prior period to be unreliable. He added the signs of the sexagenary cycle from Yao onwards. In this regard one can point out that in the Ming there were more systematic efforts to determine the exact chronology of this earliest period of history, concerning which there were many divergent indications. One significant text for chronology was Xue Yingqi’s *薛應旂* (1500-1575) *Jiazi huiji* 甲子會紀 (Record of the Sexagenary Cycles; Jiajing 37 = 1558). It is organised entirely according to the signs of the sexagenary cycle. It assigns the first day of the cycle, *jiazi* 甲子, to the the eighth year of Huangdi (2697 BC), and continues until the forty-second year of Jiajing (1563), when the seventy-first cycle ends, a total of 4260 years.

That Nan Xuan’s *Qianbian* obtained important status can be seen from the fact that his version was incorporated in compilations of the complete *Zizhi tongjian* series. For instance, it was further edited by Chen Renxi 陳仁
錫 (1579-1634), who was a prolific editor of books on the classics and history.\(^\text{32}\) In 1630 (Chongzhen 3), Chen integrated Nan’s work into a larger collection of three texts that covered the whole of history until the Yuan. In addition to Zhu Xi’s *Zizhi tongjian gangmu* 資治通鑑綱目 (59 juan) for the period from Zhou to Tang and Shang Lu’s *Xu Zizhi tongjian gangmu* 續資治通鑑綱目 (27 juan) for Song-Yuan, he opted for Nan Xuan’s *Zizhi tongjian gangmu qianbian* 資治通鑑綱目前編 (25 juan) for the earliest period. Other editions opt instead for Jin Lüxiang’s *Zizhi tongjian gangmu qianbian* 資治通鑑綱目前編 and Chen Jing’s *Zizhi tongjian qianbian waiji* 資治通鑑綱目前編外紀.

Mainstream tradition underwent a new development in the Ming, taking the Song works as a model and extending history both to more recent times (Song and Yuan) and the most distant past. As such, Chinese history became entirely comprehensive. Yet there were two concurrent authoritative texts about this ancient past: one by Chen Jing, the other by Nan Xuan. Missionaries were to use both of them extensively.

### 2.2.2. Ming gangjian 綱鑑 Tradition

The works just mentioned all attempted in some form or another to be part of the same *Zizhi tongjian* scholarly tradition. Though Nan Xuan’s work differentiates itself from its predecessors by including Ming scholars’ commentaries, these *Zizhi tongjian* texts were written with the ultimate purpose of being aids for government. The sixteenth century, however, saw historical scholarship take off in a second direction, with the emergence of a new type of writing that, though built on the *Zizhi tongjian* tradition, also had its own characteristics. Owing to the large number of texts published in this genre, modern historians sometimes call it “gangjian fever” (gangjian re 綱鑑熱) or “gangjian fashion” (gangjian feng 綱鑑風). As has been pointed out by Wang Zhongmin 王重民, the tendency of compiling gangjian gained in popularity during the Jiajing (1521-1566) reign, peaked during the Wanli era (1573-1619), and it declined during the Tianqi (1620-1627) and Chongzhen (1628-1643) period.\(^\text{34}\) They are called *gangjian* 綱鑑 (outline and

---

32 Franke (1968), n. 6.6.7.


34 Wang Zhongmin (1983), p. 103; also quoted in Qian Maowei (2003), p. 408. One may note that this genre is nearly completely absent in Wolfgang Franke’s discussion on the writing of history during the Ming, see his “Some Aspects of Ming Historiography”, in Franke (1968), pp. 4-8 and “Semi-Private and Private
Mirror) because, as Yuan Huang 袁黄 (J.S. 1586), author of one of the most popular editions explains, they aimed at combining the gangmu (outline and detail) and tongjian (comprehensive mirror) traditions, and did so by integrating, on the basis of various authors, the entire history from Pangu until the end of the Yuan. In general, gangjian histories are often, but not always, shorter works (20 to 40 juan), and usually follow the composite style of the standard histories, with Shiji as the primary model.

In contrast to the Zizhi tongjian works that were not so widely distributed, this new tendency points to the need for books about history that were more easily accessible both in terms of content and print. They were destined for a large audience, especially candidates preparing for the Civil Service examinations. Factors such as growing wealth, increased commercialisation, expanding literacy and numbers of students preparing for the examinations, the flourishing printing industry and extension of the book market all contributed significantly to this development.

Commercialisation had its side effects. The quality of the print was not always very good, there was much copying from other authors, and some texts appear with nearly identical content under different editors. As a result, many works may have falsely adopted the names of famous scholars, such as Wang Shizhen 王世貞 (1526-1590), Zhang Juzheng 張居正 (1525-1582), Ye Xianggao 葉向高 (1562-1627), Jiao Hong 焦竑 (1541-1620), He Qiaoyuan 何喬遠 (1558-1632), Zhong Xing 鍾惺 (1574-1625), Feng Qi 馮琦 (1559-1603), Feng Menglong 馮夢龍 (1574-1646) and others.

On the basis of various bibliographical lists of rare books, one can identify at least 50 different authors who have a gangjian text to their name. The number of different editions is much higher due to reprints. In the classical bibliographies they are usually classified under the biannian 编年 (annalistic arrangement) section of history (shi 史). Not all of these books, however, cover the entire span of history.


35 See the preface by Yuan Huang to his book Lishi gangjian bu, SKJH, vol. 67, p. 101 (yin 乙), p. 4a-b. See Qian Maowei (2003), p. 405 and Cang Xiuliang (2007), p. 23 on the basis of the same preface. Cang is of the opinion that although they are called gangjian, they still take the gangmu style as their template.


Several of the authors of these works had some connection with the Jesuits:

Guo Zizhang 郭子章 (1543-1618), who edited (ding 订), among others, Gangjian biaoti yaoxuan 綱鑑標題要選 (Outline and Mirror Selection with Headings) (12 + 1 juan)\(^39\) and Gangjian yaoxuan 綱鑑要選 (10 juan)\(^40\), wrote a preface to Matteo Ricci’s Shanhai yudi quantu 山海輿地全圖 (Complete World Map; 1600);

Wang Xijue 王錫爵 (1534-1611) compiled (ji 輿), among others, Xinkan shixue beiyao gangjian huibian 新刊史學備要綱鑑會編 (New Historical Outline and Mirror; 1578) (48 juan)\(^41\), and wrote a preface to Ricci’s Liang yi xuan lan tu 兩儀玄覽圖 (The World Observing Map; 1603);

Feng Qi 馮琦 (1559-1603), a Chinese scholar with whom Ricci has a conversation in the second chapter of his Jiren shipian 異人十篇 (Ten Chapters by a Non-Conformer; 1608), was the editor (zhuan 撰) of Dingqie zuanbu biaoti lunbiao ce gangjian zhengyao jingchao 鼎鍥纂補標題論表策綱鑑正要精抄 (Fine Selection of Outline and Mirror with Headings Including Examination Themes; 1606) (20 juan)\(^42\);

Cao Yubian 曹于汴 (1558-1634), another of Ricci’s conversationalists, was the author of prefaces to Sabatino De Ursis (1575-1620) and Xu Guangqi 徐光啟 (1562-1633; jinshi 1604) Taixi shuifa 泰西水法 (Western Hydraulics; 1612) and to Diego de Pantoja (1571-1618) and Yang Tingyun’s 楊廷筠 (1652-1627) Qike 七克 (Seven Overcomings; early 1610s). He also wrote a preface to Li Pan 李槃, et al., Chongke xiangding shishi leibian 重刻詳訂世史類編 (Reedition of the Detailed Historical Encyclopaedia);

Weng Zhengchun 翁正春 (1553-1626), who when a Vice-Minister of Rites, recommended Jesuits to be employed for the calendar reform of 1610. He compiled a Bianji mingjia pinglin shixue zhinan gangjian xinchao 編輯名家評林史學指南綱鑑新鈔 (New Outline and Mirror with Historical Guidelines by Famous Scholars) (20 + 1 juan)\(^43\);

Zhang Nai 張鼐 (js. 1604), another collaborator on the Taixi shuifa 泰西水法 (1612), is also known for editing (zhuan 撰) Xinjuan Zhang taishi zhushi

---


\(^{41}\) Zhongguo guji shanben shumu, vol. 2, p. 132, n. 1358; also compiler of Xinkan tongjian biaoti caiyao 新刊通鑑標題採要 (Newly Carved Selection of the Comprehensive Mirror with Headings) (28 +1 juan) (p. 130, n. 1327).


Xiong Mingyu 熊明遇 (1579-1649) was a collaborator on Manuel Dias’ (1574-1659) *Tianwen lüe 天問略* (Questions about Heaven; 1615), and wrote prefaces to Sabatino De Ursis’ *Biaodu shuo 表度說* (Explanation of the Gnomon) (1614) and Diego de Pantoja’s *Qike*. He also wrote a preface to a reprint of Yuan Huang’s *Lishi gangjian bu 歷代綱鑑補* (1610);

Ye Xianggao 葉向高, who retired as grand secretary in 1624 and held learned discussions with Giulio Aleni (Ai Rulüe 艾儒略, 1582-1649) in Fujian in 1627, as reported in *Sanshan lunxue ji 三山論學紀* (Record of Learned Conversations at Sanshan; 1629), wrote a preface to Aleni’s *Zhifang waiji 職方外紀* (Areas Outside the Concern of the Chinese Imperial Geographer; 1623; ca. 1626 Fujian reprint) and to Yang Tingyun’s *Xixue shijie chujie 西學十誡初解* (Explanation of the Ten Commandments of Western Learning; ca. 1624). He is also mentioned as editor (*zhuan 撰*) of *Dingqie Ye taishi huizuan yutang jiangang 鼎鍥葉太史彙纂玉堂鑒綱* (Outline and Mirror compiled by Minister Ye [Xianggao]; 1602) (72 juan);

He Qiaoyuan 何喬遠 (1558-1632; *jinshi* 1586) wrote a preface to Aleni’s *Xixue fan 西學凡* (Survey of Western Learning; 1623; 1626 Fujian reprint), and was the editor of *Ke Wang Fengzhou xiansheng jiacang tongkao gangjian pangxun 刻王鳳洲先生家藏通考綱鑑旁訓* (Edition of the Comprehensively Investigated Outline and Mirror Preserved in the Family of Wang [Shizhen] with Parallel Instructions) (20 juan).

Though these examples do not prove a direct (or mutual) influence concerning the writing of history, they do show that the missionaries functioned in a milieu in which such scholarship was common enough to have prefaces written by or attributed to scholars with whom they were in contact. One might also note here that the first time that the term *gangjian* is apparently mentioned in a Chinese work by a Jesuit is in Giulio Aleni’s

---


45 *Zhongguo guji shanben shumu*, vol. 2, p. 133, n. 1368-1370. It has Li Jing 李京 as compiler (*dingyi 訂義*) and Liu Zhaoxian 劉朝咸 as revisor (*jing jiao 經校*). See HYL: T 2512 4920; BAV, Borgia Cinese 16-17 (early Qing edition; copy brought by J.F. Fouquet).

46 *Zhongguo guji shanben shumu*, vol. 2, p. 133, n. 1372. Wang Fengzhou is Wang Shizhen (see below).
With regard to internal structure, as mentioned above, these gangjian texts follow the composite style of the standard histories, with Shiji as their primary model. Though works with the title gangjian started to be published from the mid-sixteenth century, a model for them can already be traced back to the early Ming. A revised version of Jiang Zhi’s Shaowei tongjian jieyao (dated 1428), of which the waiji section is entitled “Xin bian zuan zhu Zizhi tongjian waiji zengyi” 新編纂註資治通鑑外紀增義 (Newly Edited Increased Meaning to the Additional Chronicle to the Comprehensive Mirror for the Aid of Government (5 juan) was compiled and augmented by Wang Feng 王逢 and Liu Yan 劉剡. This contains precisely the structure used by the gangjian texts one hundred fifty years later: a radically revised and rearranged version of the Shiji text with interlinear notes, together with the comment by Hu Hong at the end of the section and short summaries at the top of the page.

Probably the most well known and most popular work of the genre was attributed to Yuan Huang 袁黃 (jinshi 1586; 1533-1606), who is especially known for his writings concerning the Ledgers of Merit and Demerit.

His gangjian text is entitled Lishi gangjian bu 歷史綱鑑補 (Supplement to the Historical Outline and Mirror; 1610), also called Dingqie Zhaotian Liaofan Yuan xiansheng bianzuan guben lishi dafang gangjian bu 鼎锲趙田了凡袁先生編纂古本歷史大方綱鑑補 (Supplement to the Historical Outline and Mirror Compiled by Mr. Yuan [Huang]). It is not known to

---

47 Wanwu zhenyuan, p. 3a; CCT ZKW, vol. 1, p. 169 (reference provided by Ad Dudink, see following article). It quotes the passage bu xinzhuan er xinjing, qi lun shiding 不信傳而信經, 其論始定 “By trusting the classics while not trusting the commentaries, the debate was for the first time settled.” The quote can be found in the commentary of Hu Hong to the opening paragraph of most gangjian texts. See, e.g., Zhong Xing, SKJH, shi 65, p. 112 (juan 1, p. 1a); Yuan Huang, SKJH, shi 67, p. 123 (juan 1, p. 1a). It is also quoted in Lodovico Buglio (1606-1682), Budeyi bian 不得已辯 (Refuting ‘I Can No Longer Stand It’) (1665) (p. 16a; WX, p. 259).

48 See the copy in HYL: T 2512 1279.314, juan 1, pp. 16a-17a. On this work, see also Qiao Zhizhong (2002), p. 444.

49 The work was reprinted often. A copy of Shaowei tongjian was among the confiscated books of the Jesuit house at Nanjing (1617), see Dudink (1996), pp. 144, 150.


51 SKJH, vol. 67, pp. 99-741; vol. 68, pp. 1-384 (39 juan, 1610 ( Wanli 38)); same edition see also HYL: T 2512 4348; BAV, BnF and ARSI all have a copy of the book:
what extent Yuan Huang actually had a hand in its composition (the work may have been attributed to him for commercial reasons), but this article will continue to call it the version of “Yuan Huang”.

Another prolific author was Zhong Xing 鍾惺 (1574-1624, jinshi 1610), mainly known for his literary works. One entitled Dingqin Zhong Bojing dingzheng Zizhi gangjian zhengshi daquan 鼎鋟鍾伯敬訂正資治綱鑑正史大全 (General History for the Aid of Government According to the Outline and Mirror Method Compiled by Zhong [Xing]; Ming Chongzhen era) (74 juan, shou 1 juan, abbreviated as Gangjian da quan 綱鑑大全) is attributed to him, with the collaboration of Yu Yingqiu 余應虬 (preface 1628). Content wise, it shows many similarities with the one attributed to Yuan Huang. It covers history from the earliest times until the end of the Yuan, and is characterised by the addition of the the signs of the sexagenary cycle, starting with Fuxi. In doing so Zhong Xing also changed Yuan Huang’s chronology (the length of the reigns of the early emperors), which was based for the early emperors on Shao Yong’s 邵雍 (1011-1077) Huangji jingshi shu 皇極經世書 (The Book of the August Ultimate through the Ages).

see Chan (2002), p. 491: ARSI Jap. Sin. III, 15-18 (entitled Lishi gangjian bu 歷史綱鑑補, with preface by Xiong Mingyu) (= SKJH); BnF, Chinois 539-542 (= SKJH) (Courant attributes this reprint to Xiong Mingyu in 1690, which, according to Chan (2002), p. 491 it is a mistake (maybe for 1609); BAV, Borgia Cinese 288-289 (copy brought by J.F. Fouquet). Beida, pref. 1606 and 1610 (see Wang Zhongmin (1983), p. 98). For Di Ku 帝嚳, see SKJH, vol. 67, pp. 130-131 (juan 1, pp. 16b-18a). There were also Japanese reprints of this work.


These cyclical date signs can also be found in some other writings, but apparently not always applied in the same systematic way. Though there are many similarities between Zhong Xing and Yuan Huang, there are also numerous differences. In the text on Emperor Ku, the information is arranged differently in Zhong Xing: the four concubines are arranged in a subtext after the information on the death of Ku, and the commentary by Su Xun 蘇洵 is missing. In other cases the text in Zhong Xing is more extensive than in Yuan Huang. Compare for instance Zhong Xing, SKJH, shi 65, pp. 131-133 (juan 2, pp. 5a-8a) with Yuan Huang, SKJH, shi 67, pp. 136-137 (juan 1, pp. 27a-30a).

Compare the years of reign for Yao = 72, Shun = 61 and Yu = 27 in Yuan Huang, SKJH, shi 67, pp. 132, 134, 135 (juan 1, 20a, 23b, 25a); similar to Shao Yong, Huangji jingshi shu, SKQS, vol. 803, pp. 445-451 (juan 3 shang, 22b-25b) with Yao = 100, Shun = 48 and Yu = 8 (Zhong Xing, SKJH, shi 65, p. 87 (mulu, p. 1b-2a) = similar to Hu Hong, Huangwang daji, SKQS, 313, p. 40 (juan 3, p. 20a), p. 46 (juan 4, p. 12), p.
The gangjian texts were a very important and widely spread genre. Their importance is confirmed by the fact that they were used, alongside the texts of the mainstream tradition, by both the authors of the early Qing and by the missionaries. One might also add here that information about early history could also be found in other genres, such as encyclopaedias, historical novels and primers.

2.3. Early Qing

For the early Qing one should distinguish between works in Manchu and Chinese, though there clearly is a link between the production of both. Missionaries also used both.

2.3.1. Manchu Versions

A major development in the early Qing was that the new Manchu rulers made Chinese history available in the Manchu language. This translation process throws new light on the authoritative texts of the late Ming. The first text on Chinese history to be translated belonged to the gangjian tradition and this initiative began very early. A key role in these early translations was played by Dahai 達海 (died 1632), a Manchu translator who was commissioned by Nurhaci (1559-1626) to translate official Chinese texts into Manchu. The first translation of an historical text was finalised after 1644. In the third year of the Kangxi era, on 16 February 1664, it was reported that the printing of the tongjian in Manchu script was finished. The Manchu work that is preserved, Hafu buleku bithe (Tongjian 通鑑) (Comprehensive Mirror) in 80 ce, attributes the translation to Dahai, and is variously identified as being a translation of a work by Wang Shizhen (therefore sometimes given the Chinese title Gangjian huizuan 綱鑑會纂) or by Yuan Huang. Since it is not a literal translation but a summary, it is difficult to identify the precise source.

Yet, this was not the last tongjian publication. Three years later, the Kangxi emperor (r. 1662-1722) ordered scholars to revise, among others, the Tongjian quanshu 通鑑全書 (The Complete Book of the Comprehensive Mirror) to make such works more accessible for instruction of officials and

---


56 On these early translations, see Fuchs (1936), pp. 40 ff., esp. pp. 44-46.

57 Qing shilu, vol. 4, p. 168 (Kangxi 3/1/guiwei = 16 February 1664).

58 A comparison between the Cambridge version and Yuan Huang shows that large sections of the main text and the notes have been deleted. The commentaries are not included (thanks to Nathan Vedal, Mark Elliott and Roel Sterckx for their help concerning this identification).
In 1691 it was reported that a translated Manchu edition of *Tongjian gangmu* had been published. This *Han-i araha tung giyan g’ang mu bithe* (Imperially Commissioned *Tongjian gangmu* 通鑑綱目) was in 111 juan and was printed at the palace Wuyingdian 武英殿 in Kangxi 30 (1691). The translation was made by explicit order of the Emperor, who claims that he personally watched over the translation process. The well-known Manchu official and translator Hesu 和素 (1652-1718) was responsible for the translation.

It is in fact a translation of three works:

- *Dzjy tunggiyan g’angmu ciyan biyan* = Nan Xuan’s *Qianbian* 前編 (25 juan, 8 ce);
- *Dzjy tunggiyan g’angmu bithe* = Zhu Xi’s *Zhengbian* 正編 (59 juan, 56 ce); and
- *Sioi dzjy tunggiyan g’angmu bithe* = Shang Lu’s *Xubian* 續編 (27 juan, 27 ce).

This corresponds to one of the two versions of the “complete history” in line with the Ming mainstream tradition (probably the Chen Renxi edition) as pointed out above. Thus, for this Manchu translation, the editors preferred Nan Xuan to Chen Jing/Jin Lüxiang.

Little is known about the spread of these Manchu works. Yet the early Qing missionaries had a clear understanding of them, and they were to use them for their own translations.

---

59 Qing shilu, vol. 4, p. 346 (Kangxi 7/1/gengxu = 26 February 1668).
60 Qing shilu, vol. 5, p. 665 (Kangxi 30/3/wuzi = 31 March 1691). According to Langlès (pp. 70-71) there were two Manchu translations under Kangxi. This probably refers to the first one published in 1665 and the second published in 1691.
61 See the imperial preface, entitled “Han-i araha Tung-giyan g’ang-mu bithe-i siio” (Preface to the Imperially Commissioned *Tongjian gangmu*), transcribed and translated into German by Erich Haenisch ((1956), pp. 44-45); for the Chinese version, see Qing shilu, vol. 5, pp. 665-666 (Kangxi 30/3/wuzi = 31 March 1691).
62 Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing period*, p. 281. Parrenin in a letter dated 1740 gives an account of Hesu: “He taught Manchu and Chinese language to most of the Kangxi emperor’s children and presided over the translation of all the King [jing] and of the Chinese history [i.e. *Zizhi tongjian gangmu*] …”. LEC (1811), vol. 22, p. 276 (letter to Du Halde). The translation bureau, Neifan shufang 内繙書房, responsible for translations from Chinese into Manchu, was established by the Kangxi emperor.
63 Liaoningsheng tushuguan Manwen guji tushu zonglu (p. 225, n. 50014) most probably wrongly attributes the *Qianbian* to Chen Jing/Jin Lüxiang, since the number of juan corresponds to the Nan Xuan version and not to the combined Chen Jing/Jin Lüxiang version.
2.3.2. Early and Mid Qing Chinese Editions

Works in the gangjian tradition continued to appear in the early Qing. One such example, still reprinted today, is the *Gangjian yizhi lu* (An Easy to Understand Record of the Outline and Mirror; 1711) (92 juan), compiled by Wu Chengquan 吳乘權, (1655-1719) and others (Zhou Zhijiong 周之炯, Zhou Zhican 周之燦), which covers the period from Pangu till the end of the Ming. The editors clearly had the examples of late Ming gangjian to hand, but combined these with some elements from Nan Xuan’s description.

Interest in chronology also continued. For instance, Xu Fa’s 徐發 *Tianyuan lili quanshu* (A Complete Book of Calendrical Principles; pref. 1682) (12 juan), which was based on *Zhushu jinian*. Xu was also aware of Western chronology and claims that it corresponded best with the chronology of *Zhushu jinian* (Bamboo Annals). His tables are divided into cycles of 19 years. He starts with the first year of Yao (the 13th year in the first cycle) and ends with the first year of the Kangxi emperor (1662).

Another major work in chronology was (Yuding) *Lidai jishi nianbiao* (Imperially Approved Annual Tables of Historical Events) (100 juan), compiled by Wang Zhishu 王之樞 (jinshi 1685) as main editor, and published by order of the Kangxi emperor in 1715. It contains 72 sexagenary cycles, starting with the 61st year of Yao and finishing with the 22nd year of the Kangxi emperor (1683), and all information is converted into tabular form.

---

64 HYL 2512 2324; in HYL the full title is *Chimutang gangjian yizhi lu* 尺木堂銜易知錄 (An Easy to Understand Record of the Outline and Mirror from the Chimu Hall); it is accompanied by *Chimutang Mingjian yizhi lu* 尺木堂明銜易知錄 (An Easy to Understand Record of the Mirror for the Ming Dynasty from the Chimu Hall) (15 juan) by Zhu Guobiao 朱國標.

65 Xu Fa 徐發, *Tianyuan lili quanshu* (12 juan), XXSK, vol. 1032, pp. 331-615. Other version SKJHB, zi 33, pp. 183-484 (in which some pages are missing (e.g. final page of preface, p. 189), and it contains the juan shou (pp. 195-198) which is absent in the XXSK edition).

66 Xu Fa 徐發, *Tianyuan lili quanshu*, XXSK, vol. 1032, p. 472; SKJHB, zi 33, p. 335 (kaogu 考古 1, pp. 8a-b): 夫西士紀年,必有西土之史,而其數恰與中國竹書相應,可謂六合同文 “The chronology of the Western scholars is necessarily based on Western history, and its figures correspond to the Bamboo (Annals), one could call it a text similar from all sides”. Gaubil (see below at note 224) interpreted “Western” as “European”. For the correct interpretation, see article by Ad Dudink.

67 SKQS, vols. 387-391. So, in this case the start of Jin Lüxiang’s Qianbian is preferred to Nan Xuan’s Gangnu qianbian, and Emperor Ku is mainly mentioned as
Not all writings on chronology were as extensive. Nian Xiyao’s 年希堯 (?-1738) Gangjian jiazi tu 綱鑑甲子圖 (Chart of Outline and Mirror with Sexagenary Cycles), for instance, is a chart of the jiazi system (sexagenary cycles) according to the Tongjian gangmu, from 424 BC (beginning of the reign of Zhou Liewang 烈王) till 1705. Nian is perhaps best known as the main editor of Shixue 視學 (Study of Perspective; 1729), a translation of Andrea Pozzo’s work on perspective (Perspectiva Pictorum et architectorum, Rome, 1673-1700).

A further development was the production of editions of comprehensive histories in Chinese initiated by the emperor. Sixteen years after the Manchu edition appeared, an imperially approved new Chinese edition of the major historical texts was published with the title Yupi Zizhi tongjian gangmu quanshu 御批資治通鑑綱目全書 (Imperially Approved Complete Book of The Outline and Detail of the Comprehensive Mirror for the Aid of Government). This included a preface by the Kangxi emperor entitled Yupi Zizhi tongjian gangmu quanshu xu 御批資治通鑑綱目全書序 and dated Kangxi 46/1/17 (19 Feb 1707). It was different to the Manchu edition in one major respect: with regard to the basic structure of early history, it follows Jin Lüxiang’s Tongjian gangmu qianbian 通鑑綱目前編 (together with his Juyao 舉要) and Chen Jing’s Waiji 外紀, not Nan Xuan. Thus, in a certain sense, under the Kangxi emperor the two available versions of the late Ming of this early history were republished: one in Manchu (with the Nan Xuan version) and one in Chinese (with the Chen Jing version).

Under the Qianlong emperor (r. 1736-1795), imperial control over the writing of Chinese history intensified, as is shown by the Yupi lidai tongjian jilan 御批歷代通鑑輯覽 (Imperially Approved Overview of the Historical Comprehensive Mirror; 1776-1777) (120 juan), which took Li Dongyang’s Lidai tongjian zhuanyao as a model. The climax of this trend, however, was the compilation of the massive Siku quanshu (Complete [Imperial] Library in Four Branches of Literature), which was accompanied by the official evaluation, selection and potential rejection of all previous works on history. The Qinding siku quanshu zongmu tiyao 欽定四庫全書總目提要 (Annotated

being the father of Yao. See SKQS, vol. 387, p. 3 (sanyuan jiazi bianzhu 三元甲子編年 3). See also the copy in BnF, Chinois 644-653.

For copies see note 173.

Catalogue of the Complete Imperial Library of in Four Branches of Literature) (1789), an annotated catalogue of the works considered for inclusion in the *Siku quanshu*, assigns most of the important historical works to the *biannian* 編年 category, and they are included in the final selection, e.g. *Zhushu jinian*, Sima Guang’s *Zizhi tongjian*, Liu Shu’s *Tongjian waiji*, Jin Lüxiang’s *Tongjian qianbian*, Chen Jing’s *Tongjian xubian*, etc. Reviewed but not included in *Siku quanshu*, however, is Nan Xuan’s *Tongjian gangmu qianbian*, the editors criticizing Nan for not having always carefully checked his sources. This negative evaluation contrasts with the authoritative position the text had held in the late Ming and early Qing (serving as a basis for the Manchu translation). Xue Yingqi’s *Jiazi huiji* falls under the same category of having been reviewed but not included. The compilation of the *Siku quanshu* resulted in a campaign against seditious books that sometimes led to their destruction (especially in the years 1774-1788). The lists of works that were rejected and meant to be destroyed is significant, therefore, and includes many of the *gangjian* tradition, among them those by Yuan Huang and Zhong Xing.

It is striking how much the opinions of the editors of the *Siku quanshu* have influenced present-day evaluations of late Ming and early Qing works on history. Some of the more important texts of the mainstream tradition have fallen into oblivion, while the *gangjian* tradition has been nearly forgotten. It is only in recent years with their republication and use in some secondary sources that they have once again come to the attention of scholars.

The two major historical genres of the late Ming proved to be foundational for the early Qing. On the one hand Chinese and Manchu texts from the early Qing continued the *gangjian* genre, on the other hand they confirmed the mainstream tradition of Chen Jing or Nan Xuan. As will be shown in the next section, missionary sources demonstrate that nearly all

---

71 Qinding Siku quanshu zongmu (1997), vol. 1, p. 669 (also *biannian*). See also in Zuo Guiqiu (2009), p. 146 n. 1.
missionaries used *gangjian* texts, often alongside the official texts, well into the eighteenth century.

# 3. Missionary Accounts and their Sources

Missionary accounts of Chinese history can be divided into two groups.\(^75\) The first group dates from the late seventeenth century, the main authors being Martino Martini and Philippe Couplet.\(^76\) They were mainly published relatively quickly after the return of their authors to Europe and contain relatively little indications as to their sources. They also generated other European publications by scholars who had never been to China, such as Christian Mentzel and Melchisédec Thévenot, and they stimulated the first European debate on the subject that lasted until the 1720s.\(^77\)

The second group dates from the eighteenth century. These are the works of the French Jesuits, who were originally sent to China with a primarily scientific mission that included studies on Chinese history, and started to be published from the 1720s. They were usually published by intermediaries—Paris Jesuits such as Jean-Baptiste Du Halde, or orientalists, such as Joseph de Guignes—often long after the texts had arrived in France, that is, in the late eighteenth and even early nineteenth century. They contain many more references to their sources, and were part of the correspondence between the Jesuits in China and French academicians, resulting in debates that ultimately formed part of the Enlightenment movement.

## 3.1. Late Seventeenth Century

The writings of Martini and Couplet launched a debate in Europe about the use of the Vulgate version of the Bible (a Latin translation of the Hebrew version that placed the Creation around 4004 BC and the Flood around 2348 BC) and the *Septuagint* version (a Greek translation with the Creation around 5622 BC and the Flood around 3366 BC).

In the preface to his work, Martini explains that he was obliged to indicate a date for the authentic origins of Chinese history that seemed to be in contradiction with the Vulgate. He leaves it to chronologists to solve the question, however, since they have at their disposal the *Septuagint* and

\(^{75}\) For this division, see also Pinot (1932), p. 249.
\(^{76}\) We will not discuss the scattered references to ancient Chinese history in works by authors such as Nicolas Trigault or Álvaro Semedo. See Pinot (1932), p. 194.
\(^{77}\) For a discussion of this debate see Pinot (1932), pp. 214-249.
other texts. He had such admiration for Chinese history and for Chinese chronologists that he affirmed the certainty of this chronology without considering the consequences this might have for criticism of the chronology of the Scriptures. According to Virgile Pinot, after Martini the Jesuits, who were nonetheless fervent defenders of the antiquity of China, were never again as daring, at least not in their publications. Like Martini’s, Couplet’s chronology does not accord with the Vulgate. But unlike Martini, who presents an uninterrupted flow of historical events, Couplet includes an interruption to preserve the possibility of a universal Flood. In his eyes, the Chinese have great difficulty in interpreting the earliest times of their history precisely because they lack the Flood, but that everything becomes clear when one uses the light of the Bible. Thus, the Bible is an aid to solving the obscure periods of ancient Chinese history. This became the Jesuit position after 1686. They were not afraid to accept, with some precautions, ancient Chinese history. The only concession to be made was to accept the version of the Septuagint instead of the Vulgate for the calculation of the years.

3.1.1. Martino Martini (1614-1661)

*Sinicae historiae decas prima: Res à gentis origine ad Christum natum in extremâ Asiâ, sive Magno Sinarum Imperio gestas complexa*, Monachii: Lucæ Straubii, 1658 (362 pp.), Amsterdam: Joanem Blaev, 1659 (413 pp.).


Martino Martini is the first to have published a major work on Chinese history in a European language. He left for China in 1640 and, after a stay of about seven to eight years, was asked in 1650 to return to Europe as

---

78 Martini studied in Rome with Athanasius Kircher (1602-1680), who believed, tacitly following the Calvinist Scaliger, that Egypt existed before the Flood. When he arrived in China and read the annals, he was not surprised to find that they too began too early to fit the chronology of Genesis. See Rosenberg & Grafton (2010), p. 69.


81 On the various editions, see also Cordier (1904), vol. 1, col.; in APF there is a manuscript copy of Martini’s book (505 pages), which belonged to J.F. Foucquet (APF, SC Indie Orientali e Cina Misc.[ellanea] 21).
procurator of the China mission. He arrived in Bergen in 1653 and on his way to Rome spent some time in the Low Countries, where he finalised and published some of his major works. He is best known for the *Novus Atlas Sinensis*, published in Amsterdam in 1655. Another important work was *Sinicae historiae decas prima: Res à gentis origine ad Christum natum in extrema Asia, sive magnó Sinarum imperio gestas complexa* (The first decade of the history of China: Covering the events that took place in the far East, or in the great empire of China, since the origin of the [human] race until the birth of Christ). He covers the period 2952 BC (= Fuxi) to 1 (the birth of Christ) (= Emperor Ai of Han), marking the periods according to the sexagenary cycles starting from the third emperor, which corresponds to 2697 BC. In total, the work discusses 136 emperors and includes 44 complete sexagenary cycles plus 57 years of the 45th cycle.

The sources used by Martini have been the subject of some research, though he himself is very discreet about them. In the introduction he explains that he wrote this history as clearly and concisely as he could:

drawing from a large number of books on Chinese history, which were compiled with great care. The authors of those volumes, persevering with fidelity and effort, described the historical process in such a way that, although it is one and continuous, it has numerous authors, of which some are more ancient than others, by whom it is presented in an orderly way. Indeed, authors of subsequent times are not allowed to correct or to call into doubt the earlier history, but have a duty to carefully add to the annals of the past those of their own times and, by

---

82 The name “first decade” indicates that Martini wanted to follow the classical scheme of subdividing history into parts as the ancient Latin historians had done. See von Collani (2005), p. 121. He also intended to have a “second decade”: see Martini, *Novus Atlas Sinensis*, (2002), pp. 45 and 76 (information provided by Noël Golvers). On the “second decade” published by Thevenot, see below (see also Foss (1991), pp. 169-170).

83 He leaves aside the period prior to Fuxi, because these annals were considered suspicious by the Chinese due to the fact that they contain many “false and ridiculous” aspects (see Martini, p. 3 (2010), p. 11).

order of the emperor, to prolong it in a continuous series.\textsuperscript{85}

In her most recent study on the sources of Martini, Luisa Paternicò states that these words seem to deny the statement made by Lundbæk, for which he unfortunately does not provide a reference, that

Martini states in several places that he has drawn his information from the short historical summaries written for the common people who do not want to burden their memories with too much detail.\textsuperscript{86}

Paternicò herself is of the opinion that Martini may well have used a limited number of books, for the simple reason that he had to carry them with him to Europe. That Martini consulted texts such as *Shangshu* 隋書 (*Shujing* 書經, Classic of Documents), *Daxue* 大學 (Great Learning) and *Mengzi* 孟子 (Mencius) is indicated by brief references in his text.\textsuperscript{87} It is not impossible that he had access to other primary sources, such as Sima Qian’s *Shiji*.\textsuperscript{88} Martini’s work, however, is much more detailed than *Shiji*, both in chronological references and content, and therefore it cannot be his primary source. Possible sources for the reigns from Pangu to Yu have been investigated by Wu Liwei, who compares the number of years in the reigns and the the signs of the sexagenary cycle that are used in Martini with various Chinese historical works. She comes to the conclusion that Martini may have used Chen Jing’s *Zizhi tongjian xubian* 資治通鑑續編, though she does not rule out that he also consulted other works such as Sima Qian’s *Shiji*.\textsuperscript{89} Building on this research, Paternicò has investigated the subsequent periods. She concludes that Martini used Chen Jing’s *Zizhi tongjian xubian* for Pangu till Emperor Ku; Jin Lüxiang’s *Zizhi tongjian* (gangmu) qianbian from Yao to King Kao of Zhou 周考王 (= end of book 4 of Martini); and Zhu Xi’s *Zizhi tongjian gangmu* for the subsequent period until Emperor Ai of Han (book 5 till the end of book 10). In addition he used *Shiji*, *Shujing* and Sima Guang’s

\textsuperscript{85} On his sources, see his preface p. 3 ((2010), p. 7). See also Martini, *Novus Atlas Sinensis* (2002), p. 147 (about the fact that he carried with him fifty Chinese books) and p. 170 (about the fact that he carried with him “Chinese histories” (information provided by Noël Golvers).


\textsuperscript{87} See Paternicò (2010), pp. xviii, esp. notes 10-12.

\textsuperscript{88} E.g. von Collani (1996), p. 233; see also von Collani (2005), pp. 120-121, 123.

\textsuperscript{89} Or also Hu Hong’s *Huangwang daji* for the period from Pangu till Suiren and possibly also Zheng Qiao’s 趙樵 *Tongzhi* (1104-1162) 通志 (Comprehensive Treaty). Wu Liwei (2004), pp. 137-149; Wu Liwei (2005), pp. 95-116.
Both the structure and concrete examples given by Paternicò would indeed lead to this conclusion. Yet, this is not completely certain. As pointed out earlier, there were two editions of Tongjian gangmu quanshu 通鑑綱目全書 at the end of the Ming. One consisted of Chen Jing’s Zizhi tongjian qianbian waiji 資治通鑑綱目前編外紀 (1 juan) and Jin Lüxiang’s Zizhi tongjian gangmu qianbian 資治通鑑綱目前編 (18 juan) and the tables Juyao 舉要 (3 juan) for the earliest period; the other had Nan Xuan’s Zizhi tongjian gangmu qianbian 資治通鑑綱目前編 as the basis for the ancient history; both had Zhu Xi’s Zizhi tongjian gangmu 資治通鑑綱目 (59 juan) and Shang Lu’s Xu Zizhi tongjian gangmu 續資治通鑑綱目 (27 juan) for the later history. It has yet to be ascertained which edition Martini used, if indeed he did so.

There are also a number of significant differences between these texts and Martini’s Decas, which indicate that he must have used other sources. The most likely candidate for these is the texts of the gangjian tradition, such as those by Yuan Huang and Zhong Xing. As can be seen from the following table, which lists a number of identifiable details concerning Emperor Ku and preceding emperors, Martini’s text is closer to the gangjian texts than to Chen Jing’s or Nan Xuan’s. The explanation of Ku’s name as “summum”, the identification of his capital city with Yanshi 偃師 in Henan, the miraculous birth after his mother had seen a red dragon and had a pregnancy of fourteen months are all details that appear in the gangjian texts and not Chen Jing’s or Nan Xuan’s. Similar details can be found in the paragraphs on other emperors, such as Lantian 藍田 as the place of origin of Fuxi, the opposition by Jiuli 九黎 under Shaohao 少昊 and the move of the capital from Baoding 保定 to Puyang 濮陽 under Zhuanxu 顓頊. There is much overlapping between the texts of Chen Jing, Nan Xuan and the gangjian tradition, because they quote the same earlier sources and because the gangjian texts are also partly based on Chen Jing, Nan Xuan and Shang Lu, making it very difficult to prove that Martini did not use Chen Jing. Moreover, there are also cases that cannot be explained on the basis of the gangjian texts, such as the order of the four concubines, where

---

91 Since Nan Xuan (used in the other complete Tongjian gangmu edited by Chen Renxi) starts with Fuxi rather than Pangu, it is less likely that Martini used this edition.
92 By Chen Jing is meant the original version, also used by Paternicò. There are more resemblances with the newer version, by which is meant the 1506/1560 version (see above mentioned Naikaku Bunko copy). Unlike the gangjian texts, the information appears in extensive notes, and not all information (which appears in the gangjian texts) is included.
Martini follows an order that is identical to *Shiji* and both Chen Jing and Nan Xuan. Also the chronology is different. Yet, this overview shows that Martini, in order to make his text comprehensible for his European public, actively used texts of the *gangjian* tradition, which were much more accessible than the *Zizhi tongjian* texts. In sum, one can be sure that Martini used a *gangjian* text for his early history, while it is much less certain which text from the official tradition he used.
Table 1. Comparison of selected passages between the works of Martini, Chen Jing, Nan Xuan, Yuan Huang and Zhong Xing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Di Ku</th>
<th>Cycle of first year</th>
<th>Explanatio of name</th>
<th>Transfer of capital</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Order of concubines</th>
<th>Red dragon and 14 months of pregnancy</th>
<th>Shao and opposition by Ji Li in using magical arts</th>
<th>Length of reign</th>
<th>Start with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22th year</td>
<td>丙戌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shennong: 140</td>
<td>伏羲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23th year</td>
<td>乙酉</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huangdi: 100</td>
<td>伏羲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24th year</td>
<td>甲申</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shaohao: 84</td>
<td>伏羲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25th year</td>
<td>甲申</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zhuanxu: 78</td>
<td>伏羲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70/99</td>
<td>23th year fifth cycle</td>
<td>九遼</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Di Ku: 70</td>
<td>伏羲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22th year</td>
<td>丙戌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yao 90</td>
<td>伏羲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23th year</td>
<td>乙酉</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shun 33</td>
<td>伏羲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24th year</td>
<td>甲申</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yu: 10</td>
<td>伏羲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SK 332*
Yuan Huang follows the chronology of Shao Yong, Huangji jingshi shu, SKQS, vol. 803, p. 361 (juan 1 xia, p. 68b).

1 Yuan Huang follows the chronology of Shao Yong, Huangji jingshi shu, SKQS, vol. 803, p. 361 (juan 1 xia, p. 68b).
3.1.2. António de Gouveia (1592-1677)

“Monarchia da China dividida em seis idades” (Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid Ms 2949; Archivum Provinciae Toletanae Societatis Iesu, M-96 (227)).

Around the time that Martini was in Europe, the Portuguese Jesuit António de Gouveia (1592-1677) sent a manuscript back to Europe that treated the history of the Chinese monarchy in six periods. De Gouveia had spent most of his time as a missionary in the provinces and had a keen interest in history. He compiled two histories of the China mission: the first together with Nicolas Trigault (1577-1628) was entitled “Historia Missionis Sinensis, 1610-1625”\(^94\); the other is the extensive “Asia extrema: Entra nella a Fé, promulga-se a Ley de Deos pelos Padres da Companhia de Jesus” (1644)\(^95\). The treatise on Chinese history “Monarchia da China dividida em seis idades” (The Monarchy of China divided in Six Periods) was the result of twenty years of study and research and is dated 20 January 1654 (Metropoli de Fò = Fuzhou 福州). De Gouvea never returned to Europe to promote the publication of his work. It remained in manuscript form, and it is not clear to what extent it was actually used.\(^96\)

The text covers the history from Fuxi to the beginning of the Qing dynasty. According to the short description at the beginning, “Monarchia da China” is drawn from Chinese and Portuguese books. In a certain way it is similar to Martini’s work, but it covers a much longer period. The author may have had different sources to hand, but there can be little doubt that one of the gangjian texts was at its origin, since many of the details that justify the identification of Martini’s source also appear in De Gouvea.\(^97\)

---

\(^93\) The last copy is referred to by Asami (1999), who gives a description of the two copies. The Madrid text counts 195 fols., the Toledo text 476 pp. and an index of 11 pp.

\(^94\) ARSI, Jap. Sin. 107.


\(^96\) According to Pfister (1932), p. 223, the text is often quoted by Noël Alexandre O.P. (1639-1724) and Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero O.F.M. (1602-1669; in French: Antoine de Sainte-Marie).

\(^97\) The text contains many details, such as the contemporary location of places, that are typical of the gangjian texts. Other details seem to come from other sources: see for instance “Monarchia da China”, fol. 21v: the passage on the invention of the bayin 八音 (eight sounds, called jin 金, shi 石, si 絲, zhu 竹, pao 髑, tu 土, ge 革 and mu 木) by Huangdi: 金石絲竹匏土革木, which can be found in Li Dongyang, Lidai tongjian zuanyao, WSSK 4-12, p. 17 (juan 1, p. 7b).
The passage on Emperor Ku, for instance, appears to be a summary of one of the gangjian texts, such as Yuan Huang. The author also added chronological information, such as the years according to the beginning of the monarchy and separating a given sovereign from the Flood.

3.1.3. Philippe Couplet (1622-1693)

“Prologomena ad Annales Sinicos, necnon Synopsim Chronologicam Monarchiæ Sinicæ” (ARSI, Jap. Sin. IV, 6 A, fols. 3-26; dated Canton, 24 December 1666; with approbation by Vice-Provincial Feliciano Pacheco, 20 August 1668).100

“Prologomena ad Annales Sinicos, necnon Synopsim Chronologicam Monarchiæ Sinicæ Auctore Patre Philippo Couplet Societatis Iesu” (ARSI, Jap. Sin. IV, 6 D, fols. 100-121).101

“Prologomena ad Synopsim Chronologicam Monarchiæ Sinicæ”, 49 fols (BnF, Ms. Lat 17804).102

“Ex Prolegomenis ad Annales Sinicos necnon Synopsim Chronologicam Autore P. Philippo Couplet Societ. Iesu anno 1666 in provincia Qu’àm tūm” (BVE, Fondo Gesuitico, n. 1314, fols. 1-16v, 20r-v).103

“Synopsis Chronologica Monarchiæ Sinicæ, Ab Anno post Diluvium 275 Usque ad Annum Christi 1666” (ARSI, Jap. Sin. IV,6A, fols. 27-56 [from Fuxi until Eastern Han]; ARSI, Jap. Sin. IV, 6 B, fols. 57-80 [the subsequent period - Tang]).

“Synopsis Chronologica Monarchiæ Sinicæ, Ab Anno post Diluvium 275 Usque ad Annum Christi 1666” (ARSI, Jap. Sin. IV, 6 E, fols. 122-141 [from Fuxi until Eastern Han], (in table form with Chinese characters); Imperii

98 Compare “Monarchia da China”, fol. 23r with Yuan Huang (SKJH, shi 67, pp. 130-131; juan 1, pp. 16b-18a), though the text is abbreviated (e.g. the passage of the miraculous births by the consorts is left out), unless it is based on a shorter gangjian text.

99 In the case of Emperor Ku this is 737 years after the Flood.

100 For a description of this and the following ARSI texts (Jap. Sin. IV, 6 A-E), see Chan (2002), pp. 538-543. This text counts 9 chapters; there are no Chinese characters in the text, only in the table of cyclical signs.

101 Some Chinese characters added to the text.

102 Same as ARSI, Jap. Sin. IV 6 A, fols. 1-16v: ends with reference to Canton, 24 dec. 1666 (other handwriting; no characters; no numbers for paragraphs as in the ARSI copy).

103 This is a much reduced selection from Couplet’s “Prologomena”, probably based on one of the other incomplete copies. See also Golvers (1998), p. 1162, n. 72.
Tabula chronologica Monarchiae Sinicae: A R. P. Philippo Couplet Soc. Jesu concin nata, Et Honoribus Illustrissimorum, ac Perillustrium Dominorum In Antiquissima ac Celeberrima Universitate Viennensi, Promotore R. P. Carolo Granielli Societatis Jesu, AA. LL. & Philosophiae Doctore, ejusdemque Professore Ordinario, primâ AA. LL. & Philosophiae laureâ Condecoratorum A Neo-Baccalaureis Condiscipulis Inscripta & dicata Anno M.DCCIII, Vien nae: Voigt, 1703. (the tables are converted into a continous text)

The next text on Chinese chronology that had considerable influence on the European scholarly world was the Tabula chronologica Monarchiae Sinicæ by Philippe Couplet.\(^\text{104}\) Couplet had become enthusiastic about going to China after attending a lecture by Martino Martini in Leuven in 1654. He left for China in 1656, and after about twenty years there he was, as Martini had been, chosen as procurator to return to Europe in 1680. He arrived in the Netherlands in 1683. Tabula chronologica Monarchiae Sinicæ was first published by G. Garnier in Paris in 1686, but is better known in the version added to the end of the Confucius Sinarum Philosophus, published by D. Horthemels in Paris one year later in 1687.\(^\text{105}\) It mainly consists of two “tables” arranged according to the sexagenary cycle: the first from Huangdi (2697 BC) until the birth of Christ; the second until 1683; both are preceded by a preface. There was also a new printing done in Austria in 1703, in which the content of the tables is converted into a narrative text.


\(^{105}\) See Golvers (1998), pp. 1162-1163; G. Garnier was the publisher of M. Thevenot’s earlier editions of his Relations (see below); the version Tabula chronologica in Confucius Sinarum Philosophus still carries the date 1686.
The text goes back to a much earlier work by Couplet, “Prologomena ad Annales Sinicos, necnon Synopsim Chronologicam Monarchiæ Sinicæ” that is dated Canton, 24 December 1666 (thus finalised during the Canton exile; Couplet had then been in China for seven years), and approved by Vice-Provincial Feliciano Pacheco on 20 August 1668. It was carried to Europe by Prospero Intorcetta (1625-1696) in 1668. The text must have arrived in Rome by 1670 and was submitted to internal Jesuit censorship in the following years (1672-1673).106 By the time Couplet returned to Europe and arrived in Rome in December 1684, his manuscript had still not been published. At least four copies of this manuscript are still extant. The ARSI copies contain two incomplete versions of the specific chronology entitled “Synopsis Chronologica Monarchiæ Sinicæ, Ab Anno post Diluvium 275 Usque ad Annum Christi 1666”. One copy (ARSI, IV 6 A-B) covers the period from Fuxi until the Eastern Han (Xiandi 獻帝, 190-220 AD) and from Emperor Zhaolie 昭烈帝 (221-223) to the Tang (Dezong 德宗, 780-805); the other copy (in table form; ARSI, IV 6 E) only covers the period from Fuxi until the Eastern Han (Xiandi 獻帝, 190-220 AD).107 Besides the fact that the Tabula chronologica extends the chronology from 1666 until 1683, the year of Couplet’s arrival in Europe, the other significant difference is that it starts later, with Huangdi as first emperor instead of Fuxi in the manuscript version. In his preface, Couplet distinguishes between the period before Fuxi, which is considered fabulous (fabulosum)108, and the period which starts with Fuxi, which is considered historical. He points out, though, that the Chinese historians who start indubitable history with Fuxi, report about events under Fuxi and Shennong in the same way as the period before. According to Couplet, the caesura should be made not at Fuxi but Huangdi. Thus, his printed chronological table with Chinese emperors of

---


107 The tables also include comparative chronological dates, e.g. the years after the Flood, which in the case of Emperor Ku is 792.

108 See “Præfatio ad Tabulam chronologicam Sinicæ monarchiæ”, p. iv and manuscript § 4: fabulosum, fabulas, fabulæ, fabulosum.
which the reigns are dated starts with Huangdi, while he merely gives undated events that took place under Fuxi and Shennong in his preface.\textsuperscript{109}

The sources of Couplet's *Tabula chronologica Monarchiæ Sinicæ* have been the object of some study.\textsuperscript{110} The manuscripts "Prologomena ad Annales Sinicos..." provide additional material for the identification of Couplet's Chinese sources, because they include references to Chinese sources that are not included in the "Preface" of the printed version (which is much shorter than the manuscript version).\textsuperscript{111} On the one hand, Couplet shows that he is well aware of the different genres of works on history in China;\textsuperscript{112} mentioning major texts such as *Xingli daquan* 性理大全 (The Complete Collection of Nature and Principle), *Shujing* 書經 (Classic of Documents), *Tongjian gangmu* 通鑒綱目 (Outline and Detail of the Comprehensive Mirror), *Nianyi shi* 廿一史 (Twenty-One Histories), *Guoyu* 國語 (Discourses of the States), *Chunqiu* 春秋 (Spring and Autumn Annals).\textsuperscript{113} On the other hand, the presence of two passages in Chinese characters allows one to identify two explicit quotes from *Shujing*\textsuperscript{114} and *Zizhi tongjian*, which he used as a source. Couplet may well have directly consulted some of the

\textsuperscript{109} See also Pinot (1932), pp. 212-214.

\textsuperscript{110} For earlier discussions, see Mungello (1990), pp. 186-189; von Collani (2005), p. 123.

\textsuperscript{111} The manuscript of the "Prologomena" includes nine chapters in 87 numbered paragraphs: in the printed version the introduction (§ 1-3), chapter 2 (§ 10-21: a discussion on the necessity to use the Septuagint), chapter 6 (§ 35-39: on the Chinese calendar, a.o. the intercalary months), chapter 7 (§ 40-50: on the reliability of the Chinese historiographers), the end of chapter 8 (§ 68-71) and chapter 9 (§ 72-87: on the tables) were completely reproduced. Other sections have been abbreviated. The printed version includes two prefaces; the second corresponds with the beginning of chapter 8 of the manuscript.

\textsuperscript{112} See § 47 chîm sù. i.e. *rectam legitimamque Historiam* = *zhengshi* 正史; *guêi sù. fabulosæ falsæque sunt* = *waishi* 外史; *yè sù. syluestres atque à privatis hominibus conscriptar* = *yeshi* 野史; see also § 43 on the five classes of historians under the Zhou.

\textsuperscript{113} Sim li tài cuêün (§ 5; printed version, p. v); xû kim (§ 13, 36, 56); tüm kiên câm mô, (150 ferè voluminibus) (§ 41, 50, 79); Niên yê sù. (§ 41); quê yû (§ 43); chûn cieû (§ 56; printed version, p. 25).

\textsuperscript{114} § 36 (ARSI, Jap. Sin. IV, 6 D, fol. 110r) = Legge (1991), vol. 3, pp. 21-23 (*Shujing,juan 1*, from *Yaojian* 報典).

\textsuperscript{115} § 80 (ARSI, Jap. Sin. IV, 6 D, fol. 118v) = *Yu pi Zizhi tongjian gangmu* 御批資治通鑒綱目, SKQS, vol. 689, p. 548 (juan 9 shang, pp. 35a-b).
other works he refers to, such as Sima Qian’s *Shiji*,¹¹⁶ from which he also may have adopted the idea to convert all his data into tables.¹¹⁷

Regarding Ming authors, Couplet quotes Nan hien = Nan Xuan 南軒¹¹⁸ (also in the printed version) who states that many of the events from times before Yao and Shun are not canonical (*pu kim*, *hoc est*, *non authentica* = 不經).¹¹⁹ Another important reference is Couplet’s mention of the existence of “175 historiographers”, about whom the preliminaries of the historian “yên fân lêao” (36 volumes) shed ample light.¹²⁰ An author “yên fân liao” has so far not been identified, but it may well be a mistake for Yuan Liaofan, i.e. Yuan Huang, whose *Dingqie Zhaotian Liaofan Yuan xiansheng bianzuan guben lishi dafang gangjian bu* 炳鏡趙田了凡袁先生編纂古本歷史大方綱鑑補 indeed gives an extensive list of over 160 historiographers with their name, origin,

---

¹¹⁶ See the reference to Sima Qian: sù. mà çïēn (§ 16, 44; see also Taí sù cûm (§ 4, 56; printed version, p. iiij, 25). Possible reference to Zuoshi 左氏 as author of *Zuozhuan* 左傳: çò xí, eruditus author et antiquus (§ 43). Not yet identified is yâm cî, gravissimus inter Sinas auctor ... in Prologo suo (§ 59; printed version, p. 26).

¹¹⁷ The manuscript version of the “Synopsis Chronologica Monarchiae Sinicae” exists in two versions (both of which are incomplete): one is in a narrative form, one is in tabular form (see above).

¹¹⁸ Most Jesuit writings from the seventeenth and early eighteenth century refer to the personal name as “hien” = xian in pinyin; 軒 has as alternative pronunciations xiàn, xían, luân and jiàn; for convenience sake, the transcription xuān will be kept in this text.

¹¹⁹ § 9 nănhiēn (printed version p. xj: “Unde Nan hien auctor meritò dicit, multa ex iis quae referuntur ante tempora Yao & Xun accidisse, esse *pu kim*, hoc est, non authentica,...”). The quote can be found in Nan Xuan’s preface to his *Zizhi tongjian gangmu qianbian* 資治通鑑綱目前編, CMCS, shí vol. 9, p. 6 (*yuanshi* 原始, p. 1b) (Nan Xuan refers specifically to Chen Jing and Liu Shu). The passage is also quoted in Giulio Aleni’s *Wanwu zhenyuan* 萬物真原 (The True Origin of All Things) (p. 3a; *CCT ZKW*, vol. 1, p. 169) and in Lodovico Buglio, *Budeyi bian* 不得已辯 (Refuting ‘I Can No Longer Stand It’) (p. 16a; *WX*, p. 259) (see also Witek (1983), p. 235): “Nan Xuan, in discussing the events before Yao and Shun says that ‘among them there are many that are not authentic’; moreover he says that ‘in historical writing there is no doubt that one should start with Fuxi.’” (The second quote can also be found in Nan Xuan’s preface, p. 6).

¹²⁰ § 67 (not in printed version) “Scriptores autem rerum Sinensium (praeter eos, qui Trium Familiarum Principum tempore floruerunt) universim 175 extitierunt; (quorum nomine), et patriam, et dignitatem quisquis scire voluerit, quid item, quo stylo, qua ratione scripserint, Annalium Maius Opus non autem Synopsest et compendia consultat; Prologomena quoque Historiographi yên fân lêao dicti, quae operi suo (quod 36 voluminibus constat) Author iste praemittit, non parum Lucis hic adferre poterunt.”
works, etc. as indicated by Couplet. If this is confirmed, Yuan Huang would also be one of the most important sources used for the manuscript “Synopsis Chronologica Monarchiae Sinicæ”. The content of the passage on Emperor Ku, for instance, corresponds to a large extent to what is mentioned in texts of the gangjian tradition, such as Yuan Huang, rather than those of the official tradition: the reference to Yanshi in Henan, the dressing as sages, the order of the concubines, the reference to Jiushao 九招 music, the age of 105, the naming of the different phases of the moon, etc. all can be found in the gangjian texts, while most of this information is absent in those of the official tradition (though Jiushao is mentioned in Chen Jing but not in Nan Xuan). Some of the information can be found in the notes to the Shiji, from which the gangjian authors took it, but not all (e.g. the order of the concubines and the Jiushao music). Yet, Couplet still may have consulted Shiji: the sentence on attributing territory in Sichuan (state of Shu 蜀) to the children and grand-children of Changyi 常意 does not appear in the passage on Emperor Ku in gangjian texts, neither in Chen Jing or Nanxuan, but can be found in the commentaries to Shiji, chapter 13 (chapter on the tables).

The search for the sources for the printed version of Couplet’s Tabula chronologica Monarchiae Sinicæ, however, is complicated further when one compares the manuscript version with the printed version. The differences are considerable and show that Couplet seriously revised his text between 1666 and 1686. These revisions are not only a matter of style or making the text more understandable to the European reader (such as adding the information that Houji 后稷 was later known for agriculture). Couplet adds new information that was not present in the manuscript. One example is the supplementary information about the miraculous births by the concubines. A comparison with Martini shows that Couplet may well have been having using Martini’s text: expressions such as novo exemplo, votum (Deo factum) impetravit, decimo quarto (à) conceptu mense and filium habuit all appear in Martini’s text. But Couplet also used additional primary sources, such as in the case of the vocal music, most probably again taken from the gangjian tradition. An important difference is that in the printed version Couplet also added the dates according to the sexagenary cycle (such as

121 SKJH, vol. 67, pp. 112-115 (shou juan, pp. 17a-24a: xianru minggong xingshi 先儒名公姓氏) (166 names in total). The editions of Yuan Huang that have been preserved all contain 39 juan. See Zhongguo guji shanben shumu, vol. 2, p. 133.

122 See Shiji, vol. 1, p. 507 (juan 13); quotation from Suoqin, which states that he gave territory to his zhishu 支庶 (i.e. sons of a concubine); in the printed version the sentence was changed to Emperor Ku’s brothers and sons (who are indeed the children and grandchildren of Changyi).
“anno cycli 23, 32, 33, and 40” under Emperor Ku but more frequently under the subsequent emperors). A systematic work recording such dating is Zhong Xing’s *Dingqin Zhong Bojing dingzheng Zizhi gangjian zhengshi daguan* 隆鍾鐘伯敬訂正資治綱鑑正史大全. It can not be ruled out that Couplet actually used this *gangjian* text.

From this analysis, it appears that Couplet used several sources, but most probably relied heavily on works of the *gangjian* tradition.

### 3.1.4. Melchisédec Thévenot (1620-1692)


Melchisédec Thévenot (1620-1692) was a French scholar, who knew several oriental languages. He published on a wide variety of topics (such as physics, medicine, the art of swimming, etc.). “Synopsis Chronologica Monarchiæ Sinicæ” is included in the 1696 augmented reissue of his *Relations de divers voyages curieux* (published in various editions since 1663). It is an early example of a European publication on Chinese chronology by a scholar who never went to China. The origin of this Chinese chronology has been the object of various interpretations, mainly caused by Thévenot’s own explanation.

First he considers it as somehow a supplement to Martino Martini’s *Decas prima*. In Thévenot, the early history ends on page 19 (page 20 being blank): this break is right at the point where Martini’s

---

123 E.g. Couplet, pp. 2-3; Yuan Huang (*SKJH*, *shi* 67, pp. 130-131; *juan* 1, pp. 16b-18a) does not mention the cyclical year for Emperor Ku and only for the first year of Yao (*jiachen* 甲辰 (= no. 41) which corresponds to Couplet); Zhong Xing (*SKJH*, *shi* 65, pp. 121-122; *juan* 1, pp. 20a-21a) mentions the cyclical years for the first year of Emperor Ku (*yiyou* 乙酉 (= no. 22)), Zhi (*yiwei* 乙未 (= no. 32)) and Yao (*jiachen* 甲辰 (= no. 41)); Couplet frequently has a difference of one in the number of the cyclical year; yet, all sources consulted give *yiyou* as the first year of Emperor Ku.

124 E.g. Couplet, p. 5 (under Ti Xu = *Di Zhu*: “*An. 41 succedit Ti Xu filius. Anno 44. maris Eoi rebelles domat.* (He mastered the rebellious people of the eastern sea). *An. 57 Ti Xu mortuit.*”); Yuan Huang (*SKJH*, *shi* 67, p. 137; *juan* 1, p. 29a) only mentions the cyclical year for the succession; the mastering of the rebellious people is not mentioned (only added in handwriting); for the death date there is no cyclical year; Zhong Xing (*SKJH*, *shi* 65, p. 132; *juan* 2, pp. 7b-8a) mentions the three cyclical years: *jiachen* 甲辰 (= no. 41), *wushen* 戊申 (= no. 45) and *gengshen* 庚申 (= no. 57); Couplet has mistaken *wushen* for n. 44 instead of 45.

125 On the content of this text, see Van Kley (1983), pp. 198-199.
Decas prima ends, the time of the birth of Christ. The text continues on page 21 and contains the header Decas secunda.\textsuperscript{126} Next, Thévenot states that the original was written in “Persian”.\textsuperscript{127} Yet it appears that it is simply the publication of the complete text of “Synopsis Chronologica Monarchiae Sinicæ” attributed to Philippe Couplet and discussed above. The above mentioned ARSI manuscripts of Couplet’s “Synopsis” are incomplete (one includes the history merely until the Later Han, the other until the Tang), but Thévenot is exactly the same as these sections, as is also clear from the description of Emperor Ku. Thévenot’s text, however, covers a longer period, from Fuxi until 1425 (death of the Hongxi 洪熙 emperor of the Ming). It thus appears that Thévenot had access to the longer manuscript.\textsuperscript{128} Pinot states that this text provides nothing new compared to Martini, except that it indicates the increased interest in Chinese chronology by the wider public at that time. The only new aspect is that the author resolutely follows the version of the Septuagint.\textsuperscript{129} This in fact may be one of the reasons why it was published anonymously and strangely attributed as being the translation of a Persian text.

\textsuperscript{126} See also Foss (1991), pp. 170-172.

\textsuperscript{127} This explanation appears at the beginning of part 4 in volume 2 (unpaginated introduction): “Je me trouve encore une histoire entiere de la Chine, écrite en Persan, continuée jusqu’au commencement du dernier siecle, & qui peut en quelque façon suppléer la seconde decade qui manque à l’Histoire de la Chine, que le mesme Pere Martinius nous a laisse imparfaite ne l’ayant continuée que jusqu’au temps de la naissance de Jesus-Christ.” See also Foss (1991), p. 171: Foss points out that another Persian account of Chinese history had been translated into Latin and edited by the cosmopolitan Andreas Muller in 1677. On this text, see also Cordier (1904), vol. 1, col. 581.

\textsuperscript{128} As explained above, the longest ARSI manuscript continues until the Tang, but the text is entitled “until 1666”; the reason for the discrepancy between 1425 in Thévenot and 1666 is not clear.

\textsuperscript{129} Pinot (1932), pp. 210-211. Pinot also points out that it fixes the first year of Fuxi at 2944 instead of 2952 (in Martini).
Table 2. Comparison between the two texts attributed to Couplet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Prologomena ad Annales Sinicos...&quot;</th>
<th>Tabula chronologica Monarchiæ Sinicæ, pp. 2-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princeps obiediens ceolo , spirituum quoque verator , pius et gravis et beneficus et syncerus , formâ Imperio digna. medium prudens tenet. Eodem quo sapientes ætatis illius habitu vestium utitur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rerum-status-prosper Pax suh hoc diuturna. Rege...omnes-gaudent-ee-se subdere. filios ac nepotes chám y (fuit hic filius hoāmti terii Imperatoris) donat ditionibus Regnal Præs. comiteque Regnique Dynastiae in prov. Su. ché.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti ċō, alias Cao sin. ren. 70.</td>
<td>Anno 23. succedit Ti Co quœ Chao kie. patre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the same year as the chronology in Thévenot’s collection, another treatise in German on Chinese chronology, by Christian Mentzel (1622-1701), appeared. He was the personal physician of the Great Elector Friedrich Wilhelm (1640-1688). He could read some Chinese and was in charge of the Chinese book collection of the Elector. He corresponded with Couplet, but it is not sure whether they actually met during the latter’s visit to Berlin in the 1680s. The book consists of 25 chapters. It starts with a reproduction of the beginning of a text entitled \textit{Lidai diwang zongji} (General Record of Sovereigns Throughout History), which begins history with Taigu. A transcription is added to the Chinese characters. The first chapter discusses this early history. Next follows a second reproduction of a text in Chinese starting with Fuxi. The second chapter treats history from Fuxi to Huangdi. The last chapter concerns the Kangxi emperor (ends p. 140 in the year 1684).

The chronology, from Huangdi down to Kangxi, is mainly an abbreviation of Couplet’s \textit{Tabula chronologica Monarchiæ Sinicæ}. Mentzel does not say so, although he does mention Couplet and he also refers to Martini. Theophilus (Gottlieb) Siegfried Bayer (1694-1738) pointed out that it was simply a translation—sometimes incorrect—of Couplet’s \textit{Chronology} and gave several examples of such mistakes. The passage on Emperor Ku, the characters for whom are added in the text, can be found in the third chapter, p. 23. It is situated in the 5th cycle, 2457 BC. It is a translation of Couplet, with the section on the concubines abbreviated. Mentzel must have had access to Couplet’s manuscript with Chinese characters, or ano-

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{133} Lundbæk (1986), pp. 81-82. In note 141, Lundbæk adds: “Mentzel writes that he has made this short historical catalogue, from the ‘Chinese Annals’ in the Electoral Library, for the use of future librarians. This is true in so far as he found the individual emperor’s names in the ‘Annals’ and added them to his summaries from Couplet’s chronology.”
\end{itemize}
ther Chinese text with them, since all the emperors are mentioned with Chinese characters.

Mentzel also added at the beginning some new material taken from a book that he identifies as *Kinder-Lehre Siao Ul Hio* (see also the Chinese characters in “Vorrede”, p. 2). This refers to a Chinese children’s book, a primer, a genre already quite widespread in the late Ming and early Qing. These primers usually include *Xiaoer lun* 小兒論, a conversation between Confucius and a child. Some of these primers also include a short *Lidai diwang zongji* 历代帝王總記 (General Record of Sovereigns Throughout History), which includes the names and short biographies of the emperors (copies published in early Qing continue till the Southern Ming emperor Nan huangdi 襲皇帝 [Zhu Yousong 朱由崧 1644-1645, with the reign period (nianhao) Hongguang 弘光]). The two pages with Chinese characters reproduced in Mentzel are a copy of such a text. Walravens suggests that Mentzel used a source similar to *Wanbao youxue xuzhi aotou zazi daquan* 萬寳幼學須知鰲頭雜字大全 (Complete Primer of Characters to Be Known by Little Children) [1680?]. This precise text cannot be the source of the chronology, as it does not contain *Lidai diwang zongji*. This text is, however, included in another primer kept in Germany. Lundbæk mentions two copies lacking full titles of such primers, *zazi* 雜字 (Miscellaneous words) or *zazi daquan* 雜字大全, not among the Bayeriana, held in Glasgow University Library that fit the description of Mentzel. The copy in Harvard-Yenching Library, with the slightly different title *Zengguang youxue xuzhi aotou zazi daquan* 增廣幼學須知鰲頭雜字大全 (4 juan), ([Fujian]: Wencuitang 文萃堂, [Kangxi?] wuwu 戊午 [1678]), includes the *Lidai diwang zongji* (in juan shou, fols. 51-8b). The text is exactly the same as the version with charac-

---


136 Untitled, see Fuchs (1966), no. 142: Thüringische Landesbibliothek Weimar, Q 679 a); see also a MS.: Fuchs (1966), no. 177, c: “Genealogia Imp[eratorum Sinensium, in hoc libello (parentorum filiorum sermones, doctrinæque dicto) contenta, et ab initio mundi deducta. lie tai ti ram çum ki 历代帝王總記.”


138 HYL: T 9308 2728; the other copy T 9308 4448 does not contain the *Lidai diwang zongji*: Zengbu suweng zhizhang zazhu quanji 增補素翁指掌雜著全集, ed. Li Zhi
ters used in Mentzel. The reference to the *Xiaoer lun* and this correspondence with the chronology proves that Mentzel had a primer to hand.\footnote{On primers and elementary texts, see Lee (2000), pp. 432-477 and esp. pp. 441-442 (*zazi*); pp. 452-453 (*Baijiaxing 百家姓*); p. 466 (Essential Knowledge for Little Children, *youxue xuzhi 幼學須知*).}

### 3.2. Eighteenth Century

The most important actors in the eighteenth century were the French Jesuits. In his study of their role, Virgile Pinot makes a thematic and subsequently regional distinction between the French Jesuits who were studying the Chinese ancient past, dividing them into two groups, those who believed in the antiquity of China as a nation (Gaubil, Parrenin, Regis, Mailla) and those who did not (Bouvet, Prémare, and to a certain extent Foucquet). After the death of the Kangxi emperor and the subsequent expulsion of 1724, those in the first group were allowed to remain in Peking, while those in the other, with the exception of Bouvet, had to move to Canton and Macao. That is why the first can be called the “Peking group” and the second the “Canton group”. There was a major difference in their attitude towards the Chinese past. The first group accepted ancient Chinese history as it was established by tradition. They wished to include the history of China in the general history of all peoples, as reported by the Bible. The others denied that one could find the original history of China in the Chinese canonical writings, considering them to be symbolic books, and therefore they rather sought in these texts for traces of teachings concerning the first humans and the announcement of a Messiah. The first were “historians”, the second symbolist theologians, or “Figurists”, as they were designated by Nicolas Fréret (1688-1749), secretary of the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, with whom many of them entered into correspondence.\footnote{Pinot (1932), pp. 149, 251-252.}

#### 3.2.1. Dominique Parrenin (1665-1741)

“Version litterale du commencement de l’histoire chinoise depuis Fou-by jusques à Yao”, Peking, 12 August 1730.\footnote{A letter sent to Jean-Baptiste Du Halde with instructions to forward it to Jean Jacques Dortous de Mairan of the Paris *Académie des Sciences*. This letter was edited (with considerable) changes in *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*; see LEC (1810), vol. 21, pp. 364-418 (for the references in other editions, see Cordier (1904), col. 933); the}
A second phase of publications on Chinese chronology is initiated by the French Jesuits who arrived in China in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. The first text to be mentioned is a manuscript by Dominique Parrenin, who arrived in China in 1698 and is known for his excellent knowledge of Chinese and Manchu. It was addressed to Jean Jacques Dortous De Mairan (1678-1771), member of the Académie Royale des Sciences, who kept up an intensive epistolary correspondence with Parrenin, discussing history and chronology of the early times. This treatise, which only exists as a manuscript dated 1730, covers the history of China from Fuxi to Emperor Ku (Yao is not included). The text distinguishes between a main text, handwritten in larger letters, and a commentary, in smaller letters, and it includes Chinese characters.

Parrenin himself writes that it is a translation of Tse Tchi Tom kien kam mou Tsien pien by Sse ma kouan (= Sima Guang), which, as he states, was the version that was also translated [into Manchu] by order of the Kangxi emperor. In fact “Version litterale du commencement de l’histoire chinoise depuis Fou-hy jusques à Yao” is a translation of the beginning of Nan Xuan’s 南軒 Zizhi tongjian gangmu qianbian (1595). One explanation for this confusion of author is that Parrenin may have used the collective edition, sometimes entitled Tongjian gangmu quanshu (a.o. edited by Chen Renxi), which included the Nan Xuan version for the early period of history. Yet, Antoine Gaubil writes in a letter dated 1730 that Parrenin wrote “a faithful edition of the beginning of Chinese history of the Toum Kien Kam mou” and that it was based “on the Manchu version”. The Manchu version of the collective edition, entitled Han-i

---

142 On this correspondence, see Grover (1980), p. 90ff.
143 “Il est bon encore d’avertir que l’histoire que j’ay traduite est celle qui a pour titre: Tse Tchi Tom kien kam mou Tsien pien faite par Sse ma kouan historien public de la dynastie des Som, qui vivait dans le 11me siècle après J.C. C’est celle que l’Empereur Cam hy fit traduire, et dans la preface qu’il y a mis, il fait l’éloge de cet auteur...” Parrenin refers also to Zhu Xi, to Jin Lüxiang, author of the Tsien pien (qianbian), and to the su pien (xubian), all mentioned in the same preface. (BnF, Ms. fr. 12.215, fol. 136r; BnF Ms. fr. 17240, fol. 90; see also Cordier (1904), col. 1086; Grover (1980), p. 91 n. 53).
144 “(...) P. Parrenin (...) a cru devoir faire une traduction fidèle du commencement de l’histoire chinoise du Toum Kien Kam mou. Il l’a fait sur la version tartare,
araha tunggiyan g’angmu bithe (通鑑綱目) and printed in 1691, also included Nan Xuan for the early history: Dzjy tonggiyan g’angmu ciyan biyan (without the reference of author). Since Parrenin’s text gives Chinese characters for names and essential terms, he seems to have used both the Chinese and Manchu versions, since the Manchu version does not include Chinese characters. Gaubil regarded this translation very highly: he himself had made a French translation, but he preferred the one made by Parrenin. It is the clearest example of the use by Jesuits of the Ming mainstream tradition as preserved under the Qing, and it is also an example of a precise translation, without summarizing or paraphrasing, typographically even respecting the distinction between the main text and the notes.

3.2.2. Jean-Baptiste Du Halde (1674-1743)

“Fastes de la Monarchie Chinoise, ou l’on voie en abrégé selon l’ordre chronologique de ce qui s’est passé de plus remarquable sous chaque empereur” (BnF, ms.fr. 19537, fols. 1-72).


“The Annals of the Chinese Monarchy: or, A Chronological History, of the most remarkable Events that happen’d during the Reign of every Emperor”, in The General History of China, Containing a Geographical, Historical, Chronological, Political and Physical Description of the Empire of China, Chinese-Tartary, rien n’est plus exact et la mienne ne sauroit l’etre a ce point”; Gaubil (1970), p. 262; letter to an unnamed Jesuit (probably Étienne Souciet) dated 20 September 1730; See also Foss (1991), pp. 165-166. The same information is also mentioned in Gaubil’s Traité de la chronologie chinoise, Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, p. 182. For full biographic reference see section 3.2.9.


Foss (1991), p. 176, n. 82. According to Foss, it is written in Du Halde’s small hand. The manuscript version is quite similar to the text printed in Description. The passage on Emperor Ku can be found ff. 5v-6r. The final date mentioned in the manuscript is 30 November 1731.

“Annals of the Chinese Monarchs; or, A compendious History, containing the most remarkable Events under each Reign according to Chronological Order”, in A Description of the Empire of China and Chinese-Tartary, Together with the Kingdoms of Korea and Tibet: Containing the Geography and History (Natural as well as Civil) of those Countries, 2 vols, London: T. Gardner, 1738-1741, vol. 1, pp. 130-236.

The chapter “Fastes de la Monarchie Chinoise” in Jean-Baptiste Du Halde’s four-volume Description is included in this overview, though it is not directly based on a Chinese or Manchu source. Du Halde, also editor of Lettres édifiantes et curieuses in the period 1711-1732, did not know these languages and never went to China, but had close contact with the China missionaries and published many manuscripts and letters they sent to Europe. The Description, which was translated into English soon after its publication, included “… a Geographical, Historical, Chronological, Political and Physical Description of the Empire of China, Chinese-Tartary, Corea and Thibet” in a version revised by Du Halde himself. The “Fastes” present an overview of Chinese history in chronological order according to the emperors, from Fuxi to Yongzheng (r. 1723-1735).

Du Halde’s chronology has already been the object of extensive study by Virgile Pinot and Ted Foss. Pinot proves that for the early history from Fuxi to Yao, Du Halde took as his basis Parrenin’s “Version litterale du commencement de l’histoire chinoise depuis Fou-hy jusques à Yao”. This is the section of the above-mentioned letter of Parrenin (to Jean Jacques Dortous de Mairan, 12 August 1730) that Du Halde had left out of the Lettres édifiantes et curieuses. Pinot points out that Du Halde “cleaned the text, purging from it what was too archaic, too Chinese and too shocking for French ears.” Pinot also compares the manuscript letter to the version in the Description. Moreover, as pointed out by Ted Foss, Du Halde

---

149 In this regard the attempt by Wu Liwei (2005), pp. 154-161 (on Emperor Ku) to trace the various original sources is somewhat confusing, because it leads to the identification of many different sources that Du Halde in fact did not use directly or even indirectly.

150 On Du Halde’s work, see Landry-Deron (2002); see also Hsia (2009), p. 137 ff.; for the various editions (including partial German and Russian translations), see Cordier (1904), vol. 1, cols. 45-52, 61.


153 For the section on Emperor Ku, see Pinot (1932), pp. 177-178 (but mistakenly identified as his son Zhi).
also used other sources, such as Martini andCouplet, whose names are also mentioned in his preface.\textsuperscript{155} In fact it appears that even for the earlier history Du Halde integrates all these sources, as can be clearly seen from the section on Emperor Ku:

TICO ou KAO SIN. Sixième Empereur
Les Ecrivains Chinois font de grands éloges de ce Prince: il étoit éclairé, disent-ils, il voyoit tout; il examinait tout par lui-même; il entroit dans les plus grands détails: il étoit populaire, sans rien perdre de sa Majesté; il aimoit tendrement ses Sujets; il répandoit par tout ses biensfaits; il se réformait lui-même; il étoit religieux dans le culte du souverain Seigneur du Ciel, qu’il servoit respectueusement; son air grand & auguste attirait de la vénération, sa vertu étoit éminente, il n’agissoit qu’à propos & gardoit en tout un juste milieu. Enfin il n’y eut aucune Nation éclairée par le Soleil, & arrosée par les pluies, qui ne se fût un plaisir d’obéir à ses ordres.

Il établit des Maîtres pour enseigner la vertu aux Peuples, & il inventa la Musique vocale, ce fut Hien he, qui le premier fit par son ordre des chansons: il donna le soin à d’autres de faire divers instruments, des flûtes droites & traversières, un tambour, une cloche, un King, * il fit jouer cette Musique qu’il nomma Lou ing, c’est-à-dire, la beauté du Ciel, de la Terre, & des quatre Saisons.

In margin: * Plaque platte & mince, qu’on frappe avec un maillet de bois.

Ce fut le premier qui donna l’exemple de la polygamie:
Il épousa quatre femmes.— Il eut de la première un fils, nommé Ki, dont les Descendants firent la Dynastie des Tcheou: de la seconde, il eut un fils nommé Sie, dont les Descendants firent la Dynastie des Chang. La troisième lui donna Yao, & le fils eut qu’il eut de la quatrième s’appella Tchi. Les grandes espérances que donnaient ce dernier Prince, porterent l’Empereur à le choisir pour successeur, préférablement à ses trois frères.

Martini; Parrenin; Couplet, added by Du Halde

Comparison with the Parrenin manuscript shows that Du Halde rearranged the information, moving the general description of the qualities of Emperor Ku (which Nan Xuan took from Shi ji) from the end to the front.

\textsuperscript{154} Foss (1991), pp. 167-168 (this includes reference to eighteenth-century authors recognizing the similarity to earlier missionaries’ works on history), and esp. pp. 176-182.

\textsuperscript{155} Du Halde (1735), vol. 1, p. xii (quoted by Foss (1991), p. 182); Du Halde (1736), vol. 1, p. xx.
He also deleted material that was present in the original text by Parrenin. This includes the more “technical” information, such as Chinese terms including the names of Emperor Ku’s ancestors, the place names of his court, or the name of the Liuyin 六英 music. But he also left out elements that obviously affected the content, such as the sentence that Emperor Ku “distinguished the good and bad spirits” (“il fit la distinction des bons et mauvais esprits”). Pinot points out, on the basis of other examples as well, that Du Halde did not like the elements that might suggest that the Chinese believed in spirits and magic.\(^\text{156}\) Moreover, as appears from the addition of the sentence that Emperor Ku was “religiously observant of the worship of the sovereign Lord of Heaven” (“il étoit religieux dans le culte du souverain Seigneur du Ciel”) Du Halde wanted to stress that the ancient Chinese believed in a unique and personal God.\(^\text{157}\) This additional sentence is partially inspired by Couplet, who wrote that Emperor Ku was “obedient to heaven” (“obediens coelo”). The adoptions from Couplet and Martini (of which Du Halde used the French translation) are relatively minor, yet obvious. They also confirm Pinot’s assessment that Du Halde did not like prodigious or marvelous stories in ancient Chinese history, since he did not adopt the miraculous births mentioned in Martini.

The “Annals of the Chinese Monarchy” is not the only place in Du Halde’s Description where Emperor Ku is referred to. The ancient emperors’ observance and service of the High Lord is also mentioned at the beginning of the chapter on “the religion of the Chinese”.\(^\text{158}\) In it Emperor Ku is described as someone who “did not apply less than his Uncle [=Zhuanxu] to the Worship of Chang ti [=Shangdi], and to the religious Observation of the Ceremonies.”\(^\text{159}\) Moreover, unlike the section on ancient history, here the miraculous birth of Houji 后稷 is given full attention by stressing its religious character:

> It is said in the Annals of this Prince, [and in the tradition authorised by the King] that the Empress Yuen kiang, who was barren, accompanying the Emperor to a solemn Sacrifice, prayed to Chang ti for Children with so much Fervency that she conceived almost at the same time, and

---

\(^{156}\) Pinot (1932), p. 175. For Du Halde’s use of Parrenin, see also Landry-Deron (2002), pp. 114.

\(^{157}\) Pinot (1932), pp. 177-178.


\(^{159}\) On Du Halde’s use of Tien and Chang ti, see Landry-Deron (2002), p. 249.
ten Months after [her prayer] brought into the World a Son called Heou tsie (...).

The text continues with the choice of Zhi as successor over the other sons of Emperor Ku and the end of Zhi’s reign:

It is said in the Book, entitled Cang kien, that the Providence of Chang ti watched over the Welfare of the State, and that by his Appointment the unanimous Suffrages of the People deposed this wicked Prince to place the virtuous Yao in his room (...).

The origin of this section on the religion of the ancient Chinese of Du Halde is not clear, since no manuscript version has been found. It is not known whether it is based on a text of a missionary, or is Du Halde’s own composition assimilating information sent by the missionaries. In this short passage, however, several sources are mentioned. The “tradition authorised by the King” probably refers to the fact that the miraculous birth of Houji is mentioned in Shijing (Classic of Songs). Cang kien is probably gangjian, the abbreviation often used for Yuan Huang’s work. Yet, the passage on Zhi in Yuan Huang (or any similar work) makes no direct reference to Shangdi in this regard, and may have been added by Du Halde.

3.2.3. Claude de Visdelou (1656-1737)

“Tabularum chronologicarum” (Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 2006 (1643)).

Bibliothèque Mazarine in Paris contains a “Tabularum chronologicarum” in two files (fols. 1-25, 26-41). It is a chronological table with years, the signs of the sexagenary cycle and names (or reign periods, nianhao) of emperors.

160 The English translation is here corrected on the basis of the French version:

“Ti ko, neveu de Tchuen hio, fût de même élevé à l’Empire par les suffrages de tous les Ordres de l’Etat. Il ne s’appliqua pas moins que son oncle [=Zhuanxu], au culte du Chang ti, & a l’observation religieuse des cérémonies. On trouve dans les fastes de ce Prince, & dans la tradition autorisée par les King, que l’Impératrice Yuen kiang, qui étoit stérile, accompagnant l’Empereur à un sacrifice solennel, demanda des enfans au Chang ti avec tant de ferveur, qu’elle conçût presqu’au même tems; & que dix mois après sa priere, elle mit au monde un fils nommé Heou tsie. (...).

161 Landry-Deron’s excellent work (2002), which identifies most of Du Halde’s sources, unfortunately does not include an identification of the source of this section.

162 See also Landry-Deron (2002), pp. 193-194, 278.

163 Yuan Huang (SKJH, shi 67, p. 130-131; juan 1, pp. 16b-18a); Zhong Xing (SKJH, shi 65, pp. 121-122; juan 1, pp. 20a-21a); also not in Nan Xuan (CMCS, shi 9, pp. 25-26; juan 1, pp. 26b-28a); Chen Jing (SKQS, vol. 332, p. 445; juan 1, pp. 13a-b); Liu Shu (SKQS, vol. 312, p. 667; juan 1, p. 13a-b).
from Huangdi 8 (2697 BC) to Kangxi 61 (1722 AD). Specific to this
manuscript is that the first page also gives the names of the signs of the
sexagenary cycle in Manchu (in transliteration). The text is anonymous, but
a note on the cover mentions Claude de Visdelou (1656-1737) with a
question mark.

3.2.4. Jean-Baptiste Régis (1663-1738)
[“Concordia chronologiae annum Sinensis Imperii, cum epochis Historiae
nostriæ sacræ & prophanæ, à creatione mundi usque ad initium Æræ
Christianæ” (1730; 438 pages in folio)].

“Abbregé d’un manuscrit Latin qui a pour titre: Accord de la Chronologie
des Annales de la Chine, avec les Époques de l’Histoire ancienne, &c.”, in
Vojeu de Brunem (= Joseph Jouve), Histoire de la conquête de la Chine par les
Tartares mancheux; à laquelle on a joint un accord chronologique des annales de
la monarchie chinoise, avec les époques de l’ancienne histoire sacrée & profane,
207-318.

Jean-Baptiste Régis arrived in China in 1698. According to the introduction
to the printed version, the original manuscript [not consulted], dated 1730,
was held in the Jesuit Library in Lyon at the time of publication. Each page
was originally divided into three columns, with sacred history on the right,
the history of China in the middle, and profane history on the left. In
the published text these columns have been abandoned, and the main figures
of the three types of history are intermingled and arranged in chronological
order. The text gives an overview from the Flood (dated 3638 BC) until
Jesus Christ. The description of the Chinese emperors is very brief, which
makes it difficult to identify the sources. Ti-ko (Emperor Ku) (2435 BC), for
instance, is only mentioned as being the founder of the first public
schools.

3.2.5. Jean-François Foucquet (1665-1741)
Tabula Chronologica Historiae Sinicae connexa cum cyclo qui Vulgo Kia Tse
Dictur (Rome, 1729).

---

165 On this work, see also von Collani (2005), p. 127; Foss (1991), pp. 175-176: Foss is of the opinion that the manuscript was not used by Du Halde. Pinot (1932), p. 452 (only a brief mention).
167 See also Kolmaš (2007) for the Latin text and Czech translation.
Jean-François Foucquet had spent some twenty years in China (he arrived in 1699), when he was recalled to Europe because of his controversial ideas. Among other things, he was said to have put the mission into danger by denying any authenticity to Chinese history before the fifth century BC, something that, according to Gaubil, could be penalized with capital punishment. In Rome Foucquet left the Society of Jesus and was ordained titular Bishop of Eleutheropolis (1725). His Tabula Chronologica Historiae Sinicae (published 1729) was intended as a confirmation of his opinion about history before the fifth century BC. Rejecting the authenticity of ancient Chinese history, he wanted to prove with this publication that reliable Chinese history only started from the fifth century BC. This is not a book, however, but rather a chart on one page. It was based on Nian Xiyao’s 年希堯 (1671-1738) Gangjian jiazi tu 綱鑑甲子圖 (Chart of Outline and Mirror with Sexagenary Cycles), which is a table of the jiazi (sexagenary cycle) system according to the Tongjian gangmu, from 424 BC (beginning of the reign of Zhou Liewang 烈王) till 1705. Foucquet exten-
ded the chart until Yongzheng 9 (1729) and added a short explanation to it.\textsuperscript{174} Du Halde alludes to it in the introduction to \textit{Description}, but did not adopt it.\textsuperscript{175} According to Foss, Du Halde chose to exclude Foucquet’s table from his chronological exposition not merely because Nian Xiyao did not have a reputation as an historian, but rather because Foucquet’s bizarre chronological views, expressed in his Figurist writings, had embroiled him in deep conflict.\textsuperscript{176}

3.2.6. Joseph de Prémare (1660-1736)

“L’ancienne histoire du monde suivant les Chinois” (BnF, Collection Bréquigny 18, fols. 2-144. [sent 10 November 1730]).


Joseph de Prémare arrived in China in the same year as Régis and Foucquet. Owing to the ban on the missionaries by the Yongzheng emperor, he was exiled to Canton in 1724 and to Macao in 1733. He is best known for his studies on Chinese language. He attempted to prove that Christian revelation was present in Chinese classical texts in a figurative form, and shared his ideas with French scholars, in particular Étienne Fourmont (1683-1735). In a letter to the latter, dated 20 October 1728, Prémare announced he would write a “History of ancient times” (“Histoire des vieux temps”) for the \textit{Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres} in Paris. Together with his letter of 10 November 1730, he sent to Fourmont “the first half of it”, entitled “L’ancienne histoire du monde selon les Chinois”.\textsuperscript{177}

This manuscript deals with the most ancient period of Chinese history, starting with the origin of the universe, followed by Pangu 盤古 and the other early emperors. Strictly speaking it does not include a section on Emperor Ku, though it intended to do so, since it stops abruptly with chapter 17 (Tchi-yeou = Chiyou 蚩尤, the contestant of the descendants of Shennong, just before Huangdi), which should have included Emperor Ku. The text was revised by Joseph de Guignes (1721-1800) and included as “Discours preliminaire” in Gaubil’s \textit{Le Chou-king, un des livres sacrés des Chinois}. De Guignes gave it a new title “Recherches sur les tems antérieurs à ceux dont parle le Chou-king, & sur la Mythologie Chinoise”. As such it

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{Witek} Witek (1982), p. 457 (includes a list of several existant copies).
\bibitem{Lundbæk} Lundbæk (1991b), pp. 161-165.
\end{thebibliography}
was the only one of the many writings of Prémare’s to appear in the eighteenth century. The text (and the manuscript) ends with chapter 16 of Prémare; the short supplement (pp. cxxx-cxxxvii: from Huangdi to Emperor Ku) is provided by de Guignes, who says that he based it on Kang-mo = Gangmu. Emperor Ku appears as last emperor in this section. Prémare’s text is important because it includes the names and characters of a number of authors of historical works, such as Luo Bi, Shao Yong and others. The long and detailed presentation of Chinese mythology is, as Prémare repeatedly acknowledges, based on Luo Bi’s Lushi 路史. The Figurists in general favoured Lu shi. At the beginning of his second chapter on the principal periods of the most ancient history, Prémare gives a more systematic overview of several other sources:

Lieou tao yuen = Liu Daoyuan 劉道源 (= Liu Shu 劉恕) tong kien vai kí (= Tongjian waiji 通鑑外記);
Tchin tě king = Chen Zijing 陳子欽 (= Chen Jing) tong kien sou pien (Tongjian xubian 通鑑續編);
Yuen leao fan (= Yuan Liaofan 袁了凡) tong kien pou (= Tongjian bu 補);
ſſe ma tching (＝ Sima Zhen 司馬貞) commentary on ſſe ki (= Shiji) called fo ſyr (＝ Suoyin 索隱);

Concerning Yuan Huang, Prémare states that “he does not say as much about the ancient times as Luo Bi 羅泌, but in the difficult places he gives the criticism of various savants, which is gratifying”, and concerning Wang’s work he does not consider it “as worthy as Yuan Liaofan”. That Prémare effectively used Yuan Huang can be confirmed by a reference to

---

178 See note Le Chou-king, un des livres sacrés des Chinois..., p. cxxix.
179 Emperor Ku p. cxxxvii (fot 150). De Guignes seems to have used the mid-Ming version of Chen Jing or the Yupi Zizhi tongjian gangmu quanshu, since the musical instrument invented by Emperor Ku is Kieou-tchao = 九招; The capital, Po, is identified as being close to “Kuei-te-fou dans le Ho-nan” = 羅泌.
180 Bouvet, for instance, recognized in Lushi that Huangdi was a representation of the Messiah, see Collani (1991), p. 121.
181 This should be one of the editions of Juan Wang Fengzhou xiansheng gangjian zhengshi quanbian (A Complete History in the Outline and Mirror Style Compiled by Mr. Wang [Shizhen]) (24 juan), e.g. SKJH, shi 53, pp. 345-682.
182 Collection Bréquigny 18, fol. 18v; Le Chou-king, un des livres sacrés des Chinois, pp. liij-liv (notes).
Nicolas Standaert: Jesuit Accounts of Chinese History

Ting ngan hou = Ding Nanhu 丁南湖 (= Ding Feng 丁奉) citing Fang koütan chan (Fang fong) = Fang Kunshan 方崑山 (方鳳). 183

Several of these sources are also quoted in “Selecta quædam Vestigia præcipuorum Christianæ relligionis dogmatum ex antiquis Sinarum libris eruta” (Canton, 21 May 1724, but started in 1712) (BnF, Chinois 9248) of which there is a modern French translation Vestiges des principaux dogmes chrétiens, Tirés des anciens livres chinois, avec reproduction des textes chinois, par le P. de Prémare, jésuite, ancien missionnaire en Chine, trans. A. Bonnetty & P. Perny, Paris: Bureau des Annales de philosophie chrétienne, 1878. 184 This is one of Prémare’s Figurist writings, in which he searches for the origins of the major Christian dogmas in Chinese ancient texts. 185

In it Prémare refers to, among other things, the chapter added by Sima Zhen to Shiji. 186 He also refers to the historical digests that have been composed using the example of Liu Shu’s Tongjian waiji:

(…) other authors composed digests of the historical annals, under the generic term Kang 鑑 Kien, in which, in order to not loose or omit anything, they tell everything that they found among the ancient authors, sometimes adding, sometimes changing something.

And about Yuan Huang he writes:

In the work 鑑 Kang 鑑 Kien 補 pou, the historian Yuen-leao-fan has particularly the advantage on the others that he quotes regularly the criticism and the judgment of the

183 Collection Bréquigny 18, fol. 17v; Le Chou-king, un des livres sacrés des Chinois, p. lij. The quote can be found in Yuan Huang, SKJH, vol. 67, p. 124. Prémare makes another reference to Yuan Huang in “Lettre sur le prétendu athéisme des Chinois”, BnF, N.a. fr. 4756, fol. 41bis. Prémare refers to “袁了凡 Yuen leao fan, who wrote many books, among others, an excellent digest of the history of China with the title 历史綱鑑補 li see kang kien pou. At each difficult point he provides the opinion and criticism of several savants; which the other authors of a digest do not do.” See Landry-Deron (2002), p. 194.

184 See also the much shorter Latin manuscript with the Chinese title Jingchuan yiji 經傳遺迹 (Traces in Ancient [Chinese] Texts) (43 fols.) (ARSI, Jap. Sin. II, 168). It is an anonymous work, but, having the same handwriting and structure as Vestigia, it can clearly be identified as being from Prémare. At the beginning of the text there is a list of Chinese historical sources that were used: Sima Qian’s Shiji, Sima Zhen’s Sanhuang ji 三皇紀, Liu Shu’s Tongjian waiji, Jin Lüxiang’s Tongjian qianbian, Zhu Xi’s Tongjian gangmu and Sima Guang’s Zizhi tongjian. See also Chan (2003), pp. 455-456.

185 On this text, see Lackner (1993) and Lundbæk (1991), pp. 130-136.

savants, on a wide variety of points which are explained
by them or rejected as uncertain or without value.187

All these references indicate that Prémare was acquainted with a wide
variety of Chinese sources and that he actively used them: the mainstream
texts, the gangjian texts, and texts such as Luo Bi’s Lushi.

3.2.7. Joseph-Anne-Marie de Moyriac de Mailla (1669-1748)

“Histoire générale de la Chine, tirée des Annales de l’Empire” (BnF ms.fr.
12210-12214)188.

“Histoire générale de la Chine” (BnF, ms.fr.n.a. 2492, fols. 1-143 [Manu-
scripts de la bibliothèque de Michel-Ange-André Le Roux Deshauterayes
(1724-1795)]).

Histoire générale de la Chine, ou Annales de cet Empire, traduites du Tong-kien-

Italian translation: Storia generale della Cina ovvero grandi Annali Cinesi

Joseph-Anne-Marie de Moyriac de Mailla (1669-1748) arrived in China in
1703, and his major occupation in the first ten years of his stay was his
participation in the cartography project of the Kangxi emperor. Mention of
Mailla’s translation work on history was made in the correspondence of
Gaubil as early as 1728, but the completed work did not arrive in Europe
until 1737.189 It was hoped that Fréret, who had a high regard of the part
of the work he had seen, would be the editor. Unfortunately, Mailla died in
1748 and Fréret in 1749 before anything could be done. Earlier Mailla had
taken care to keep the work from Du Halde’s heavy editorial hand. As Foss
remarks, after the great deal of care which Mailla had taken in preparing
his translation, he did not want Du Halde to perform on it the severe edi-
ting that had made him unpopular with many of the China Jesuit scho-

187 “Selecta quædam Vestigia”, BnF, Chinois 9248, fols. 256-257; Prémare (1878),
p. 391.

188 See description in Cordier (1904), col. 584. See also Dehergne (1973), p. 164:
“Cf. Miss. Étrangères de Paris 436, 327-333”.

For other references in the years 1732, 1735, 1736 and 1737, see Foss (1991), pp. 184-
185; Pinot (1932), p. 143.

190 For this genesis of the publication, see Foss (1991), pp. 186-188.
and a number that require criticism. This work was done a bit too fast, and we should have examined it better in China; we pressed a little too much to send it to Lyon." The manuscript languished in the collection of the Jesuit college at Lyon until the dissolution of the Society of Jesus, when the work was confiscated by government authorities. In 1775, Mailla’s work was placed in the hands of l’abbé Grosier (Jean-Baptiste Grosier, 1743-1823). Under his guidance and careful editing it was finally published in 1777-1785 as Histoire générale de la Chine, ou Annales de cet Empire, traduites du Tong-kien-kang-mou. Grosier was aided by Michel-Ange-André Le Roux Deshauterayes (1724-1795), professor of Arabic in the Royal College of France, who also knew some Chinese and who was the nephew of Étienne Fourmont. In total there were thirteen volumes:

- vol. 1 (1777; cc + 349 pp.); Fuxi 伏羲 (2953 BC) - Mou-ouang 穆王 (967 BC)
- vol. 2 (1777; 590 pp.); Mou-ouang 穆王 (966 BC) - Hiao-king-ti 孝景帝 (141 BC)

Gaubil (1970), p. 674-675 (letter to Delisle, 28 August 1752). Gaubil had been critical of some early translations by Mailla, for instance he preferred Parrenin’s work on the history from Yao to Fuxi to the one made by Mailla, which he felt needed to be explained and its real point of view brought out. (Gaubil (1970), p. 262, to an unnamed Jesuit, probably Étienne Souciet, dated 20 September 1730). One finds similar critical remarks in a letter by Joseph-Marie Amiot to Bertin (dated Beijing, 19 November 1777): “L’ouvrage du P. de Mailla n’est pas parfait, il s’en faut bien; mais si l’éditeur aidé des lumières de M. Deshauterayes vérifie le tout sur le Kang-Mou on pourra se flatter d’avoir l’histoire authentique de la nation Chinoise” (BnF, Bréquigny 22, fol. 40r).

Foss (1991), p. 188, points out that a condensed version was prepared by an Augustinian priest, Père Janin, in 1769, but was never printed. This manuscript work (788 pages) in two volumes is entitled, “Annales de la Chine, réduites en abrégé par le Père Janin, augustin, sur la version française de J.M. Moyriac de Mailla, missionnaire apostolique connu en Chine sous le nom de Fong-Ping-tching.” There are clear differences between the different manuscript versions, which were also revised by Le Roux Deshauterayes, and the printed version. The printed version is shorter, the phrasing and choice of words were changed and many transliterations (such as with the names of Emperor Ku’s concubines) have been left out.

The files BnF, N.a. fr. 2492-2494, which contain various manuscript texts (with Chinese characters) by Le Roux Deshauterayes, show that he was well acquainted with the topic. N.a. fr. 2493 contains various drafts on the early history, based on the Chinese annals, which combine Du Halde and Parrenin (e.g. on Emperor Ku, fol. 39r-v); in fol. 186r he refers explicitly to Nan Xuan. N.a. fr. 2494 contains the draft of a “Bibliothèque chinoise, ou dictionnaire universel” (fol. 1-110), which includes many references to Chinese historical writings.
As mentioned in the introduction to this article, the subtitle Tong-Kien-Kang-Mou is somewhat misleading for a number of reasons. For instance, Mailla covers a history that is longer than the one covered by Zizhi tongjian gangmu, uses numerous other historical texts, among them the gangjian texts, and he also used both the Manchu version and Chinese version. All these elements are clearly revealed in Mailla’s introduction. In it he gives a long historical overview of the different sources of Chinese history. When he discusses those of the Qing, Mailla writes that the Kangxi emperor “had translated into Manchu the Tong-kien-kang-mou, as the most solid, the most instructive history and the one that was the least suspected of error.” He then wonders whether he could do better than to imitate “this great prince in order to make known the history of China to Europe.” Moreover, he did it “the more willingly, because the knowledge of the Manchu language, which is not subjected to the equivocals of Chinese, gave me more facility to succeed.” He concludes that his general history of China is, strictly speaking, merely a translation of Tong-kien-kang-mou; yet a translation in which he did not feel obliged “to be subjugated to his authors in a servile way.” He states that in this regard he also imitated the Kangxi emperor (r. 1662-1722), who deleted several things, either because they were less

---

195 Besides “Table générale des matières”, it also includes: “Des Nien-hao”, “Nomenclature de tous les anciens et nouveaux Départemens de la Chine & des principales Villes qui en dépendent”, “Notice historique sur la Cochinchine”, “Mémoire historique sur le Tong-king”, “Notice historique sur les premières entreprises des Russes contre les Chinois”.

important or because they were difficult to comprehend by those of his nation, who were less informed about Chinese customs. “Since the Manchu version is fairly exact and does not say anything that is not in Chinese,” Mailla writes, “similarly in my French translation I do not say anything that is not in the Manchu or Chinese version.”

From this testimony it is clear that the main source was the Manchu work entitled Han-i araha tunggiyan g’angmu bitte (Imperially Commissioned Tongjian gangmu 通鑑綱目) as compiled at the instruction of the Kangxi emperor in 1691, and which included Nan Xuan’s Qianbian 前編 and Zhu Xi’s Zhengbian 正編 and Shang Lu’s Xubian 續編. The title of the Manchu version (tunggiyan g’angmu) also explains why the subtitle of Mailla’s work Tong-kien-kang-mou not only refers to Zhu Xi’s text, but to the three texts as a whole. Yet, at the same time, Mailla clearly refers to the fact that he used the Chinese versions as well, and it appears that he most probably used both at the same time. There are several indications for this. In the first place, in his historical overview Mailla shows that he is well acquainted with the Chinese sources, including earlier works on history, such as the different additions to Zizhi tongjian by Lieu-ju (= Li Shu 劉恕), Kin-li-tishtiang (= Jin Lüxiang 金履祥) and Tchin-king (= Chen Jing 陳秸). Moreover, just after the mention of the Kangxi edition, he refers to historical works composed by individuals, two in particular. One is Nien-y-sse (Nianyi shi 廿一史), the name given in most of the Jesuit writings at that time to a group of texts, the dynastic histories. The other is called “Kang-
kien” (gangjian), mentioned as an abridged version of Nianyi shi. This is a clear reference to Lishi gangjian bu (1610), which is the gangjian text by Yuan Huang, who is mentioned by Mailla as being “the first who gave the model” for these abridged histories. Mailla has a mixed evaluation of Yuan Huang’s work. He regrets that this excellent project was not better executed, since “instead of limiting himself to the authentic history of the empire, he added, without criticism and discernment, part of the reveries of the ancient Tao-se (= Daoists) of Qin and Han.” He adds that Yuan Huang’s book, the modest price of which encouraged its circulation, was quite successful, to the extent that other scholars after him, to make a name or to relieve their indigence, published several such digests (abrégés) under the same title of gangjian, “which, rather than increasing the esteem, make them lose it almost entirely.”

Mailla’s acquaintance with Chinese historical texts also appears from his letter to Fréret (dated 23 May 1735), which was meant as an introduction to the General History of China. At the start of this letter, Mailla distinguishes, “together with the Chinese”, between three classes of writings. First are those works with a generally recognised uncontested authority—basically the Classics (Shujing (Classic of Documents), Shijing (Classic of Songs), Chunqiu (Spring and Autumn Annals) and Zuozhuan (Commentary of Zuo), etc.) They have such high authority that no one dares to change a character or question their truth. In the second class, the work is classified under histories composed by “individual authors” (particuliers), while he mentions the individual dynastic histories earlier in his preface. On p. xlix he writes about this text, “Le Nien-y-se, par la multitude de ses volumes, pourrait faire une bibliothèque complète... Cette collection immense & estimée, fut commencée sous Huai-tsong, empereur de la dynastie des Ming, vers l’an 1660 de l’Ere-chrétienne.” Yet, the date, name of emperor and name of dynasty do not correspond. Gaubil (1970), p. 199 (letter to Souciet, 3 August 1728) gives another explanation: The late Emperor Kangxi had all the histories examined and made a composite work out of them, entitled Nien-Y-se. It is an abridged version of the individual histories, or, to say it better, a large number of parts on various subjects were deleted, but good notes were added. A footnote refers to BnF, Chinois 1385, which is Nianyi shiyue bian (Concise Compilation of the Twenty-One Histories) (ca. 1696) (8 juan + 2 juan) by Zheng Yuanqing (1660-ca.1730). It is a relatively short work (only 10 ce), which gives a very succinct overview of history up to the Ming (included). It gives very few chronological references. Concerning Emperor Ku, it only mentions that he was on the throne for 70 years (see ce 2 (qianbian 前編), fol. 2a). Given its nature, it is unlikely that Mailla is referring to this text. Nianyi shi is also referred to by Couplet, but he could not have seen Nianyi shiyue bian, because it appeared much later than his own book (1687).

201 Mailla, “Préface”, pp. xlix-l.
concerning history and chronology, one will find the dynastic histories as well as the *Zizhi tongjian* and its derivates by Zhu Xi, Liu Shu, Chen Jing, Jin Lüxiang, etc. (all mentioned by the name of the editors). In the eyes of Mailla, “all these authors have been president or members of the tribunal of history under the different dynasties, starting with the Zhou, and they successfully worked at the history of the dynasties that preceded them.” In the third class are individual authors, who wrote largely with help that they procured themselves, such as Huangfu Mi 皇甫謐 (215-282) (editor of *Diwang shiji* 帝王世紀 (Annals of Emperors and Kings)), Ma Duanlin 馬端臨 (1254-1325) (editor of *Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考 (General Investigation on Important Writings; 1308)), *Nianyi shi* 廿一史, and, besides Yuan Huang, Ming authors such as Gu Yingtai 谷應泰 (d. after 1689) (author of *Mingshi jishi benmo* 明史紀事本末 (Historical Events from the Ming period in their Entirety) 1658), Zhong Xing 鍾惺 and possibly Zhou Li 周禮, “… and an infinite number of others, for which it is useless to report the names.”

Finally, he distinguishes the “fabulous histories, which the sectarians of the philosopher Lao-kiun [= Laozi 老子] published, at the moment when, under the Han, one reestablished the truthful history of China.” Among them figure Luo Bi’s *Lushi*, to which Mailla devotes several pages of explanation, discussing among other things, the “absurdities of the sect of the Taoists” that it contains. It would appear that the Peking Jesuits were much more critical of *Lushi* than the Canton Jesuits.

That Mailla used several Chinese sources in addition to the Manchu version seems to be proven by the text itself. He regularly adds a note to his text in which he gives references to various Chinese primary sources. In the section on Emperor Ku these references are absent. They were included in the manuscript, where the following texts are referred to:

- *Sse ki* (= *Shiji* 史記)
- *Tong kien* (= Sima Guang’s (*Zizhi* tongjian (資治通鑑))
- *Tong tchi* (= Zheng Qiao’s *Tongzhi* 通志)
- *Tsienpien* (Chen Jing/Jin Lüxiang’s *Zizhi tongjian (gangmu) qianbian* 資治通鑑（綱目）前編)
- *T.K. Kangmu* (Zhu Xi’s *Zizhi tongjian gangmu* 資治通鑑綱目)
- *Nien yi ssu* (Nianyi shi 廿一史)

---


204 Mailla, “Lettre I”, pp. lxxix-lxxxij. This is followed by a discussion of the chronology in *Zhushu jinian* (Bamboo Annals).

205 E.g. Mailla, vol. 1, p. 35 (the page before the start of Emperor Ku).
The purpose of these references is not entirely clear. Since they do not refer to a specific passage, they seem rather to function as a more general reference for the content of a paragraph, while the passage itself may be directly adopted from one or two works. As may be noticed, despite the doubts Mailla expresses about Yuan Huang in his preface, he still refers to it here. There are also some indications that he actually used Yuan Huang or another gangjian text, such as that by Zhong Xing, and that he relied heavily on them. When one compares Mailla with Chen Jing or Nan Xuan, on the one hand, and Yuan Huang on the other, the similarities to the latter are greater. One such example is the reference to the location of Emperor Ku’s burial place in Dunqiu 頓丘, identified as Qingfengxian 清豐縣, Damingfu 大名府, which cannot be found in any of the above works except in Yuan Huang and Zhong Xing. Not only is the order of the concubines the same as in the gangjian tradition and different from Chen Jing/Nan Xuan, but the miraculous births, absent in both latter works are extensively discussed, including a long reference to the related odes from the Shijing (Classic of Songs). In addition Gaubil noticed that Mailla added in the first part a large number of passages from Shujing (Classic of Documents) that the Manchu version only briefly refers to. Taking all these references together, it appears that Mailla was well acquainted with a wide variety of historical sources, but that for specific passages he probably used a smaller number of texts than indicated in his references.

---

206 Le Roux Deshauterayes also regularly doubted whether the references given by Mailla can actually be found in the primary sources he mentions: see e.g. BnF, N.a. fr. 2492, fols. 2r, 2v, 4r, 5r.

207 The only other place with this reference is Yupi lidai tongjian jilan 御批歷代通鑑輯覽, SKQS, vol. 335, p. 39 (juan 1, p. 18): 頓丘故城在今直隸大名府清豐縣西南,帝繆陵在今河南衛輝府滑縣東北.

208 Gaubil’s Traité de la chronologie chinoise, Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, pp. 181-182. Gaubil adds that Mailla did the same for the third part, where he took information from the particular histories of Liao, Jin and Yuan. The preface is called “fort instructive”.

---

Kang kien (Yuan Huang’s, Lishi gangjian bu 歷史鋼鑼補)
Taki (Hu Hong’s Huangwang daji 皇王大紀)
Ouai ki (= Liu Shu’s (Zizhi tongjian) waiji (資治通鑑)外紀).

Le Roux Deshauterayes also regularly doubted whether the references given by Mailla can actually be found in the primary sources he mentions: see e.g. BnF, N.a. fr. 2492, fols. 2r, 2v, 4r, 5r.

The only other place with this reference is Yupi lidai tongjian jilan 御批歷代通鑑輯覽, SKQS, vol. 335, p. 39 (juan 1, p. 18): 頓丘故城在今直隸大名府清豐縣西南,帝繆陵在今河南衛輝府滑縣東北.

Gaubil’s Traité de la chronologie chinoise, Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, pp. 181-182. Gaubil adds that Mailla did the same for the third part, where he took information from the particular histories of Liao, Jin and Yuan. The preface is called “fort instructive”.
3.2.8. Alexandre de la Charme (1695-1767)
“Abrégé de l’histoire Chinoise” (647 pp.).
Alexandre de la Charme arrived in China in 1728. His lengthy manuscript on Chinese chronology, “Abrégé de l’histoire Chinoise”, is a translation of Kia tsee houei ki = Xue Yingqi’s 薛應旂 Jiazi huiji 甲子會紀 (1558). It starts with the eighth year of Huangdi, considered the first sexagenary cycle starting with jiazi 甲子, and extends down to the Kangxi emperor (r. 1662-1722). In his introduction, he explains that he used other sources to explain what was insufficiently clear in Xue’s text, which is usually added in notes. He also hoped that the public would still refer to the work of Mailla, which he considered the complete history. The very short passage on Emperor Ku can be found pp. 5-6, and corresponds to the equally short passage in Jiazi huiji.

La Charme’s translation was approved by Gaubil on 11 September 1741. In a letter to Fréret (2 October 1741), Gaubil refers to this work and acknowledges that he helped la Charme.

3.2.9. Antoine Gaubil (1689-1759)
“Chronologie chinoise” [27 September 1749; earlier versions: 1724, 1727, 1730, 1732, 1737, 1739] (BnF, Bréquigny 21, fols. 1-137 (autographe); See München: Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis (1858, vol 7, no. 1302).

209 See München: Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis (1858, vol 7, no. 1302).

210 “Comme il ne fait gueres qu’indiquer les faits, j’ai cru devoir les eclaircir par des notes que j’ai ajoutées et que j’ai tirées de la grande histoire et d’autres ouvrages authentiques et que je cite.”

211 “J’ay lu l’abregé de l’histoire Chinoise composé en français par le R. P. Alexandre de la Charme. Dans cet abregé l’auteur a mis avec gout et netteté ce qui est essentiel dans les differentes histoires Chinoises et cet ouvrage me paroit tres propre a faire connoitre et estimer la nation Chinoise, à Peking ce 11. 7bre 1741.”

212 Gaubil (1970), p. 534: “Le P. L Charme à ma prière a mis en état un excellent abregé d’histoire chinoise avec quelques notes; nous étions convenus de la forme de l’ouvrage et du choix des faits, je crois qu’il a bien exécuté le projet, je l’ay aidé de mon mieux, il est très laborieux et a bien appris le tartare.”


214 On it appears the date 1749. Corrections on this copy have been made in various handwritings. It does not include Chinese characters. Bibliothèque de l’Institut, ms. 3996 contains an extensively annotated printed version. On the back of p. 1, there is a note stating “Collationné sur le manuscrit autographe du P. Gaubil que j’ai déposé à la Bibliothèque du Roi 29 7bre 1814 L[ouis] Langies”, which refers to BnF, Bréquigny 21.


Antoine Gaubil, known for his work in the field of astronomy, was one of the most prolific authors of letters to Europe. A correspondent of both Académie des Sciences and Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, an associate member of the Royal Society, and an ordinary member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, he exchanged letters with their respective secretaries. Among his correspondents were the French astronomer Joseph-Nicolas Delisle (1688–1768), who spent twenty-two years at the Russian Academy, Nicolas Fréret (1688–1749), secretary of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, and Theophilus (Gottlieb) Siegfried Bayer (1694–1738), secretary of the Russian Academy of Sciences, who all did research on China.216 Gaubil, who had arrived in China in 1722, also wrote studies on ancient Chinese history. He made the first translation of the Shujing (Classic of Documents; sent to Europe in 1739-1740), only printed in 1770 in a (seriously) revised edition by Joseph de Guignes: Le Chou-king, un des livres sacrés des Chinois, Qui renferme les Fondemens de leur ancienne Histoire, les Principes de leur Gouvernement et de leur Morale; Ouvrage recueilli par Confucius, Paris: N. M. Tilliard, 1770.217 Gaubil’s major interest was chronology, a topic on which he wrote an extensive study entitled “Chronologie chinoise”. He had written an initial report on this topic as early as 1724, and it was followed by various other reports, which culminated in a text sent to Europe in 1749 (dated Beijing, 27 September 1749). Yet the “Traité de la Chronologie chinoise, divisé en trois parties” was not published until 1814, as a supplement to volume 16 of the famous collection Mémoires concernant l’histoire, les sciences, les arts, les mœurs, les usages, etc. des Chinois (285 pages), of which the first volume had appeared in 1776.

This treatise is divided into three parts. The first is an overview of ancient Chinese history from Fuxi to the year 206 BC (pp. 1-71). The second is a report on the opinions of Chinese historians about the chronology of


217 See Gaubil (1970), p. 17. It was originally made on the basis of the Manchu version and de Guignes complains in his preface that it contains too much paraphrasing.
this period, and a description of their works (pp. 72-191). What Gaubil calls “une courte notice” is in fact the most systematic and elaborate overview of Chinese publications on chronology. In the third part Gaubil expresses his own opinions on Chinese chronology (pp. 192-285).

The first part is based on a digest (Abrégé), from which Gaubil adopted the eras and years of eras. This digest is entitled Tse-tchi-kang-kien-ta-tsun, dating from the end of the Ming, and covering the history from Fuxi to 1368 (the last year of the Yuan). This work can be identified as Zhong Xing’s 鍾惺 Dìngqīn Zhōng Bójìng dǐngzhēng Zìzhì gāngjiàn zhēngshì dàquán 鼎鍾伯敬訂正資治綱鑑正史大全 (74 juan, shou 1 juan, also abbreviated as Gāngjiàn dàquán 綱鑑大全). This confirms that works from the gāngjiàn tradition were important references for the Jesuits until the middle of the eighteenth century. The description of Emperor Ku is very brief and the first year of his reign (yiyou) corresponds to 2436 BC.

The second part is an overview of all works that particularly concern chronology. All the Chinese and Manchu works noted in the early part of this article are mentioned, and several more. For each of them Gaubil gives a precise description and their value for the study of the chronology of ancient China. This proves that Gaubil was thoroughly aware of the state of this field in China at the time. Concerning the Ming and Qing, several aspects can be pointed out. Gaubil pays much attention to Xue Yingqi’s (Sūe-yīng) 薛應旂 Jīaźi huìjī (Kia-tse-hoe-yi) 甲子會紀, the chief characteristic of which is the systematic treatment of Chinese history in terms of the signs of the sexagenary cycle signs. Gaubil is also conscious of the two different versions of comprehensive histories at the end of the Ming. One he arranges under the title “Tsien-pien, Tchêng-pien et Su-pien” (前編, 正編, 續編), which includes Nan Xuan’s 南軒 (Nian-hien; Ouey-chang = Wēishàng xiànsēng 渭上先生) Zìzhì tōngjiàn gāngmu qīǎnbiàn 資治通鑑綱目前編 for ancient history, and the other he entitles Tōng-kien (= 通鑑), which

218 Gaubil, “Avertissement de l’auteur”, in Gaubil, Traité de la chronologie chinoise, in Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, [p. iv]. There seem to be different versions of this “Avertissement”; the version in BnF, Bréquigny 21 does not include the reference to the Chinese text.

219 Gaubil, Traité de la chronologie chinoise, in Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, p. 12.

220 For an overview of the sources used by Gaubil, see also the appendix to Dehergne (1945), p. 204 ff.: “Auteurs cités par Gaubil et principales époques de la chronologie chinoise”. Many of the sources are also quoted in Gaubi’s letters: see the index to Gaubil (1970).

221 Gaubil, Traité de la chronologie chinoise, in Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, pp. 168-170. See also copies in BnF, Chinois 625-628.
includes Liu Shu’s 刘恕 (Lieou-jou) Waiji 外紀 for the earlier history. He considers this Tongjian “not as instructive” as the Qianbian.222 At the end of the section on Tong-kien he makes a brief reference to the abrégés of history, called Kang-kien (= gangjian 綱鑑), which follow to various degrees the chronologies of the previous works.223

For the early Qing Gaubil first refers to the Tien-yuen-ti-li by Su, which is Xu Fa’s 徐發 Tianyuan lili quanshu 天元曆理全書 (12 juan, pref. 1682). Xu’s chronology was based on Zhushu jinian, and Gaubil points out that Xu’s choice was based on the fact that he claimed that Western chronology corresponded most with the chronology of Zhushu jinian.224 Next, Gaubil gives a longer description of another extensive work, “because of its usefulness and because it is not yet known in Europe”, Yu-ting-li-tay-ki-che-niennpiao, which is the above-mentioned (Yu ding) Lidai jishi nianbiao (御定 历代 纪事年表 (100 juan) compiled by Wang Zhishu 王之樞 as main editor and published by order of the Kangxi emperor in 1715.225 At the end Gaubil refers to the Manchu translations of Chinese histories. He distinguishes between the work that was published in the third year of the Kangxi era (1664), and which he identifies as a translation of the above mentioned Tong-kien (= Hafu buleku bithe), and the 1691 translation of the Tse-tchi-tong-kien-kang-mou (= Han-i araha tung giyan g’ang mu bithe). “One did not include in it [i.e. in the latter Manchu translation] many of the notes and observations that Kangxi considered useless for the Manchus. He revised himself the work and the translation has a great reputation.”226 This is the work translated by Mailla.

222 Gaubil, Traité de la chronologie chinoise, in Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, pp. 170-174.
223 Gaubil, Traité de la chronologie chinoise, in Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, pp. 174-175.
224 Gaubil, Traité de la chronologie chinoise, in Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, pp. 175-177. The passage can be found in Xu Fa, Tianyuan lili quanshu, XXSK, vol. 1032, p. 472 (see note 66 of this article; see also correct interpretation in article by Ad Dudink).
225 Gaubil, Traité de la chronologie chinoise, in Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, pp. 177-181. See also Gaubil (1970), pp. 534-547 (letter to Fréret, 2 October 1741), where Gaubil praises this work and its use of Zhushu jinian against Mailla. The work was also sent by Gaubil to Kirill Grigorievich Rozumovsky (1728-1803), president of the Imperial Academy in St. Petersburg in 1755 (see Gaubil (1970), p. 818). See also copy in BnF, Chinois 644-653.
226 Gaubil, Traité de la chronologie chinoise, in Mémoires concernant ... Chinois, vol. XVI, p. 181.
Table 3. Overview of major sources for Jesuit accounts of Chinese history and chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chen Jing version</th>
<th>Nan Xuan version</th>
<th>Yuan Huang</th>
<th>Zhong Xing</th>
<th>Other Chinese sources</th>
<th>European sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tongjian gangmu quanshu 通鑑綱目全書</td>
<td>Gangjian 綱鑑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martini (1658)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Gouvea (1654)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couplet Ms. (1666/96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couplet (1686)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentzel (1696)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouquet (1729)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrenin (1730)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prämare (1730)</td>
<td>(√)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailla (1737/77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la Charme (1741)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaubil (1749/1814)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Conclusions

The purpose of this article was to identify the Chinese sources for European accounts of early Chinese history and chronology. My initial difficulties in identifying these sources have also led to a deeper study of late Ming and early Qing historiography, which I will publish elsewhere. Our view of this historiography is largely determined by the primary importance attributed to Song works, on the one hand, and the selection made by the Siku quanshu project on the other, so that some notable Ming texts, such as those by Nan Xuan in the mainstream tradition and by Yuan Huang or Zhong Xing in the gangjian tradition, have fallen into oblivion. The early Qing Manchu and Chinese editions confirm the importance of these texts as authoritative works. The research in this paper regarding the origins of missionary works on Chinese history provides further confirmation of this.
Though not all the sources have been definitively determined yet, especially the precise versions of the gangjian texts that were used, it has become clear that the missionaries used both Nan Xuan and gangjian texts, with the latter as the most important sources. This does not exclude the possibility that they had further traditional sources to hand, such as the different versions of Chen Jing for the early period of history. The fact that these texts are rarely referred to by their author is also related to the fact that in the case of an authoritative text the text is often more important than the author. While in the seventeenth century the missionary texts make little reference to the sources they used, in the eighteenth century more precise references are more common, and sometimes, as in the case of Gaubil, very detailed. On the whole they confirm that the missionaries had an extensive knowledge of the different primary sources available, even if they did not always use them directly.

There are several parallels to be drawn between the late Ming Chinese texts and those by the missionaries. Missionaries tried to write comprehensive histories of China, something that was made possible by the fact that the recent late Ming publications contained more information about the distant past as well as about recent history. Such comprehensive and continuous histories of one nation were also something relatively new in Europe during the Renaissance. With regard to form, just as a lot of copying from other earlier texts took place in the case of the Chinese works, much the same happened in Europe once the manuscripts from China arrived in Europe and needed to be edited, as can clearly be seen in the case of Du Halde. Content wise, there was both in China and in Europe a rise in interest in chronology. In addition, in China the gangjian texts expressed a variety of opinions, while among the European missionaries there was also a variety of opinion about the ancient past.

On the whole there was an increase in historical awareness in China at that time. Chinese comprehensive histories attracted a wide readership and this included the missionaries. Most probably the Chinese counterparts introduced the missionaries to these texts. Through the circulation of knowledge this information travelled to Europe and ultimately would have an enormous impact on European intellectual life.

---

227 This aspect will be discussed in a separate article that will analyse the various opinions concerning the miraculous births of the consorts of Emperor Ku.
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