

## **Is Good Act Rooted in Good Will?**

- Matteo Ricci's Debate with the Chinese Scholar

**Lecturer, Yi, Jongwoo** (GyeonginNational University of Education)

- I. Introduction
- II. Whether Good Will is the Root of Good Act
- III. When the Result of Good Act Based on Good Will is Bad,  
Can It Be Praised?
- IV. Conclusion

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21050/CSE.2022.53.13>

---

( 국 문 초 록 )

---

! fi/ 1 t fi i / ! ž Ž \*)(" \$ # 7 & %) ' i ( / \* +

이종우(경인교육대학교 강사)

선행의 뿌리는 선의지인가? 마테오 리치와 중국선비는 이 주제에 대하여 논쟁을 벌였다. 마테오 리치에 따르면 인간은 항상 선의지를 가졌을 때 선행을 할 수 있다. 인간은 천주에 의하여 창조되었으므로 인간의 본성은 선하다. 그러나 최초 인간인 아담은 원죄를 저질렀고, 이 때문에 인간도 선천적으로 원죄가 있다. 이 때문에 인간은 선의지를 가졌을 때 선행을 할 수 있다. 그러나 만약 인간이 악의지를 가졌다면 그들은 악행을 할 수 있다. 마테오 리치는 『대학』의 (의)도 의지로 해석하였다. 이러한 마테오 리치의 해석은 토마스 아퀴나스의 윤리에 근거한 것이다. 이와 달리 중국선비는 선행이 선의지와 무관하다고 주장하였다. 그는 선행은 선한 마음에서 나올 뿐, 선한 의지에서 나온다고 여기지 않았다.

주제어: 선행, 선의지, 카톨릭, 유가, 아퀴나스

---

## Will: Good or Bad

Is good act rooted in good will? Is good act rooted in good will? Good act may be rooted in good will, while it may not so. Can it be praised if it is a good will but the result is an evil? blamed? For example, a hunter tries to kill a tiger but has killed a man, while another tries to kill a man but killed a tiger. Can the archer's killed a man be blamed? Can the archer's killed a tiger be praised? The former had will to kill a tiger in order to rescue a man, but he killed the man and this means good will. By Contrast, the latter had will to kill a man, but killed a tiger, and this means evil will. Is the action of the former meant good? Is the action of the latter meant good? Owing to this, Matteo Ricci (1552-1610), a Catholic missionary sent to China, had a debate with the Chinese scholar. I research on that topic in this paper.

In that regard, Yi Jongwoo has researched on Matteo Ricci's debate with the Confucian on whether a child's theft to support his parents is good or evil.<sup>1)</sup> In this paper, Ricci regarded it as evil, while the Confucian regarded it as good. Michele Ferrero researched on the motive of action in Catholicism and Confucianism in *0;6)6I8"+I;3*. (天主實義, The True meaning of the Lord of heaven). In this paper, for Christianity it seems that good actions are performed in order to go to Heaven. In contrast, the Confucian good action should be performed for its own sake, without any thought of future reward.<sup>2)</sup> Yang Yan

1) Yi Jongwoo, "Matteo Ricci's Debate with A Confucian on Whether A Child's Theft to Support His Parents is Good or Evil", 『 『 』 』 131(2020).

2) Michele Ferrero, "Motivation to Act in Confucianism and Christianity: In Matteo

has researched on a Confucian scholar's refutation of Catholic priest and Matteo Ricci's response to that, because the priest has no male heir and this regards it as unfilial according to Confucianism.<sup>3)</sup> Bani Li has researched that the debate of Catholic churches on whether ancestral rites are idol worship.<sup>4)</sup> Yang Myeongsu has researched that a comparison of the Lord of Heaven in *0;6)G18" +1;3;* and principle of Neo-Confucianism.<sup>5)</sup>

### VVÛ~ 6~ 690888 Û 7MM7 : ~ 6Û88 8 0888 05

According to Matteo Ricci in *0;6)G18" +1;3;*, goodness is perfect but evil lack of that: "There is a generally accepted view according to which goodness results from wholeness, and evil from fragmentation."<sup>6)</sup> Only good is in reality but evil not,<sup>7)</sup> Humans were created by the Lord of Heaven, therefore, human nature is good.<sup>8)</sup> But the first human being

Ricci's The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven (Tianzhu Shiyi 天主實義)" In: *Frontiers of Philosophy in China*, 14,2(2019), Leiden: Brill.

- 3) 楊硯, “~ 明儒家思潮影響下利瑪竇的. 各選擇: 試論《天主實義》對 ~ 無後 大J 的反駁”, 『漢語基督 學術論評』 24(2017), 41-72.
- 4) Li Bani, "Becoming All Things to All Men: Lessons from Matteo Ricci and the Rites Controversy", *Puritan Reformed Journal*, January 1(2020).
- 5) . 『 (天主) (理) = . 『 』 31(2009).
- 6) Matteo Ricci (1923), *0;6)G18" +1;3;6.4*(上海: 上海土山灣印書館, 1923), 善者成乎全, 惡者成于一
- 7) Matteo Ricci (1923), *0;6)G18" +1;3;* 7.2, 惡非實物, 乃無善之謂) because all things were creature by the Lord of Heaven (*0;6)G18* 天主) and he is good as the perfect supreme being. (*0;6)G18" +1;3;* 2.12, 夫天主之性, 最為全盛; *0;6)G18" +1;3;* 1.6, 天主, 固無上至大之所以然也)
- 8) Matteo Ricci (1923), *0;6)G18" +1;3;* 7.1, 本性自善.

was born with original sin, the sin of Adam. This is called human second nature. Because of original sin, when humans have good will, they can do good.

“Man’s first ancestor had already corrupted the roots of man’s nature so that later generation of sons and grandsons all suffered residual harm and were unable to receive perfect nature.”<sup>9)</sup>

The mention of Ricci, “an original sin of the first ancestor, Adam, is transmitted to descendants”, was based on *08AA6" 0I&\*(\*J;%6* of Aquinas.<sup>10)</sup> This original sin of Adam is the root of human evil, while the human nature created by the Lord of Heaven is fundamentally good. Because of this, human nature has both good and evil. Therefore, humans can do good based on good will or do evil based on evil will. According to Matteo Ricci, the root of human good is the Lord of Heaven<sup>11)</sup> and this was based in *08AA6" 0I&\*(\*J;%6* written by Aquinas. In the works of Aquinas, God is perfect<sup>12)</sup> and good,<sup>13)</sup> and this was influenced by Aristotle.<sup>14)</sup> Matteo Ricci researched philosophy,

9) Matteo Ricci (1923), *0;6)GI8"+I;3*; 8,6, 世人之祖, 已敗人類性根, 則爲其子孫者, 沿其遺累, 不得承性之全, 生而帶疵.

10) Thomas Aquinas, *08AA6" 0I&\*(\*J;%6* 2.81, translated by John Henry Parker, ;)" *0I&" Z\*A<(;&," B \*2 '+ " \*d" 0I \*A6+" - 78;)6+* (Amazon Kindle Edition, 2018), 2555.

11) Matteo Ricci, *0;6)GI8"+I;3;V.9*, 1923, 今吾欲擬指天主何物, 曰…爲道德之原也.

12) Thomas Aquinas, *08AA6" Z\*)*, 26 Gentiles 37.3, in *0I&" Z\*A<(;&," B \*2 '+ " \*d" 0I \*A6+" - 78;)6+*, translated by John Henry Parker (Amazon Kindle Edition, 2018), 7981. “But we have shown that God is perfect. Therefore, He is good.” (*08AA6" Z\*)*, 26" *N&);(;&+ 37.3*, 7981)

13) Thomas Aquinas, *08AA6" 0I&\*(\*J;%6* 1.19, 5425-32.

14) The God in Aquinas’ work was based on unmoved mover, implying perfection,

theology, mathematics, cosmology and astronomy under the direction of Christopher Clavius (1538-1612) at Roman College under the Society of Jesus (Latin: Societas Iesu), founded by Ignatius of Loyola with the approval of Pope Paul III in 1540. At the time, Ricci had mainly researched Aquinas' theology and Aristotle's philosophy.<sup>15)</sup>

According to Matteo Ricci, good and evil act rooted in human will. Good will emerges to good act and evil will to evil one. Humans can choose of good or evil. This is because human soul can govern the body, whereas animals cannot so.

“Bird and animal always accord with the desires and follow wherever their feeling leads them, unable to exercise any self-control. Only the soul

---

in Aristotle's works (Aristotle, *Physics* 7.1-3, translated by J. A. Smith, in *101 Z\* A < (& B \* 2 '+' \* 4" - 2; +, \* (& (Amazon Kindle Edition, 2020, 149-154; > & 6 < 13+; % 4.8, translated by J. A. Smith, in *101 Z\* A < (& B \* 2 '+' \* 4" - 2; +, \* (& (Amazon Kindle Edition, 2020, 304), so Aquinas quoted that of Aristotle. (Thomas Aquinas (2018b), *08AA6" Z\**, 26" N&), ; (& 37.3, lo.7981, "Now, virtue is a certain perfection, for each thing is then called perfect when it reaches the virtue belonging to it," as may be seen in *Physics VII.*") Aquinas regarded the perfection of unmoved mover in the *Physics* of Aristotle as God's perfection. Therefore, the God is good because of His perfection. (*08AA6" Z\**, 26" N&), ; (& 37.3, 7981) Afterward, this is written in Aquinas' *Summa Theologica*. (Thomas Aquinas, *08AA6" 01&\*( \* J; % 1.6.1, 2552-2560), "God alone is good essentially. For everything is called good according to its perfection. Now perfection of a thing is threefold: ... This triple perfection belongs to no creature by its own essence; it belongs to God only.")***

15) There were the works of Aristotle and Aquinas, the Bible in the curriculum of University of Rome. Therefore, Matteo Ricci, including other Jesuit missionaries would learn these works. For example, the Bible, *Summa Theologica* of Aquinas and Aristotle's works: *Physics*, *Meta physics*, *On the Soul*, *Nicomachean Ethics*, *On the Heavens*, *On Generation and Destruction*, and *Meteorology*. , “

of humans is capable of being the master of his body causing it to act or arresting it, in accordance with its will.”<sup>16)</sup>

When human will be in the right, his act will be right. But when his will be wrong, his act will be wrong too. The Lord of Heaven created only the good human,<sup>17)</sup> and the human can freely choose good or evil such as Adam choose of the fruit of the tree of good and of evil. If the human has no free choice, he will do only good such as the first human created by the Lord of Heaven, the supreme good.

“Good and evil, virtue and vice all stem from right or corrupt will. If there are no wills there can be no good or evil or any distinction between superior and inferior humans.”<sup>18)</sup>

Humans can freely choose between good or evil, but they should be responsible for their own good and evil act in his life, because the Lord of Heaven will send good soul to heaven and evil soul to hell after the human death, according to Ricci.<sup>19)</sup> Therefore, humans should do good to go to heaven after their death. This good act is based on good will, so Ricci emphasized good will and he interpreted with human will on Confucian classics.

Ricci interpreted of “rectifying of human mind (*GI&J*;) 正心) and

---

16) Matteo Ricci, *0;6)GI8" +I;3;"* 3.5, 禽獸常行, 本欲之役, fi 其情之所導, 而不能自檢. 獨人之魂能爲身主, 而隨吾志之所縱之.

17) *0;6)GI8" +I;3;* 1.9, 夫乾坤之內, 善性善行, 無不從天主fi 之

18) *0;6)GI8" +I;3;* 6.1, 善惡德慝, 俱由意之正邪, 無意即無善惡, 無君子小人之判矣

19) *0;6)GI8" +I;3;* 6.14.

“making human intention true” (%1&)J3; 誠意) in the *N2&6, T&62*;)J (Daxue 大學), one of Confucian classics, as good will. People should have good will to carry good act, according to the interpretation of Ricci.

“Confucianism regards the will of sincerity as the foundation for the rectification of the mind, for self-cultivation, for the regulation of the family, for the ordering of the state, and for the bringing of peace to the world. How, then, can one say that there is no hidden motive? ... If you say that he has no motive, then you do not understand Confucianism, and you do not know the source of good and evil.”<sup>20)</sup>

Unlike him, the Chinese scholar did not interpret those of the book as that will: “But certain Confucian scholars distinctly assert, have no wills, no good and no evil”<sup>21)</sup> He believed good will is not the root of good act. Therefore, he did not accept an original sin of Adam in Ricci’s Catholicism. The argument of the Chinese scholar implies both good and evil in reality:

“Goodness emerges from goodness and evil from evil”.<sup>22)</sup>

The former, “goodness emerging from goodness”, means good act

20) Matteo Ricci, *0;6)G18" +1;3*; 6.1, 儒者, 以“誠意”爲“正心”. 修身齊家治國平天下之根基, 何能無意乎?...如云: 誠意!, 是不達儒者之學, 不知善惡之原也. 善惡德惡, 俱由意之正邪, 無意則無善惡, 無君子小人之判矣.

21) *0;6)G18" +1;3*; 6.2, 1923, 中士曰: 毋意, 毋善, 毋惡!, 世儒固有其說.

22) Matteo Ricci, *0;6)G18" +1;3*; 7.2, 七 國之士, 有曰: 出善乃善, 出惡乃惡



emerging from good mind, and the latter, “evil emerging from evil”, means evil act emerging from good mind. The former was implied Mencius’ theory that human nature is fundamentally good. By contrast, the latter was implied Xunzi’s theory that human nature is fundamentally evil. The Chinese scholar did not regard good act was based on good will. This is different from Ricci’s claim. In *Ol& - )6(&%, +” \*4” Z\*)48%;8+”* (Lunyu 論語), mainly said 2& (仁), not the good of human nature. That after, in the book of Zhu Xi (1130-1200), a neo-Confucian scholar in Southern Song dynasty (1127-1279) of China, original nature of humans was endowed with pure good but physical nature mixed good and evil due to the body.<sup>23)</sup> Therefore, the Chinese scholar said Ricci so.

The common point of Ricci and Mencius is human nature being good. The view of Ricci is because of humans created by the Lord of Heaven, the supreme good, while that of Mencius regarded human nature as good regardless of the Heaven. The Chinese scholar believed not Ricci but Mencius and Xunzi’s view. Unlike that, according to Lo Pingcheung, the view of Ricci is close to the view of Mencius, so that of Ricci has influenced to the Confucianism of Qing Dynasty.<sup>24)</sup> By contrast, Ricci firmly excluded Mencius because Mencius’ theory that human nature to be good is different the theory original sin in the Bible, according to Takada Kayoko.<sup>25)</sup> According to Liu Yu, Ricci’s

23) 朱熹, 『朱子語類』4, 64(北京: 中華書局, 1999)

24) 羅秉祥, “利瑪竇性善論: 天學與漢學宋學之辨”, 『哲學與文』37卷11期 (2010.11)

25) 高田佳代子, “中 古典O. - / 1 宣/ 師1 理解” (Master thesis in Tokyo University, 2008)

pro-Confucianism aimed only Catholic mission in Ming China (1368-1644).<sup>26)</sup> According to Euiyun Shin, Matteo Ricci tried to supplement Confucianism but there had a limitation, finally, his policy implied sticking to a Catholicism.<sup>27)</sup>

Accordingly, the Chinese scholar refuted the assertion of Ricci because of following Mencius' argument. Therefore, Ricci persuaded the scholar that the Lord of Heaven also has the willingness, and Laozi and Zhuangzi said the willingness.<sup>28)</sup> The willingness of Ricci's term of the willingness was influenced by Aquinas and interpreted the *N2&6," T&62);)J*, a Confucian classic, based on Aquinas. However, the scholar book means not the willingness. Mencius' claim, human nature is fundamentally good,<sup>29)</sup> so good act emerges from human nature. Therefore, good act is not good will. By contrast, Ricci claimed good act based on good will and evil act based on evil will: "When I said that right will are the root of good conduct."<sup>30)</sup> The will is chosen freely by humans. However, the Chinese scholar claimed that good and evil acts are regardless of human will, because he regarded good act as following reason but evil does not so.<sup>31)</sup> Ricci believed that the Lord of Heaven bestowed the nature on human to choose both good and evil.

26) Liu Yu, "Adapting Catholicism to Confucianism: Matteo Ricci's Tianzhu Shiyi", 582\*(&6)" *T&J6*%319,1(2014)

27) . " . " 「 」 81(2010)

28) 0;6)G18" +1;3; 6.2, 西士曰: 此惡欲人爲土石者耳. 謂上帝宗義, 有是哉? 若上帝無意無善, 亦將等之乎土石也. 謂之理學, 悲哉, 悲哉! 昔老莊亦有: 勿爲, 勿意, 勿辯之語.

29) 『孟子』6.1.2( : , 1970)

30) 0;6)G18" +1;3; 6:4, 吾言: 正意爲善之本

31) 0;6)G18" +1;3; 6.3, 中士曰··聞: 夫順理者, 卽爲善, 而稱之德行; 犯理者, 卽爲惡, 而稱之·不才. 卽顧行事如何, 於意似無相屬.

The Lord of Heaven should have allowed humans to choose only the good because He was originally good. Why he made them choose both good and evil? Humans have both good and evil act, because they were bestowed the freedom to do both by Lord of Heaven. Therefore, He bestowed the freedom of choice on humans, so humans can choose evil as well as good. If a human choose good, meaning good will, he will do good act and this will be his own merit. Human nature was endowed with good because the Lord of heaven is goodness. But humans were born with original sin due to the sin of Adam. Because of that, human nature was endowed with both good and evil. Therefore, good act is his own merit. The Lord of Heaven's bestowing the freedom of choice between good or evil on humans is natural, and His purpose makes them increased their own merits. This means His love for humans,

“When the Lord of Heaven bestowed this nature on man, man was capable of doing both good and evil, and man was enriched thereby. Because man can take reject goodness, not only is the merit of goodness increased, but that merit becomes man's own. It is therefore said that when the Lord of Heaven produced man He made no use of him, but that when he wanted him to be good He had to make use of him.”<sup>32)</sup>

---

32) 0;6)G18"+1;3; 7.2, 天主賦人此性, 能行二者, 所以厚人類也, 其能取捨此善, 非但增爲善之功, 于其功爲我功焉. 故曰: 天主以生我, 非用我, 所以善我, 乃用我. 此之謂也. This was influenced Aquinas. According to Aquinas, Humans have free will, so the evil act done by free will is punished. (Man has free-will: otherwise counsels, exhortations, commands, prohibitions, rewards, and punishments would be in vain. (08AA6"0I&\*(\*J;%6 1.83, 2018:17249-17256) This means the Lord of Heaven to bestow humans the ability to choose freely between good or evil. Therefore,

The freedom of choice also means blessed when to choose of good, not evil. Human nature was endowed with good will because the human nature is goodness.<sup>33)</sup> This means taking responsibility for good or evil act. That freedom and responsibility of Ricci was based on *08AA6" 0I&\*(%J;%6* of Aquinas,<sup>34)</sup> and that of Aquinas rooted in *.;%\*A6%I&6)" 5,I;%+* of Aristotle.<sup>35)</sup> According to Baker, Aquinas adapted to Catholicism by adopting Aristotle's reason, and the argument of Ricci was based on Aquinas.<sup>36)</sup>

At the time, Ricci researched not only Catholicism but also Aristotle's philosophy at Rome University in the times of Italian Renaissance. The free choice of good or evil means free will and this has been bestowed by the Lord of Heaven, according to Ricci. The free will was influenced by Thomas Aquinas<sup>37)</sup> and Aquinas influenced by Aristotle.<sup>38)</sup> Ricci's free will means the Lord of Heaven's bestowing on humans. According to Aquinas, God has free will because of His intellect,<sup>39)</sup> so humans created by Him have free will because of intellect as Him.<sup>40)</sup> That of Aristotle was focused on taking responsible for human own act.

---

the humans have free will. There is will in God, as there is intellect: since will follows upon intellect. (Thomas Aquinas (2018a), *08AA6" 0I&\*(%J;%6* 1.19, p.5423)

33) *0;6)G18" +I;3; 7.1*

34) Aquinas, *08AA6" 0I&\*(%J;%6*, 17249-56.

35) Aristotle, *.;%\*A6%I&6)" 5,I;%+ 3.5*, translated by David Ross(Amazon Kindle Edition, Oxford University Press, 2009, 11533-7)

36) Don Baker, "Thomas Aquinas and Chŏng Yagyong: Rebels Within Tradition", 『기독교사회윤리』 3(2002)

37) Thomas Aquinas, *08AA6" 0I&\*(%J;%6* 1.83, 1141

38) Aristotle, *.;%\*A6%I&6)" 5,I;%+ 3.5*, 11533-7.

39) *08AA6" 0I&\*(%J;%6* 1.19, 329.

40) *08AA6" 0I&\*(%J;%6"* 1.19, 329.

According to Ricci, good humans are rewarded and evil humans punished by the Lord of Heaven. The former go to Heaven, while the latter go to Hell after their death. Because human soul is immortal but the human being has a short life. This means taking responsible for their own good or evil acts. Ricci regarded it as supplement of Confucianism, because Heaven and Hell are not written in the Confucian classics.

“This is most assuredly because the Lord on High wishes to wait until these people have died before raising the souls of the good to Heaven to enjoy a life of blessedness, and before judging the souls of the evil so that they might suffer the punishments of Hell.”<sup>41)</sup>

Unlike Ricci, the Chinese denied claim that good will is the root of good act. He regarded human action was not always based on his will.

According to Matteo Ricci, humans have free will,<sup>42)</sup> so they can freely do good or evil. If someone do good act, he will be praised. By contrast, if someone do evil act, he will be blamed. If so, someone commit evil for his own profit, can it be called freedom? This cannot be called freedom, according to Ricci. Because freedom means taking responsibility for his own act, good or evil. Only human act based on free will can be praised or punished. This means taking responsibility for his own act. The claim of Matteo Ricci coincides with a criminal law of Korea influenced by a criminal law of Germany, because some-

---

41) 0;6)G18"+1;3; 6,14, 上帝固待其人之既死, 然後, 取既善者之魂而天堂福之; 審其惡者之魂而地獄刑之.

42) 0;6)G18"+1;3; 3.5, 獨人之魂能爲身主, 而隨吾志之所縱之

one's act not to be based on free will cannot be punished under criminal code.<sup>43)</sup>

“Everything in the world which has a will can allow the will to achieve its end or can restraint it, and a distinction is thereby made between virtue and vice, good and evil... Because they have no mind and no will they are devoid of virtue and vice, goodness and evil, and one cannot reward or punish them.”<sup>44)</sup>

Unlike humans, animals has not free will, the ability to freely choose between good or evil, because act on instinct: “The natures of metal, stone and animals are incapable of doing good and evil.”<sup>45)</sup> Therefore, animals cannot take responsibility for animal's act because they have not free will but instinct. Big animals eat small animal to survive, so the big animal cannot be punished to regard the act as evil. Because the action of big animal is not free will but instinct to survive. For example, a tiger having eaten a deer to survive cannot be punished. A child having strike his mother's breast to eat milk cannot be punished to regard the act as evil. The crime of miners, including child, under 14 cannot be punished under criminal code in Korea.<sup>46)</sup> Because the minor cannot have free will, an ability to choose between good and evil. When the child reached maturity, if he beats his parents, he will be

---

43) Article 13 of the Criminal Code in Korea

44) 0;6/G18"+1;3; 6.3, 凡世物既有其意, 又有能縱止其意者, 然後有德, 有慝, 有善, 有惡焉. 意者心之發也...所爲無心無意, 是以無德無慝, 無善無惡, 而無可以賞罰之.

45) 0;6/G18"+1;3; 7.2, 彼金石鳥獸之性, 不能爲善惡

46) Article 1 of the Criminal Code in Korea

blamed. Because adult has free will.

“If a child strikes its mother it is not accounted a transgressor, because it still lacks that by which it can restrain its will. When the child reaches maturity, however, and is capable of knowing whether he may or may not do a thing, then, even before he strikes her, if he shows the slightest tendency to disobey his parents, he will be accused of being unfilial.”<sup>47)</sup>

Unlike Matteo Ricci’s claim, the Chinese scholar claimed that good or evil act is regardless of human will.

“I have heard it said that to act in accordance with reason is good and that this is called virtuous conduct, and that to offend against reason is evil, and that this is called being devoid of talent. Provided one determines the nature of a man on the basis of his actions, his motives would seem to be of no consequence.”<sup>48)</sup>

The Chinese scholar believed that human act is regardless of human will. Although someone has good will, he can do evil act. This is different from Ricci’s claim.

---

47) 0;6)G18"+1;3; 6.3, 子 兒擊母, 無以答之, 其未有以檢己意也. 及其壯, 而能識可否, 則何待于擊, 稍逆其親即加不孝之罪矣.

48) 0;6)G18"+1;3;"6.3, 聞夫順理者! 爲善, 而稱之德行, 犯理者! 爲惡, 而稱之不才, 則顧行事如何, 於意似無相屬

WWÛ~ 6α : ~ 6Û6ıœ™8 Ø88s Ô5 4ı 6s 8α Ø88s Û 7™7  
 4s½ 4α : ~ 6Ô5 6 947, 6sÛ

If the will of someone is good but the result of the act is bad, is the act praised or blamed? According to Ricci, if the will is good but the result of the act bad, it can be praised. Therefore the act can be called good. By contrast, if the result is good but the will bad, it cannot be praised but is blamed. Thus, the act can be called evil. Ricci took the wills and acts of two famous archers as an example.

“Once upon a time there were two famous archers. One went out into the wilds where he saw something in the woods, crouching like a tiger. Seriously concerned lest the tiger harm someone, he shot at it, but accidentally hit a man. The second archer climbed up a tree, and thought he noticed a movement which seemed to be that of a human being. He also shot an arrow at the moving object, but it turned out, in fact, to be a deer. The first hunter most assuredly shot and killed a man, but his will was to shoot a tiger, and he was judged worthy of praise. Although what the second hunter shot was merely a wild deer, because his will had been to kill a human being, he was judged worthy of blame. And why? Because a distinction was made between good and bad wills. Thus, it is very clear that the source of good and evil is the will.”<sup>49)</sup>

49) 0;6)G18" +1;3; 6.3, 昔有二弓士, 一之山野, 見叢有伏者如虎, 慮將傷人因射之, 偶誤中人, 一登樹林, 恍惚傍視, 行動如人亦射刺之, 而實乃鹿也. 彼前一人果殺人者, 然而意在射虎, 斷當褒. 後一人雖殺野鹿, 而意在刺人, 斷當貶. 奚由焉? 由意之美醜異也. 則意爲善惡之原, 明著矣.



Like this, Ricci believed the root of good act to be good will. Therefore, he emphasized that humans should have good will. By contrast, the Chinese scholar claimed the good act is irrelevant to good will.<sup>50)</sup> The good act emerges from good mind, not good will, according to his thinking.

According to Ricci, human will is three class as follows: to get Heaven, to repay the Lord of Heaven and to obey His sacred will.

“There are three correct motives for doing good works. The lowest involves doing good in order to get to Heaven and to avoid going to Hell; the second, doing good in order to repay the Lord of Heaven for His profound favors; and the highest, doing good in order to harmonize with, and to obey, the Lord of Heaven’s sacred will.”<sup>51)</sup>

For Christianity it seems that good actions are performed in order to go to Heaven, according to Michele Ferrero(2019), and this is the lowest motive, according to Matteo Ricci.

Unlike Ricci, the Chinese scholar argued good will is not the root of good act. The scholar did not denied all the root of good act is good will. For example, the will of theft of a child to support his parents is goodness, according to the scholar. This action of a child is based on his will.

---

50) *O;6/G18" +1;3*; 6.3, 中士曰…顧行事如何, 於意似無相屬

51) *O;6/G18" +1;3*; 6.9, 凡善行者, 有正意三狀. 下曰: 因登天堂, 免地獄之意. 中曰: 因報答所重蒙天主 恩德之意. 上曰: 因翕順天主聖旨之意也.

The Chinese scholar says: "If a son steals and robs to support his parents his intentions are good, but if he is unable to avoid the sanctions imposed by the law, what then?"<sup>52)</sup>

Unlike the scholar argument, Ricci argued the will of child's theft is not goodness because he regarded goodness as perfection without a fault. Though the will of the child's supporting his parents is good, the theft of him is evil. Therefore, the child is not good but is evil, and this is neither good will nor good act according to Ricci.<sup>53)</sup> This goodness was equated from a work of Aquinas.<sup>54)</sup> Because the theft is not good but is evil, so the child's act and will is not good but is evil. At the time, the child's action was punished by the criminal law in Ming Dynasty (1368-1644), *01&"N2&6,"T6/+";)">;)J" I3)6+,3* (Dai Ming Lu, 大明律), because of his theft to be crime.<sup>55)</sup> Therefore, the Chinese scholar regarded the punishment as being unjust. Judging from Confucius's view, the child's action would be right, because he regarded a child's filial piety for his parents as being most important.<sup>56)</sup>

52) *0;6)G18"+I;3;* 6.4, 中士曰: 子爲養親行盜, 其意 善矣, 而不免于法, 何如?

53) *0;6)G18"+I;3;* 6.4, 西士曰: 吾西國有公論曰: 善者成乎全, 惡者成于一, 試言其故, 人既爲盜, 雖其餘行悉義, 但呼爲惡, 不可稱善…子爲親, 竊人財物, 其事既惡, 何有善意?

54) Thomas Aquinas, *08AA6"Z\*),26"N&),;( &+ 39.5, 7985; 08AA6"01&\*%J;%6 1.6, 131*

55) *01&"N2&6,"T6/+";)">;)J" I3)6+,3* (Dai Ming Lu, 大明律) (北京: 法律出版社, 1998, 141)

56) Yi Jongwoo, "Matteo Ricci's Debate with A Confucian on Whether A Child's Theft to Support His Parents is Good or Evil", 「  
」 131(2020)

## Will & Good Act

Is good act rooted in good will? Yes, according to Matteo Ricci, act of human is rooted his will. Therefore, humans do always good act based on good will, and the relationship between evil act and evil will is so. Unlike Ricci, the Chinese scholar claimed good act is not based on good will, and the relationship between evil act and evil will is so. The good act emerged from good mind, not good will. In the Confucian classics, good act based on good will was not written. However, Ricci interpreted “making human intention true” (Zi & Ji; 誠意) in the *Great Learning* (Da Xue; 大學), one of Confucian classics, as good will. That is, people should have good will to carry good act. However, this interpretation of Ricci was not implied in the Confucian classic. This is only Ricci’s interpretation based on Aquinas. By contrast, the Chinese scholar did not so. That interpretation of Ricci was based on the original sin of Adam and Aquinas influenced by Aristotle.

## References

•Primary Sources

- Aristotle. *01& .; %\*A6%I&6)" 5,I; %+*, translated by David Ross, Amazon Kindle Edition, Oxford University Press, 2009
- Aristotle. *?I3+; %+*, translated by J. A. Smith, in *01&" Z\*A<(&," B\*2'+ " \*4" -2; +, \*(&θ" Amazon Kindle Edition, 2020.*
- T8)38 (Analects). 서울: 성균관대학교 대동문화연구원, 1970
- Aristotle. *>&,6<I3+; %+*, translated by J. A. Smith, in *01&" Z\*A<(&," B\*2'+ " \*4" -2; +, \*(& Amazon Kindle Edition, 2020.*
- " >&)%;8+,"* by Irene Bloom, edited and with an introduction by Philip Ivanhoe, New York: Columbia University Press, 2011. "
- 『 』, 서울: 성균관대학교 대동문화연구원, 1970.
- Matteo Ricci. *0;6)6I8" +I;3;* (The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven)," Shanghai: Shanghai Tushanyin Shuguan, 1923
- Matteo Ricci. *01&" 028&" >&6);)J" \*4", I&" T\*2F" \*4" K&6&6)*, translated by Douglas Lancashire and Peter Hu Kuo-chen, edited by Edward J. Malatesta, St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, in cooperation with The Ricci Institute Taipei, 1985
- Roger Ames and Henry Rosemont (1998). *01&" -)6(&%, + " \*4" Z\*)48%;8+*, New York: The Ballantine Publishing Group
- 『 』, (*018';)Jθ" The Classic of Documents*), 서울: 성균관대학교 대동문화연구원, 1984.
- Thomas Aquinas. *08AA6" 01&\*( \*J; %6,* in *01&" Z\*A<(&," B\*2'+ " \*4" 01\*A6+ " -78;)%+*, translated by John Henry Parker, Amazon Kindle Edition, 2018.
- Thomas Aquinas. *08AA6 Z\*),26" N&);(+&, in 01&" Z\*A<(&," B\*2'+ " \*4" 01\*A6+ " -78;)%+*, translated by John Henry Parker, Amazon Kindle Edition, 2018.
- , 『 』, : , 1999.

•Secondary Sources

- Don Baker. "Thomas Aquinas and Chǒng Yagyong: Rebels Within Tradition." 『다산학』3(2002), 32-69.
- Gallagher, L.J. *ZI; )6" ;)" ,I&" 0:[, &&" Z&),823# 0I&" e\*82)6(+ " \*4" >6,, &\* M,%/%;" VtusSVdVc*, New York: Randomhouse, 1953.
- Ganss, G. *06; )," EJ)6,;8+X" EF&6" \*4" e&+8;" f);@&2+;,3*, Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1905
- 김상근. "마테오 리치의 『천주실의』에 나타난 16세기 후반 예수회 대학의 교과과정과 예수회 토미즘(Jesuit Thomism)의 영향." 『한국기독교신학논총』40(2005), 105-130.
- Li Bani, "Becoming All Things to All Men: Lessons from Matteo Ricci and the Rites Controversy." *?82; )6)" M&#\*2A&F" e\*82)6( 12(2020)*, 191-204.
- Yu Liu. "Adapting Catholicism to Confucianism: Matteo Ricci's *0;6)GI8" 0I;3;=" 582\* <&6)" T&J6%3" 19.1(2014)*, 43-59.
- . " 2 ." 『 』37 11 (2010,11), 41-66.
- Michele Ferrero. "Motivation to Act in Confucianism and Christianity: In Matteo Ricci's The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven (*0;6)GI8" 0I;3; )*." In: *D2\*);, &2+ " \*4" ?I;(\*+\* <I3"; )" ZI; )6-* 14.2, Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Loewe, M.N. "Imperial China's Reactions to the Catholic Missions", *.8A& )35(2)*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- 신의연. "천주실의에서 시도한 보유론의 한계." 『인문학연구』81(2010), 159-192.
- 양명수. "『천주실의』의 천주( )와 성리학의 리( )의 차이: 아퀴나스의 목적인과 능동인의 관계를 중심으로." 『철학사상』31(2009), 215-248.
- . " ." (Catholic Missionaries' Understanding on Chinese Classics), master thesis Tokyo University, 2008.
- . " : 3 4 『 』" 『 』24(2017), 41-72.
- Yi Jongwoo. "Matteo Ricci's Debate with A Confucian on Whether A Child's Theft to Support His Parents is Good or Evil." 『윤리연구』131(2020), 259-278.

논문투고일: 2022년 07월 01일

심사개시일: 2022년 07월 17일

게재확정일: 2022년 08월 04일

---

"#&'%"\$ '(

---

## Is Good Act Rooted in Good Will?

Is a good act rooted in a good will? Matteo Ricci and a Chinese scholar had a debate on that topic. When humans always have a good will, they can do good, according to Ricci. As humans were created by the Lord of Heaven, the supreme good, their nature is good. But man's first ancestor, Adam, committed a sin, an original sin, so humans are born with original sin. According to that, when humans have a good will, they will be able to do good. By contrast, if humans have an evil will, they will be able to do evil. Ricci interpreted so even 3;(意) in *01&" N2&6," T&62);)J* (大學), one of the Confucian classics. This interpretation was based on Aquinas but that of Ricci is not implied in the Confucian classic. By contrast, the Chinese scholar argued that a good act is regardless of a good will. According to the scholar, a good act emerges from a good mind, not a good will.

**Key words:** Good Act, Good Will, Catholicism, Confucianism, Aquinas

---