

# **The Responsibility for Free Choice between Good and Evil: Matteo Ricci's Debate with the Chinese Scholar**

Academic Research Professor, Yi, Jongwoo (Dankook University)

- I. Introduction
- II. The Definition Good and Evil in the Debate
- III. The Free Choice between Good and Evil
- IV. Responsibility for the Free Choice between Good and Evil
- V. Conclusion

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21050/CSE.2023.55.10>

## 자유로운 선악 선택에 대한 책임(마테오 리치와 중국선비의 논쟁

이종우(단국대학교 천안캠퍼스 학술연구교수)

마테오 리치는 천주가 인간에게 선악을 자유롭게 선택할 수 있도록 능력을 부여했고 그것은 인간 스스로 책임을 진다고 주장하였다. 그러한 선택은 인간의 의지에 달려 있으며, 토마스 아퀴나스의 영향을 받은 것이다. 그러한 선악에 대한 책임은 천주에 의하여 인간의 영혼은 사후에 천당 또는 지옥에서 영원히 살게 된다. 또한 인간이 현세에서 행한 선악은 사후 영원한 상벌을 받게 된다고 마테오 리치는 주장한다. 왜냐하면 인간의 육체는 잠깐이지만 영혼은 영원하다고 생각했기 때문이다. 천주가 인간에게 내리는 상벌로서 천당과 지옥은 유교를 보완하는 것을 의미한다. 왜냐하면 마테오 리치가 말하는 천주는 유교의 상제와 같다고 주장하였고, 유교는 사후세계로서 천당과 지옥이 없기 때문이다. 이와 달리 중국선비는 인간의 선행은 선의지와 무관하고 단지 인간의 본심에서 나온다고 주장하였다. 그것은 맹자의 영향을 받은 것이고, 마테오 리치와 다른 점이다. 또한 선악에 대한 책임도 현실에서 상벌을 받는 것이라고 여겼다. 그것은 사후에 그 책임을 진다는 마테오 리치의 주장과 다른 점이다.

주제어: 카톨릭, 유교, 토마스 아퀴나스, 천주, 상벌, 선악, 책임

---

## 天 主 實 義 論

Matteo Ricci(利瑪竇, 1552-1610), a Catholic missionary dispatched to Ming 明 China(1368-1644), debated with the Chinese scholar(中士) on whether humans' free choice of good or evil and how to take responsible for their own actions. Ricci argued the Lord of Heaven's having bestowed humans ability to choice between good and evil, so they take responsible for their own actions. This was criticism of the Chinese scholar's view on good and evil. Accordingly, I research Ricci's debate with the Chinese scholar on this topic in *Gl(%)P)?"3)l@l"* (天主實義, The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven), a work written by Matteo Ricci.

To date, no papers on this topic have been published. Yi Jongwoo has researched Matteo Ricci's debate with the Chinese scholar whether a child's theft to support his parents is good or evil.<sup>1)</sup> Also he has researched Ricci's debate with the Chinese scholar whether good act rooted in good will.<sup>2)</sup> Song Youngbae has researched Matteo Ricci and Confucianism. According to Song, Matteo Ricci criticized Neo-Confucianism, seeking harmony with Original Confucianism.<sup>3)</sup> Yang Myeongsu has compared the Lord of heaven in Ricci's Catholicism and principle in

- 
- 1) Yi Jongwoo, "Matteo Ricci's Debate with A Confucian on Whether A Child's Theft to Support His Parents is Good or Evil", 『 『(Journal of Ethics) 131(2020), 259-278
  - 2) Yi Jongwoo, "Is Good Act Rooted in Good will?: Matteo Ricci's Debate with the Chinese Scholar", 『 『(The Korean Association for Christian Ethics) 53(2022,8), 411-433
  - 3) 宋E 培(Song Youngbae), 『利F G 的《天主HI 》( 儒4 的融合和困境)(Matteo Ricci's Tianzhu shiyi and Harmony and Dilema with Confucianism, 『世界宗5 - 究』(Journal of the World Religion), 1999

Neo-Confucianism,<sup>4)</sup> Jeong Hyeonsu has compared Ricci's and Neo-Confucianism's views on good and evil,<sup>5)</sup> and human nature,<sup>6)</sup> and self-cultivation.<sup>7)</sup> Some have compared Matteo Ricci's free will and Jeong Yakyong's 『(?!)"EI.%自主之權,<sup>8)</sup> meaning ability to choose good or evil. The researchers have mainly investigated free will of Matteo Ricci. However, they overlooked that the free will is the basis of the free choice of good or evil and this choice comes with a responsibility. Therefore, I research Ricci's debate with the Chinese scholar on the responsibility for free choice between good and evil.

- 
- 4) (Yang Myungsu), “『 : ”(Christian God in The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven (T'ien-chu Shih-i) and Neo-ConfucianLi (理) in the Light of the Final Cause and the Efficient cause of Aquinas), 『 (Journal of Phiosophical Ideas) 31(2009), 215-248
- 5) (Jung Hyunsoo), “『天主實義』 天主學 性理學 善惡觀 比較研究”(A Comparative Study on the View of Good and Evil Between Catholicism and Neo - Confucianism Shown in 『De Deo Verax Disputatio』), 『 (Journal of Asian Philosophy in Korea) 42(2014), 369-399
- 6) (Jung Hyunsoo), “ : 『 ”(A Study on the Science of Heaven of Matteo Ricci's and Human Nature of Neo-Confucianism: Focusing on Tianzhu shiyi), 『 (The Study of Confucianism) 54(2013), 415-445
- 7) (Jung Hyunsoo), “ ”(A Study on the Science of Heaven of Matteo Ricci's and the self-cultivation of Neo-Confucianism: Centering on 『De Deo Verax Disputatio』), 『 (The Study of Confucianism) 56(2014), 157-190
- 8) (Baek Minjeong), 『 : 『 (The Philosophy of Jeong Yakyong: A New Structure beyond Zhu Xi and Matteo Ricci), Seoul: Ihagsa, 2022, 99-111) ; 『 (The Problem of Moral Emotions and Free Will in Chong Yagyong's theory of Mind), 『 (Korean Silhak Review)14, 2007 ; (Kim Seonhee), 『 : 『 (Matteo Ricci, Zhu Xi and Jeong Yakyong: 『(%)?" 3)』! and The Horizon of East Confucianism), Seoul: Simsna chulpansa, 2012, 526-544

## 利瑪竇的天主實義論

According to Matteo Ricci's argument, human nature is only good but not evil. Because he regarded only good as substance but evil not so.

"I can do both good and evil with my human nature, but one cannot say that human nature was originally evil. Evil is not a thing with substance, but rather a way of referring to a lack of goodness."<sup>9)</sup>

Why has he claimed human nature is only good but not evil? Because the Lord of Heaven governs over the world through the supreme good<sup>10)</sup> and He has created humans,<sup>11)</sup> according to Ricci. Therefore, Ricci believed human nature to be good.<sup>12)</sup> The goodness means the supreme good of the Lord of heaven(天主) and so He is perfect and the goodness so,<sup>13)</sup> Accordingly, if it is even a little imperfect, it is not the

9) 利瑪竇 (Matteo Ricci), 『天主實義』(Tianzhu shiyi) 7.2(上海: 上海土山灣印書館, 1923), 吾以性爲能行善惡, 固不可謂性自本有惡矣。惡非實物, 乃無善之謂。 Translated by Douglas Lancashire and Peter Hu Kuo-chen, *G) \$ G6? \$ Q \$(%/%E" .<" K.64" .<' \$(7\$(% (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, Taipei: The Ricci Institute, 1985), 353*

10) *GI(%P)?" 3)I@I*, 11-12, 吾人欽若上尊...至善以備此。

11) *GI(%P)?" 3)I@I* 1.5, 物有天主生。Such all things, including humans, has been created by the Lord of Heaven.

12) *GI(%P)?" 3)I@I* 7.1, 本性自善。

13) That the Lord of heaven is the supreme good and perfect, was influenced by Thomas Aquinas. (Aquinas, 9?2 2 (" G)\$ . \* .El;( 1.6, in *G) \$ F. 2/\*\$-\$ M. 6C3" .<' G) . 2 (3" Oh?I%(3, translated by John Henry Parker(Amazon Kindle Edition, 2018), 131, 110) When Ricci received priest education in Jesuit, the works of Aquinas were in the curriculum. Therefore, Ricci was influenced by Aquinas. ( (Kim Sangkeun), "*

goodness. The argument of Ricci, the good of human nature, has a common point with the Chinese scholar. According to Ricci's claim, a goodness of human nature has been based on the goodness of the Lord of heaven. Unlike the claim of Ricci, human nature is good regardless of that of the Heaven, according to the Chinese scholar.

Humans should do only good actions due to the goodness of human nature based on the Lord of Heaven, but they also do evil actions. In this regard, Ricci said that the evil actions of humans emerge from an original sin of Adam transmitted to human nature. This was based on Thomas Aquinas.

“Man's first ancestor had already corrupted the roots of man's nature so that later generations of sons and grandsons all suffered residual harm and were unable to receive perfect natures. There were imperfections from the moment of birth.”<sup>14)</sup>

---

”(The Influence the Sixteenth-century Jesuit Curriculum and Jesuit Thomism upon Matteo Ricci's T'ien-chu shih), 『  
(Korean Journal of Christian Studies) 40,1(2005), 297).

9?22("G)\$.\*.El;("was written to use as a university textbook, and is primarily in discussion form,( (Sin Changseok), 『  
Structure of 9?22("G)\$.\*.El;(), 『現代 思想』(Journal of Modern Catholic Ideas) 9(1993), 14-29.) The content of the book is about God, man, and ethics. Aristotle was often quoted and Augustine also quoted in the book.

14) *GI(P)?"3)l@!"8,6, 154, 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.* translated by" Lancashire and Hu Kuo-chen, *G)G6?Q\$(%l%E .<+)K.64".<" '\$(7\$%(St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, in cooperation with The Ricci Institute Taipei, 1985), 447*

That of Ricci was based on Thomas Aquinas. (9?22("G)\$.\*.El;( 2.81, 2555.) This was also written in *Fl:@#<H.4'* of Augustine. According to him, Adam sinned by not worshipping God and enjoying his freedom.(Augustine, *Fl:@#<H.4 13, 3011, in G)F. 2/\*\$-M.6C3".<"9-#O?E?3:1%\$, translated by Philip Schaff, Kindle*

Unlike the argument of Ricci, the Chinese scholar did not think that only good is a thing with substance but evil not so. He regarded the root of good act as good mind.<sup>15)</sup> This is a difference between the Chinese scholar and Ricci.

%% È1+Î --î 1), +Ê+Ɔ++/ Ñ)) Ò&/ÒÓÔ2

According to Matteo Ricci, the Lord of Heaven has bestowed the ability to free choice between good and evil to humans.

“The Lord of Heaven bestowed onto human nature the ability to do both good and evil deeds because he made enriched humans. Because He made humans that can choose or reject goodness, not only did the merit of human goodness increase, but the merit belongs to humans.”<sup>16)</sup>

The choice means action. Therefore, humans have innately free choice of good and evil. The Lord of Heaven could bestow only good to them, nevertheless, why He created the humans to make the free choice of both good or evil? Because He loves for humans, according to Ricci. If He bestowed only good to them, it means which they only perform a command of the Lord of Heaven. Accordingly, human good action is only perform a command of the Heaven, but it is not human

---

Edition, 2019) This means Adam having free will, so this idea of Augustine is different from Aquinas and Ricci.

15) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l*, 7.2, 117, 出善乃善, 出惡乃惡.

16) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l"* 7:2, 118, 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, 尤J 其功爲我功焉. , 351

merit. Thus, human good act means is based on the choice between good and evil, and it means human merit. So the Heaven's having bestowed the choice means His love for humans. The choice is based on free will. That of Ricci was based in *9?22("G)\$\*.El;(*, a work written by Thomas Aquinas.<sup>17)</sup> That of Aquinas has been adapted the conception of the choice in *=l;. 2(; )\$(%" 5+)l;3*, a work written by Aristotle.<sup>18)</sup> The humans had free will because the God had it, according to Aquinas. But humans had the choice because they had reason, according to Aristotle.<sup>19)</sup> He emphasized the responsibility for the choice, while Aquinas the choice more. This is a difference between two. The God had free will due to having an intelligence, so humans had free will based on the intelligence, according to Aquinas.<sup>20)</sup> This has influence to Ricci and he claimed the humans having free choice to the Chinese scholar. The claim of Ricci is the Heaven's having bestowed the choice to the humans, and the human choice based on the choice of Him. This is a difference between two. The choice of Ricci aimed to convert the Chinese scholar to Catholicism. The free choice between good and evil in the mention of Ricci is different from Zhu Xi's Neo-Confucianism as main stream at that time, because Zhu regarded the goodness as not choice but human nature. The humans were naturally endowed with 理(理) meaning a pure good, so the human nature

---

17) Aquinas, *9?22("G)\$\*.El;(* 1.83, 1141

18) Aristotle, *=l;. 2(; )\$(%" 5+)l;3*, translated by W.D. Ross (Amazon Kindle Edition, 2017), 864 ; Baker, "Thomas Aquinas and Chong Yagyong: Rebels Within Tradition", 『 『』(Journal of Tasan Studies) 3(2002).

19) Aristotle, *=l;. 2(; )\$(%" 5+)l;3*" 3.5," 864

20) Aquinas, *9?22("G)\$\*.El;(*" 1.19, 329



is good and evil emerges from individual desire, according to Zhu influenced by Mencius.<sup>21)</sup>

Unlike the argument of Ricci, the Chinese scholar claimed good and evil actions are regardless will, because accordance with principle is good and that to offend against principle is evil. The mention of the Chinese scholar was influenced the Neo-Confucianism of Zhu. This is a difference between the Chinese scholar and Ricci.<sup>22)</sup>

I have heard it said that to act in accordance with principle is good and that this is called virtuous conduct, and that to offend against principle is

---

21) Q\$;1?3"3A1, 541, 孟子, 道性善, 言必稱堯舜. : 性者, 人所K 於天以生之理也. 渾然至善 未嘗有惡. 人與堯舜 初無少異. 但衆人汨於私欲而失之. 堯舜則無私欲之蔽, 而能充其性爾.

All things, including humans, were created by the movement of ;)(氣) based on \*(V)?PI" @?\*\$I" (朱子語類)1.13, 氣則能L 釀凝聚生物也. 但有此氣, 則理便在其中) and the \$I" means +(L)(太極, the Great Ultimate), in a work of Zhu.(V)?PI" @?\*\$I" 5.20, 蓋太極是理) On the +(L) of Zhu, Ricci criticized because that of Zhu should be change to the Lord of Heaven.(G|(%P)?"3)I@I" 2.6, 但聞古先君子敬恭於天地之上帝, 未聞有尊奉太極者, 如太極M上帝一萬物之祖). Likewise, Ricci criticized +(L)(太極 the Great Ultimate) of Zhu Xi because that of Zhu is the root of all things. However, Ricci regarded the root of all things as not +(L) but 3)(%E4I(上帝, the Lord on High). Because he considered the 9)(%E4I as the Lord of Heaven in Catholicism.

22) Cunxin Yangcheng(存心養性) of Mencius and free will of Ricci have been aimed humans' harmonizing with the Heaven, according to Jung Hyunsoo.(『天主實義』 天主學 性理學 善惡觀 比較研究”(A Comparative Study on the View of Good and Evil Between Catholicism and Neo - Confucianism Shown in ‘De Deo Verax Disputatio), 『 』(Journal of Asian Philosophy in Korea) 42(2014), 391 ; Inakaki Rynoske, translated by (Jo Gyusang), 『 (A New Understanding of 9?22("G)\$.\*.EI;( of Thomas Aquinas (Seoul: Catholic Press, 2010), 131) However, that of Mencius has been aimed to keep a pure good in Original Nature. The researchers have overlooked that of Mencius.

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 wills would seem to be no consequence.<sup>23)</sup>

Against the argument of Ricci, the Chinese scholar claimed that goodness emerges from goodness and evil from evil.

“But in my humble country there are those who say that goodness emerges from goodness and evil from evil.”<sup>24)</sup>

The claim of the Chinese scholar implies good action is not always based on good will, and the will of good is not always emerged to good action. Also, he regarded original human mind(本心) as goodness. Therefore, he claimed a good man to preserve goodness in original his mind but an evil destroy the mind.

“Confucian scholars say that a good man is able to preserve the Way(道) in his mind, and that therefore, after he dies, his mind is not dissolved and extinguished. Evil people destroy their own minds with wrong-doing, and, therefore, when their bodies die, their souls are dissolved and extinguished with them.”<sup>25)</sup>

23) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l* 6.3, 聞夫順理者NM善, 而稱之德行, 犯理者NM惡, 而稱之不才. 則願行事如何? 於意似無相屬. Lancashire and Hu have translated *l*(意) into motive (p. 291) However, this means human will, not motive.

24) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l* 7.2, "117, 中士曰...O國之士, 有曰: 出善乃善, 出惡乃惡. Translated by Lancashire and Hu, 353

25) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l* 3.7, 43, 儒有一種言, 善者能以道存聚本心, 是以身死而心不散滅; 惡者以罪敗壞本心, 是以身死而心之散滅隨焉. Translated by Lancashire and Hu, 167

The claim of the Chinese scholar was influenced by Mencius. The claim of him was criticism of Ricci's argument, the free choice between good and evil. The Chinese scholar regarded a good action as based on good mind, not the human choice between good and evil bestowed by the Lord of Heaven. This is different from Ricci. The argument of Ricci, the human free choice, was trying to persuade the Chinese scholar.

According to Ricci, the Lord of Heaven is the supreme good,<sup>26)</sup> so human nature is good.<sup>27)</sup> Due to a sin of Adam, the first man, the human nature has been inherited evil.<sup>28)</sup> Accordingly, human nature is a mixture of good and evil. Thus, when the humans had good will, they can do good.

“Good and evil, virtue and vice all stem from right or corrupt wills. If there are no wills there can be no good or evil or any distinction between superior and inferior men.”<sup>29)</sup>

---

26) *GI(P)?"3)I@I" 1.9, 13-14, 其純善備無滓, 而為衆善之歸宿.*

27) *GI(P)?"3)I@I" 1.4, 7, 吾人生於其間, 秀出等夷, 靈超萬物, K 五常.*

28) *GI(P)?"3)I@I" 8.6, 155, 世人之祖, 已敗人類性根, 則為其子孫者, 沿其遺累, 不得承性之全, 生而帶疵.*

29) *GI(P)?"3)I@I" 6.1, 91, 善惡德慝, 俱由意之正邪, 無意即無善惡. Lancashire and Hu Kuo-chen have translated @I" (意) to motive and this is error. This word should be translated to will. Song Yeongbae also pointed out the error. (p. 223) When humans has good and evil will, they can do good and evil, Ricci repeatedly argued. (*GI(P)?"3)I@I" 6.3, 292, 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.*)*

Unlike the claim of Mencius, in the claim of Xunzi, human will implied because human nature was fundamentally evil but they can do good action by education. (*i ?%PI 23.1*) That is, humans have good will by education and do good action based on good will.

The good will is the root of choice of good and the evil will is the root of choice of evil. The choice means freedom based on free will. Ricci emphasized good will. According to Ricci, when an action of someone was based on good will, though the result of the action is bad, he should be praised. In contrast, when an action of someone was based on evil will, though the result of the action is good, he should be blame. Ricci cited two famous archers as the 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

---

The claim of Ricci which good action based on good will is written in *V)?P)Ih?%P)\$%E* (主制群征), a work of Johann Adamswhall von Bell (P 若望, 1592-1666) Humans do good action to reward by 3)(%E4I(上帝, the Lord on High) According to him, humans do good action to be reward from God, but do not good one if they give it up. This means free will of humans. (Johann Adamswhall von Bell (P 若望), *V)?P)Ih?%P)\$%E* (主制群征) vol. 2 (卷之下), 266, 今世豈可以M報德之所乎? N報德之中, 皆有勉人行善之意. 故所賞報德之福祿, 比斯人M道德所棄者, 應更M重大矣. 蓋人有盼望重大, 則情願棄其輕小. 豈有願棄重大, 而反得輕小者乎? 今設有人M道德致命, 而棄現世最大之福, 當以何等之福還報之? 本世之福, 不足以充人心之欲, 又不副誠德之功, 亦不顯上帝賞酬之力量也. 公相之位, 極重之酬矣, 若以之償德, 萬不償一矣. 天下固無可償德之價者也. 修德者雖不望報, 上帝之尊, 豈有不報之以盈量者乎? 王者酬功臣, Q賞以三公九錫. 上帝之酬, 而止於是乎? 人之短於量也如是. 今奉天主5者, 以現世之禍福, R不足M善惡之報, 則不必問天主現世不賞善罰惡者何故? (<https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=261768>)

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>30)</sup>

According to the claim of Ricci, good and evil actions been judged by the will of the action, not the result of the action. The will of good action is based on choice of good and so emerges to good action. Therefore, the choice is based on free will.<sup>31)</sup>

Ricci translated the reason into *Kl%E;(l* (靈才) and this means to draw a distinction between right and wrong, and true and false.<sup>32)</sup> Therefore, the human reason has been endowed by the Lord of Heaven, when human good will was based on the reason, good action emerges from the good will. Therefore, Ricci thought evil will to be not based on the reason. Accordingly, he argued only the good is substance, the evil is not so.<sup>33)</sup> As the Lord of Heaven also had the reason, humans created by Him have also been endowed with the reason and Ricci regarded it as a difference from animal.<sup>34)</sup>

---

30) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l"* 6.3, 295, 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。則意為善惡之原, 明著矣。 Translated by Lancashire and Hu, 295

31) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l"* 7:2, 118, 從何處可稱成善乎? 天下無無意於M善而可以M善也... 天主賦人此性, 能行二者, 所以厚人類也。其能取捨此善, 非但增為善之功, 尤J 其功為我功焉。

32) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l"* 1.2, 2, 靈才者, 能辯是非, 別真偽。 Song Youngbae has translated *Kl%E;(l* (靈才) into "ability of reason", (Matteo Ricci, *GI(%P)?"3)l@l"* Song Youngbae and Five translators, 『天主實義』, Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 2016, 41)

33) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l"* 7.2, 惡非實物, 乃無善之謂。

34) *GI(%P)?"3)l@l"* 1.2, 2, 凡人之所以異於禽獸, 無大乎靈才也。

## %i È1+É+°È)/°,Ê,23 Í)-3I+Î -++Ï 1), -+Ê+3D++/ Ñ))Ò &/ÒÓÓ2

According to Matteo Ricci, human good is his own merit,<sup>35)</sup> so human evil is his own demerit. This means the human's taking responsibility for his own good and evil. Therefore, it means not taking responsible for good and evil actions not based on the free choice between them. Thus, this implies that cannot be rewarded and punished the good actions and the evil ones not based on free will. Accordingly, the claim of Ricci implies that humans takes responsible for only their actions based on free will. The idea of Ricci was based on Aquinas' 9?2 2 ("G)\$.\*.El;(.<sup>36)</sup> Humans takes responsible for only human action based on free will and this means reward and punishment, according to Aquinas.<sup>37)</sup> Because he regarded only the action based on free will as taking reward and punishment.

The responsibility takes after the human's death, in the mention of Ricci. The Sovereign on High (上帝) sends the good souls of the peoples to Heaven after the peoples' death, and the evil soul of the people

35) *Gl(%P)?" 3)I@l" 7,2, 118, 其能取捨此善 非但增爲善之功, 尤J 其功爲我功焉.*

36) Aquinas, 9?2 2 ("G)\$.\*.El;(" 1.64, 899

37) Aquinas, 9?2 2 ("G)\$.\*.El; ( 1.83, 1141, translated by John Henry Parker, “:(%3I\$6+)(+, Man has free-will” Human free will is based on reason. The relationship between reason and faith is not contradiction but justify each other's roles and values.(Etienne Gilson, +)\$" - )I\*.3./)@".<"9:8" G). 2 (3" Oh?1%(3. Translated by Edward Bullogh, New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1993, 44-52 ; (Lew Jiwhang), 「 : 」(Knowledge and Free

Choice: St. Thomas Aquinas on the Relation of Reason and Will), 「

」(Journal of The Church History Society in Korea) 17(2005), 151)

to Hell. The former means reward for the good actions but the latter punishment the evil ones after the peoples' death. Because the body of human being dies but his soul is eternal.

“Although the body of man dies his soul does not because it is eternal and inextinguishable.”<sup>38)</sup>

“The Sovereign on High is without prejudice in His rewards and punishments; where there is goodness it must be rewarded, and where there is evil it must be punished. In this world evil-doers sometimes enjoy wealth, honor, contentment, and joy; and men who do good sometimes experience poverty, loneliness, suffering, and hardship. 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>39)</sup>

Therefore, humans should do good actions based free will, not forced by another, for going to Heaven. A person's bad action based on free will can cause harm to someone else but his good one on the free will profit to. Therefore, the person should take responsible for his own

---

38) *GI(P)?" 3)l@l"* 3.3, 33, 人身雖死, 而魂非死. 盖永存不滅者焉. Translated by Lancashire and Hu, 147

39) *GI(P)?" 3)l@l"* 6.14, 106, 上帝報應無私, 善者必賞, 惡者必罰. 如今世之人, 亦有為惡而富貴安樂, 為善而貧賤苦難者. 上帝固待人之既死, 然後, 取其善者之魂, 而天堂福之, 審其惡者之魂, 而地獄刑之. Translated by Lancashire and Hu, 325, Ricci regarded Heaven and Hell as supplement to Confucianism, because Sangdi reward or punished over humans, not mentioning Heaven and Hell in 9)?l%E (書經 The History of Documents)(『書經』13.8, 惟上帝不常, 作善降之百祥, 作不善降之百殃.)

action and if he does not take the responsibility for that, this is not freedom but self-indulgence, in Ricci's idea.

By contrast, the Chinese scholar can not believe Heaven and Hell, because he cannot see those. Ricci cannot also see Heaven and hell because those can be seen. Accordingly, he asserted that though humans see with eyes, this can not be felt their existence, but the wise man can know those with reason. Because seeing with eyes can be in error,

The Chinese scholar says: "Sir, have you seen Heaven and Hell that you should assert their reality so firmly?"

The Western scholar says: "Have you, Sir seen that there is no Heaven and Hell that you should so firmly assert their non-existence? Why do you not remember what I said earlier on; that the wise man will have to no need to delay belief in something until he has seen it with his physical eyes. What reason bring to light is even more real than what is seen with the physical eyes. What ears and eyes hear and see is frequently in error, but what reason has determined cannot be in error."<sup>40)</sup>

Therefore, Ricci believed the Sovereign on High's having bestowed humans free choice between good and evil, so humans go to Heaven or Hell with taking responsible for that. Heaven and Hell mean the supplement to Confucianism,<sup>41)</sup> because he regarded 上帝 (上帝) in

40) *GI(P)?3)l@l* 6.13, 105, 中士曰: 先生曾見有天堂地獄, 而決曰: 有? 西士曰: 吾子已見無天堂地獄, 而決曰: 無? 西士曰: 何不記前所云乎? 智者, 不必以肉眼所見之事, 方信其有. 夫耳目之覺, 或常有差, 理之所是, 必無謬也. Translated by Lancashire and Hu, 323.

41) Yi Jongwoo, "Is Good Act Rooted in Good Will?: Matteo Ricci's Debate with the Chinese Scholar", 『』53(2022), 411-433.



Confucian classics as the same the God in Catholicism. However, the Chinese scholar did not agree with the existence of Heaven and Hell, as well as good soul going to Heaven and evil one to Hell after their death. He believed that the people's good and evil action judged by the state's law as follows:

The Chinese scholar says: "If a child steals and robs to support his parents his wills are good, but if he is unable to avoid the sanctions imposed by the law, what then?"<sup>42)</sup>

This implies that the people's good and evil action judged by the state's law, not rewarded and punished by the Lord of Heaven after their death like Ricci's claim. A child's stealing foods to support his parents is based on good will. In response to that, Ricci claimed that the theft of the child is both not good action and not good will. Because goodness is perfect, so the theft is not good but evil.<sup>43)</sup> Good action emerges from good will, so the theft of child is not good will, according to Ricci. Therefore, the theft of the child would be punished by the Sovereign on High after his death. Ricci thought punishment for the people's evil by Him after the people's death and it is far more important than punishment for the people's evil by the law in reality. The Chinese scholar regarded people's choice of evil as taking for responsibility in reality, whereas Ricci regarded it as taking for one after their

---

42) *GI(P)?"3)I@1"* 6.4, 94, 中士曰: 子爲養親行盜, 其意 善矣, 而不免于法, 何如?

43) *GI(P)?"3)I@1"* 6.4, 94, 西士曰: 吾西國有公論曰: "善者成乎全, 惡者成於一" 試言其故: 人R M盜, 雖其餘行悉義, 但呼M惡, 不可稱善.

death.

According to the Chinese scholar, the action of the child should not be punished. But it was punished by the state's law at that time, *D(121%E"\*)* (大明律, The Ming Code), and this is similar to Ricci's claim. Therefore, it implied the Chinese scholar's criticism of the law. That claim of the Chinese scholar means him to be a Confucian scholar. As Confucius emphasized the child's support for his parents in *K?%@"* (論語, The Analects of Confucius), the scholar was influenced by Confucius,<sup>44)</sup> Unlike the idea of Confucius, the action of the child was punished by *D(121%E"\*)* at that time.<sup>45)</sup> Thus, he regarded the law as being unjust. He thought the child's action was based on good will trying to do a filial duty. The child had no choice but to steal because he had no money to support his parents. This also is filial duty, according to the Chinese scholar influenced by Confucius's mention in *K?%@"*:

Ziyou asked about filial piety. The Master said, "Nowadays 'filial' means simply being able to provide one's parents with nourishment. But even dogs and horses are provided with nourishment. If you are not respectful, wherein lies the difference?"<sup>46)</sup>

44) 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), 270.

45) 『大明律』卷第十八「刑律」1〈竊盜〉, (北京: 法律出版社, 1999), 141, 凡竊盜已行而不得財, 笞五十, 免刺. 但得財者, 以一主爲重, 併贓論罪.

46) 『論語』「爲政」( : , 1970), 82, 子游問孝, 子曰: 今之孝者, 是謂能養, 至於犬馬, 皆能有養, 不敬何以別乎? Translated by Edward Slingerland, *F. %?; 1?3" 0%(\*\$; +3* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2003, Kindle Edition), 10.

In the mention of the Chinese scholar, the child's theft to support his parents is not only material filial piety but also moral one. As the action of the child is punished by the law, he did not believe Ricci's claim which their actions are rewarded or punished by the Sovereign on High after their death. Both the Chinese scholar and Ricci regarded humans taking responsible for their good and evil. The responsibility for their actions are ruled by the law in the state, according to Chinese scholar. Unlike him, Ricci regarded that responsibility as temporary, and the eternal responsibility is made by a judge of the Sovereign on High after their death because their souls is eternal but the body temporary.

| i i ) / - 2 P , ) /

In the idea of Matteo Ricci, humans had free choice between good and evil, and the responsibility for their choice takes responsibilities after their death, and it was based on Thomas Aquinas. Good souls live forever in Heaven, in contrast, evil soul in Hell according to judge of the Sovereign on High. This means the responsibility for their actions. Good action emerges from good will based on reason, according to Ricci. Good and evil of humans cannot perfectly be rewarded and punished in this world, so their souls judged by the Sovereign on High after their death, because the human body is temporary but the soul is eternal, according to Ricci.

In the mention of the Chinese scholar, human good action emerges from original human mind and evil action does not emerge from the mind, and it means criticism of Ricci's claim, the free choice of good

or evil. This is a difference between two. The actions of humans are not judged by the Sovereign on High after their death, according to Ricci, but ruled by the law in the state in this life, according to the Chinese scholar. He did not believe the existence of Heaven and Hell. Therefore, the responsibility for humans' actions, good and evil, take in this life, not after their death. This is different from Ricci.

## References

- 김상근(Kim Sangkeun), “마테오 리치의 천주실의에 나타난 16세기 후반 예수회 대학의 교과과정과 예수회 토미즘의 영향”(The Influence the Sixteenth-century Jesuit Curriculum and Jesuit Thomism upon Matteo Ricci's T'ien-chu shih), 『한국기독교신학논총』(Korean Journal of Christian Studies)40.1, (2005), 105-130
- 김선희(Kim Seonhee). 『마테오 리치와 주희, 그리고 정약용: 『천주실의』와 동아시아 유학의 지평』. (Matteo Ricci, Zhu Xi and Jeong Yakyong: *Gl(%)P)? 3)l@l* and The Horizon of East Confucianism). Seoul: 심산출판사(Simsan chulpansa), 2012.
- 『 『(Daiming lu). (Beijing): (Falu chbanshe), 1999.
- Ricci, Matteo. 『 『(Tianzhu shiyi," The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven). : , 1923.
- Ricci, Matteo. *Gl(%)P)? 3)l@l* translated by" Lancashire and Hu, Kuo-chen, *G)S" G6?S" Q\$(%l%E" .<" +)S" K.64" .<" '\$(7S\$%8" St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, in cooperation with The Ricci Institute Taipei, 1985.*
- 『 『. (Lunyu.) Seoul: Daedong munhwa yeonkuwon at Sungkyunkwan University, 1970.
- 『 『. (Mengzi.) Seoul: Daedong munhwa yeonkuwon at Sungkyunkwan University, 1970.
- 백민정(Baek Minjeong). 『정약용의 철학: 주희와 마테오 리치를 넘어 새로운 체계로』. (The Philosophy of Jeong Yakyong: A New Structure beyond Zhu Xi and Matteo Ricci). Seoul: 이학사(Ihagsa), 2022.
- 백민정(Baek Minjeong). “다산 심성론에서 도덕감정과 자유의지에 관한 문제.” (The Problem of Moral Emotions and Free Will in Chong Yagyong's theory of Mind.) 『한국실학연구』(Korean Silhak Review) 14(2007), 401-446.
- 『 『. (Shujing, The Classic of Document.) Seoul: Daedong munhwa yeonkuwon at Sungkyunkwan University, 1984.
- 송영배 외 5인. (Song Youngbae and Five translators.) 『 『. (Tianzhu shiyi.) Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 2016.

- (Song Youngbae). “《 》与 .” (Matteo Ricci’s Tianzhu shiyi and Harmony and Dilema with Confucianism.) 「 『 』 (Journal of the World Religion), 1999, 80-90.
- 신창석(Sin Changseok). “신학대전의 형성과 구조.” (Formation and Structure of 9?22 (“G”).\*.El;(8) 「 『 가톨릭 』 (Journal of Modern Catholic Ideas) 9(1993), 3-40.
- 양명수(Yang Myungsu). “『천주실의』의 천주와 성리학의 리의 차이: 아퀴나스의 목적인과 능동인의 관계를 중심으로.” (Christian God in The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven (T’ien-chu Shih-i) and Neo-ConfucianLi ( ) in the Light of the Final Cause and the Efficient cause of Aquinas.) 「철학사상』 (Journal of Phiosophical Ideas) 31(2009), 215-248.
- 유지황(Lew Jiwhang). “인식과 자유선택: 토마스 아퀴나스의 이성과 의지 관계 이해.” (Knowledge and Free Choice: St. Thomas Aquinas on the Relation of Reason and Will.) 「한국기독교교회사』 (Joumal of The Church History Society in Korea) 17( 2005), 135-165.
- Ryoske, Inakaki, translated by 조규상(Jo Gyusang). 『토마스 아퀴나스 신학대전 새로 알기』. (A New Understanding of 9?22 (“G”).\*.El;( of Thomas Aquinas.) Seoul: Catholic Press, 2010.
- 정현수(Jung Hyunsoo). “마테오 리치의 천학과 성리학의 인성론 연구: 『천주실의』를 중심으로.” (A Study on the Science of Heaven of Matteo Ricci’s and Human Nature of Neo-Confucianism: Focusing on *Gl(%P)?” 3)1|8*) 「유교사상문화연구』 (The Study of Confucianism) 54(2013), 415-445.
- 정현수(Jung Hyunsoo). “『 』 나타난 과 의 .” (A Comparative Study on the View of Good and Evil Between Catholicism and Neo-Confucianism Shown in ‘De Deo Verax Disputatio.’) 「동양철학』 (Journal of Asian Philosophy in Korea) 42(2014), 369-399.
- 정현수(Jung Hyunsoo). “마테오 리치의 천학과 성리학의 수양론 연구.” (A Study on the Science of Heaven of Matteo Ricci’s and the self-cultivation of Neo-Confucianism: Centering on 『De Deo Verax Disputatio』.) 「유교사상문화연구』 (The Study of Confucianism) 56(2014), 157-190.
- (Zhu Xi). 『 』. (Zhuzi yulei.) (Beijing): (Zhonghua shuju), 1999.

- Johann Adamswhall von Bell ( ). *V)?P)lh?%P)%\$E"* ( ).  
<https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=261768>.
- Aristotle. *G)\$ =l; . 2 (; )\$(% 5+)l;38* translated by Ross, W. D.. Amazon Kindle Edition, 2017.
- Augustine. *Fl+@" #<" H. 4*, in *G)\$" F. 2 /\*\$;\$" M. 6C3"* .<" 9-8" *O?E?3+1%\$8* translated by Schaff, Philip. Amazon Kindle Edition, 2019.
- Baker, Don, "Thomas Aquinas and Chong Yagyong: Rebels Within Tradition," 「다산학」 (Journal of Tasan Studies) 3(2002), 32-69.
- Gilson, Etienne. *+)\$" - )\$. 3. /)@" .<" 9-8" G). 2 (3" Oh?l%(3*. Translated by Bullogh, Edward. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1993.
- K?%@( )* ." translated by Slingerland, Edward. *F. %<?;1?3" O%(\*\$;+3*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, Amazon Kindle Edition, 2003.
- Ricci, Matteo. *F)l%(" l%" G)\$" 9l>+,\$\$%+)" F\$%+?6@k" G)\$" J. ?6%(\*3" .<" Q(++\$ I" Rl; ;lk" kmolyknkj8* trans. Gallagher, Louse J.. New York: Randomhouse, 1953.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *9?2 2 (" G)\$ . \*.El; (8" in G)\$" F. 2 /\*\$;\$" M. 6C3"* .<" G). 2 (3" *Oh?l%(38* translated by Parker, John Henry. Amazon Kindle Edition, 2018.
- Yi, Jongwoo, "Matteo Ricci's Debate with A Confucian on Whether A Child's Theft to Support His Parents is Good or Evil," 「윤리연구」 (Journal of Ethics) 131(2020), 259-278.
- Yi, Jongwoo. "Is Good Act Rooted in Good Will?: Matteo Ricci's Debate with the Chinese Scholar." 「기독교사회윤리」 (The Korean Association for Christian Ethics) 53(2022), 411-433.

논문투고일: 2023년 03월 15일

심사개시일: 2023년 03월 16일

게재확정일: 2023년 03월 29일

## The Responsibility for Free Choice between Good and Evil: Matteo Ricci's Debate with the Chinese Scholar

Academic Research Professor, Yi, Jongwoo(Dankook University)

Matteo Ricci claimed the Lord of Heaven's having bestowed humans a free choice between good and evil, and the responsibility for the free choice means the Lord of Heaven's reward and punishment: sending good souls to heaven or evil souls to hell. The choice means based on human free will and it was influenced by Thomas Aquinas. Ricci claimed that good souls will live in Heaven after their death, whereas evil souls will live in Hell forever after their death. Ricci regarded it as supplement to Confucianism. Because Ricci considered the Lord of Heaven in Catholicism and S)(%E4I in Confucian classic books as the same. However, this was not mentioned heaven and hell in Confucian classics. Unlike the claim of Ricci, the Chinese scholar believed that good and evil actions are regardless of human will, and good emerges from original human mind. Thus, humans should have good mind. He argued that humans have also taken the responsibility for their good and evil actions in this life, not taking responsibility after their death. This is different from the claim of Ricci.

**Key words:** Catholicism, Confucianism, Thomas Aquinas, the Lord of Heaven, reward and punishment, good and evil

---