Itinerario, Vol. 40, No. 2, 215–237. © 2016 Research Institute for History, Leiden University
doi:10.1017/S0165115316000322

The Spiritual Empire of the Society of Jesus

TOBIAS WINNERLING*

E-mail: winnerling@phil.uni-duesseldorf.de

The aim of this article is to throw the worldwide mission efforts of the old Society of Jesus—the order from its implementation in 1540 to its dissolution in 1773—into sharper relief by applying a new analytical frame to it. The approach taken will be to view the Society as trying to establish a form of dominion over its extra-European converts that may be described as spiritual empire-building.[1] To this purpose it will first sketch the theoretical framework of a spiritual empire, and then evaluate whether the old Society of Jesus may be taken to fit it either on an organizational level or in its treatment of its converts.

Keywords: Catholic Mission, Society of Jesus, Imperialism.

The three phases of empire

In the following, I want to move away from a concept of imperial power structures, of empire, that focuses mainly on territoriality and regards other aspects merely as implications of territoriality. I further propose to conceive of "empire" as the consequence of practices that are meant to create and sustain the idea of "empire."[2] I see "empire" as a complex equilibrium of processes to be held in balance by their successful manipulation.[3] This is hardly a new approach, as Hannah Arendt already argued for it in the 1950s.[4] David Ludden recently supposed that "empire is best conceived not as a kind of structure with prime exemplars at all, but rather as a process of adaptive transformation in which people create, assemble, configure, reassemble, renovate and remodel imperial forms of power and authority under diverse, changing circumstances," so that "[i]mperial forms of power and authority thus entail systematic patterns of inequality; exhibit a wide range of variation, in many settings, including kingdoms, families, firms, nations and globalisation; and appear in all domains of analysis, including culture, psychology, economics and politics."[5] In the end, the coalescence of processes of domination into stable structures for the repetition of such processes shapes imperial structures in a distinct way, as observed by Egon Flaig: Empires are constituted of a metropolis that dominates and a periphery that is dominated, the whole composed of parts of unequal rights.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Provinces have lesser rights towards the metropolis than the metropolis has towards its provinces, and it is impossible for the province to gain access to full metropolitan rights.[6] Timothy H. Parsons has provided a very clear-cut set of definitions for "empire" along the same lines:

> Direct imperial rule, by definition, produces subjects. In common western usage, a subject is a person under the domination of a sovereign, but in the imperial context a subject refers to an outsider open to exploitation. . . . Conversely, a citizen . . . was a person possessing the rights and privileges of full membership in a city or state. Citizens were autonomous individuals, free people, and, ultimately, fully realized human beings. Imperial subjects, by comparison, lived on the periphery in territories, both geographically and ideologically removed from the "civilized" metropole. They were, by definition, primitive and exploitable. In most cases, the prospect of assimilation into the supposedly superior metropolitan society was a chimera. To be profitable and sustainable, empires by their very nature had to codify and enshrine inequality.[7]

Analogous views are shared by Abernethy,[8] Bang and Bayly,[9] Fisch,[10] Ludden,[11] and Mattingly,[12] in dealing with different empires across a timescale reaching from ancient Rome to twentieth-century Britain. I side with this definition yet want to emphasize two points: first, the key feature is to establish control;[13] second, control may come not only in political form, as held by Abernethy and Parsons.[14]

Thus, imperial-ness is the quest for dominion of a large sphere of action, populated by subjects, by a clearly defined group of persons (citizens) coming from a small core of this sphere, which renders itself and its techniques of control inaccessible to anyone from the dominated body of persons within the periphery of it.[15] This in turn necessitates a constant othering of subjects by citizens to be able to uphold the differentiation between both groups.[16]

If the focus shifts along this line, away from territory (and the political/military force needed to control it) to other spheres that then constitute fields of imperial activities,[17] three such spheres may easily be identified: territory, the economy, and the spiritual. Abernethy identifies them as the "Public," "Private Profit," and "Religious"[18] sectors, the problem being that in this formulation, as the special field of the political government the public sector functions both as the all-encompassing whole of the imperial enterprise and as one of its parts. I propose instead to view each sphere as a field of human action regulated by its peculiar needs, rules, and goals, with successful action establishing what I would like to call a distinct *phase* of empire (by analogy to three-phase electric power). This implies that in each sphere, the power that is necessary to establish control will likely be different in kind. To restrict "power" to what force of arms provides means, according to Norbert Elias, to use the word wrongly anyway, as if it denoted something substantial; "we say that a person possesses great power, as if power were a thing he carried about in his pocket."[19] Power that is accompanied by other than physical force is power nevertheless, and so the power needed to control the territorial sphere can be different from the one needed to control economic or spiritual spheres. Even the power exerted by force of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

arms can in the end be seen as something of a mental phenomenon.[20] What happens when the psychologically constructed acceptance of the ruler–ruled dichotomy fails to hold is commonly known as rebellion or revolution, and if its acceptance cannot be reinstalled by the force or forces the ruler(s) can command, the power structure thus questioned is history.

It is important to note that the three spheres and their resulting phases are of course connected, interwoven, and interdependent, yet not congruent. The achievement of dominion, the building of empire in one of them, facilitates similar efforts in the others, but does neither prescribe them nor guarantee their success. Spillovers are likely, but not inevitable. An entity constituting a full-blown empire will expand in each of these spheres, yet one sphere will likely constitute the main focus of its activities. Empires that coexist in the same space-time area by concentrating on differing spheres may thus be seen as phase-delayed, and therefore non-conflictingly possible. Possible because as power is not the same for each phase of empire, the dominion created by the exercise of power is also not the same for each phase. An economic empire strives to dominate markets and cash flows; a territorial empire aims at territorial and political control; and a spiritual empire is built on the control of believes and societal norms. If we concur—as I do—with Parsons that "[e]mpires are, by definition, a form of permanent authoritarian rule that consigns a defeated community to perpetual subjecthood, most often for the purposes of exploitation and extraction,"[21] this translates into different gains from exploitation and extraction for each phase of empire. Financial power is not the same as political might, which in turn is not the same as spiritual authority.

Although I presuppose that this model will be helpful for analysing imperial structures of all periods, as a historian of early modernity I am very relieved that it helps to disentangle some specific early modern problems frequently encountered in dealing with empire and colonialism. First of all, it does not give priority to politics, and thus allows for semistate, nongovernmental, and maybe even private actors to be taken into account as autonomous agents of empire, and not merely as subcontractors of the political ruler. Second, it allows for a satisfying interpretation of the early modern dispute about the nature of papal power. The question of whether the supreme spiritual power with which the papacy claimed to be invested also provided it with political power was still hotly debated in the sixteenth century,[22] and this called into question the very legitimacy of any European overseas conquest. The influential School of Salamanca tried to resolve this by ascribing to the pope power within the spiritual sphere as distinct, but not completely separate from, the political.[23] Interpretations that focus on political-military power alone, while relegating this spiritual power to the background and deeming it to be only symbolic or metaphorical, cannot do justice to the circumstances of the time. It is important to keep in mind that my approach presupposes to "deploy the terms empire, imperial and imperialism as analytical terms denoting a kind of power dynamic operating in ranks of systematically patterned inequality, rather than as terms to represent regime ideology or official order."[24]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Three Phase Model and the Jesuits

I will now try to substantiate the possibilities of such an approach by viewing more closely the Asian missions of the Society of Jesus, especially in its expansion outside Europe during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. The old *Societas Jesu* may be viewed as analogous to the colonial and commercial empires of early modernity, yet firmly situated within the spiritual phase. It was organisationally divided in provinces and vice-provinces found all around the globe, the whole structure—in theory—firmly centred on Rome, residence of the order's general: an empire *en miniature*, comparable to those of the contemporary territorial states, and subject to the same problems.

Early modern empires came with ideologies.[25] This is true also for the Jesuit Empire; Put simply, it exported God rather than goods. The economic activities of the East India Company (EIC) and the Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC) and the territorial holdings in the Indo-Pacific area they acquired in the same period may be seen as economically-oriented empires phase-delayed to primarily territorial colonial empires such as the Spanish viceroyalties in the Americas.[26] The *Estado da Índia*, the colonial territories of the Portuguese crown east of the Cape of Good Hope, constituted something in between these extremes.[27] The spiritual activities of the Society of Jesus, their territorial holdings such as the city of Nagasaki,[28] and the concurrently evolving economic patterns centred on these constitute such a phase-delayed empire, too.[29] "For. . . one reason European merchants, manufacturers, and religious leaders enjoyed substantial autonomy from their governments was that the territorial unit with which their activities were identified was not coextensive with the state but rather smaller or larger than it,"[30] so that spatial coexistence of imperial structures of different phases theoretically presents no more problems than their chronological coexistence. This does not mean that such coexistence did not give rise to practical problems, some of which will show up in the later sections.

Contemporary colonial as well as indigenous institutions on the spot indeed sometimes saw the Jesuit order as an independent, discrete colonial agent,[31] and some of its actions seemed to contradict its spiritual character. The acquisition of Nagasaki in 1569–70 made the order responsible for administering not only the city as such but also criminal law and penal justice within its boundaries, for which—because *ecclesia abhorret a sanguine* (the Church abhors bloodshed)—a papal dispensation would have been necessary, though one was never formally given.[32] Pope Paul IV (1476–1559, Pont. 1554–59) conceived the Society as Spain's fifth column,[33] while Philip II (1527–98) suspected it of being an agent of the papacy.[34] These conflicting impressions indicate that the order had managed to build up a position of its own which could be constrained neither to work exclusively for the political governments with which it interacted, nor to only serving papal ambitions.[35] The Spanish diplomat and counsellor of Philip IV (1605–65), Diego de Saavedra Fajardo (1584–1648), indeed set them aside as a model for monarchs of organizational control and power through knowledge.[36]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Outside Europe this was acknowledged, too. One of the main reasons that the Japanese shogun Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536–1598) prohibited Christianity in 1587 was because he feared the Pope and the Portuguese Crown would wield too much influence over the Jesuit's Japanese converts.[37] The same problem surfaced in the China mission: the Society's self-proclaimed obedience to the Pope, whom they dubbed the "Emperor of the Lore" (*jiaohuang*), was not very conducive to the missionaries' favour in the eyes of the Chinese emperor, who could have felt his prerogatives challenged.[38] Such clashes with the political authorities of extra-European territories were peculiar neither to the order's Eastern missions nor to the sixteenth century. In 1760, the Society was expelled from the then-French colony of Saint-Domingue, present-day Haiti, having been accused of encouraging slaves to hold their own mass, thus making the planters fear a secret influence over their workforce.[39]

This is shifting terrain: it would be all too easy to fall for anti-Jesuit stereotypes that enhanced the dissolution of the old Jesuit order in 1774; in 1762 the Parlement de Paris "had declared the Society of Jesus to be "inadmissible by its nature in every organized state . . . as contrary to natural right, damaging to . . . all spiritual and temporal authority, and tending to introduce into the Church and into States, under the specious veil of a religious institute . . . a political body, whose essence consists in a continuous activity aiming by all sorts of routes, direct or indirect, concealed or public, first at an absolute independence, and successively at the usurpation of all authority."[40] The fallacies of this approach are twofold: it supposes that the order was primarily an instrument of domination and that its beliefs were (at least partly) hypocritical. Moreover, it suggests that the Society was a monolithic block that could be administered as centrally and as smoothly as it liked to present itself. Both suppositions are untenable. The orders' provinces more often than not did not simply obey the superior general in Rome,[41] not just because of the difficulties of long-distance communication.[42] But this only serves to underline the similarities with other early modern empires for which the same structural phenomena are well known and never used as arguments to deny their imperial nature.

For the Society of Jesus this holds as well. Thus, we need to focus on its individual actors. To take Jesuit missionaries seriously we must begin by ascribing to them genuine faith, including a belief in their vocation and its efficacy to achieve its goals (the conquest of the entire world for Christ to the benefit and salvation of its people).[43] Furthermore, we need to acknowledge individual agency in evading or opposing orders. Jonathan Wright has captured this very well: "The cause, of course, was conversion, but it did not take long for missionaries to realize that first and foremost, soutanes and Bibles notwithstanding, they were early-modern Europeans in unusual places, where it was far from clear whether the beliefs, assumptions, and accomplishments of early-modern Europe would be derided, admired, misconstrued, or simply ignored."[44]

This does not mean, however, that their individual beliefs and actions may not be classified structurally to analytically derive certain prominent features of the different

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

missionary enterprises of the old Jesuit order. With a primarily praxeological approach, my analysis focuses on the forms and effects of their actions rather than on their intentions—bearing in mind that their beliefs are known to us only in the results of actions taken because of them. This also allows us to compare the perspectives of individual actors in the different phases of empire to see if they really are compatible. Such an approach prompts a number of questions related to the broader question of spiritual empire. Were the actions taken by Jesuits consciously embedded in a vision of colonial spiritual conquest? Did they view the people they encountered as potential subjects rather than as soon-to-be brothers in Christ? And even if both questions can be answered in the affirmative, could that be translated into changes in the societies in which the missionaries operated, and into which changes? To make matters worse, all these questions simultaneously apply of course not only to the Jesuits as proponents of mission but also to the converts and the bystanders alike, as they all formed the social field in which mission as a distinct historical process happened. Critics of concepts such as "cultural imperialism" have rightly pointed out that these questions are not only notoriously difficult to answer; in many cases they are unanswerable.[45] For the old Jesuit order this presents us with further difficulties as we have large amounts of documents but still know very little about most of the individual actors—they are "known only through a few published letters,"[46] and even less is known about their individual converts.[47] If we do have documents, they are almost exclusively of European origin.[48] For a start, therefore, I am going to examine more closely one question crucial in this context: Was the *miles Christi* really in a phase-delayed analogous position as the *conquistador*?

As both were challenged with expanding or maintaining the structure they were serving, it may be asked if they both ran similar risks. Both faced the danger of death. As both had to travel by sea to reach their destinations, both were liable to illness, malnutrition, and shipwreck in much the same way, quite literally on board of the same ships. This shared experience may well have provided points of contact both could use in cooperation at a later date.[49] Soldiers were in danger of getting wounded or killed in combat, missionaries of being killed or executed by alien communities or politicians. Soldiers took these risks for the honour and glory of their ruler (and their pay, of course), missionaries *ad maiorem gloriam dei* (and for the salvation of their own souls, of course). This analogy fits in well with the self-image of at least some Jesuits. In 1552, Henrique Henriquez, S.J. (1520–1602) wrote from the Malabar Coast of India to the general of the order, Loyola, that "as the *capitãos* search for better fighters for the wars we do now search for better Christians (as I wrote to you last year already) for this war and combat we carry in our hands"[50] when he spoke about organizing indigenous converts to relieve the shortcomings in missionary personnel; Melchior Gonçalvez, S.J. (n.d.) spoke thus of Francisco de Javier, S.J. (St. Francis Javier, 1506–1552) in an often quoted passage: "Truly you may call him a soldier of Christ, and what I tell is nothing really."[51] To dismiss this wholesale as just martial rhetoric, and nothing more, I think misses the point: though this is surely an important aspect, the frequency and context of such statements makes it

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

clear that the analogy was taken as a real one. Just as Portuguese military commanders recruited soldiers, missionaries recruited converts, for different phases of the same enterprise: war against the infidels. Moreover, in many cases the analogy was a real one, as many of those who joined the order, especially those who joined outside Europe, had formerly been soldiers or officers.[52]

Martyrdom might not be structurally equivalent to dying for king and country, but constitute a special category. Dying for the faith showed true devotion and could be turned into spiritual capital; falling in combat could not be turned into political capital in the same way. But the Society of Jesus was not especially keen on martyrdom, valuable though it could be when communicated. Missionaries (like soldiers) transported to non-European parts of the world were, apart from anything else,very costly and scarce resources, not to be squandered. When Antonio Criminali, S.J. (*1520) died on a beach in South India in 1549, the first full member of the order to be killed in the Asian missions, the verdict of Juan de Polanco, S.J. (1516–77) in his guidelines for the missions was clear: "censendum sit de modo illo quo pater Criminalis se morti exposuit"—the way in which Criminali exposed himself to death was not be repeated.[53] As Jacques d'Amiens, S.J. (1599–1659) recounted in his history of the order's first century, a mere eighteen people died outside Europe in missionary action, and their deaths were commemorated not overly enthusiastically.[54] None were specially credited with the martyr's crown, and only six—three in the Americas, three in Asia—were accounted for as *beati* (blessed).[55] It also has to be noted that many of these, as for example the three crucified in the famous Nagasaki massacre of 1596, when 26 Christians were executed, were lay brothers of the order, not full members.[56] In addition to that, Cohen's 1974 study has already demonstrated that desire for martyrdom was not among the prime motivations among Jesuit novices for joining the order in the 1560s, when the Society itself carried out an extensive survey of its members.[57] A safe haven from the turmoil of the world, both materially and spiritually, was much more what they wanted. This related favourably with the intention of the order's administration, which had clear-cut ideas about what its missionaries were to do outside Europe. They were to do productive work in the vineyard of the Lord, not just die in His name. Thus, even if martyrdom constitutes a category peculiar to the spiritual phase, it was not a phenomenon structurally called for but a rare occurrence on the fringes of everyday actions. In this it might relate to the valiant but strategically useless battle deaths of colonial military leaders, which could also be put to good use in internal and external communications but which were, if possible, to be avoided as unnecessarily costly.

The Jesuit Mission(s) as Spiritual Empire

Whatever contemporaries thought the Jesuit's power structure to be, it was markedly different to the colonial and imperial ventures of political or economic agents in that its focus was not on territorial expansion. If the Societas Jesu sought dominion, it was not over land or goods but over people. Its primary aim was not to physically conquer

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a territory, but to psychically conquer its inhabitants in what was aptly termed a *conquista espiritual*—"a la fe por la razon"[58]—[conquer] by reason for the faith—and thus to install itself as the norm-defining authority on any practices marked as morally-spiritually relevant.[59] In short, to install itself as the spiritual ruler on behalf of the new numen, the Christian God, and to be duly obeyed by their new subjects. Such an approach to dominion can be described as hegemonic rather than territorial in recourse to a distinction made by Ross Hassig in his work on the Aztec empire.

> While both territorial . . . and hegemonic systems use force and power to dominate and control, the territorial system emphasizes the former, whereas the hegemonic system emphasizes the latter, with markedly different consequences for control, extraction, integration, and expansion. The object of a territorial empire is to conquer and directly control an area. . . . The object of a hegemonic empire is to conquer and indirectly control an area.[60]

The key point is that this control, the acceptance of the new order by the conquered or converted, rests on "power" rather than (brute) force, on the "perception of the [power] possessor's ability to achieve its ends," rendering on-going direct control of the conquests unnecessary once hostilities are over.[61] In such a structure, the new subjects police themselves because they fear the consequences of other behaviour, and only when this fear no longer outweighs the presumed gains of oppositional actions do such structures turn unstable.[62] These mechanisms allow to compensate a lack of manpower that prohibits direct control of the subjects:

> Another driver of warfare against and repression of indigenous peoples at the margins of empires is that the representatives of the colonial power are often few in number and, though supported by the perception of imperial power, they are often more acutely aware of their own weakness than are their potential enemies. "Colonial weakness" can thus be an important catalyst in the segregation and reinforcement of difference between ruler and ruled in imperial settings. This fear factor also perhaps contributed in important ways to unpalatable behaviors by those in authority in colonial territories.[63]

Consciously or—more likely—unconsciously, the Jesuit practice of itinerant missionary work contributed, where successful, in its effects to the build-up of a hegemonic empire within the spiritual phase, most of all in areas outside the direct control of other colonial powers. The concept of itinerant mission work had originated in the initial wish to abandon all potentially corrupting material belongings, including permanent residences, which drove the order's founder Iñigo de Loyola (St. Ignatius, 1491–1556). It specified that members of the order should not attach themselves to whichever place they were in, as they could—in theory—be ordered at any time to any other place their superiors deemed fit.[64] Practically, this meant that individual Jesuits often did quite a lot of traveling, being relocated every couple of years to other towns, provinces, lands, or even continents. In South and East Asia especially, that meant covering a lot of ground and being thrown into entirely new social, political, and religious environments each time. That most of them hardly ever learned the indigenous languages, beyond being able to conduct the most basic of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conversations,[65] comes as no surprise. And as already said, European missionaries overseas were a costly good in short supply. The situation in most areas of Jesuit missionary work was similar to that in Thána on the north-western coast of India in 1568, where one member of the order was responsible for the pastoral care of 2,500 new Christians, as Pero Vaz, S.J. (†1539/40) reported. This figure almost exactly matches the ratio reported for the seventeenth century Guaraní mission in the Jesuit reductions of Paraguay.[66] And tellingly, Vaz had to note clearly that the task was facilitated as the brother in question was indeed capable of expressing himself in the native language.[67] In some areas, like the Moluccas and Japan, the ratio was even worse. So, as the concrete geospatial frame in which individual Jesuits operated was also a territorial one—an ambiguity already inherent in the term "mission," which meant both the process of evangelization and the territory it was to take place in[68]—they first had to cooperate with the local territorial authorities, both European and indigenous.[69] And, if they wanted to achieve a position of control within the spiritual phase, they had to clear their operational area of spiritual competitors, which included not only non-Christian religious authorities but other Christian orders as well. In the Portuguese-controlled territories of the *Estado da Índia,* this was carried out in cooperation with the colonial authorities, which had assigned each order within their territory a special zone of authority;[70] an analogous process took place in regions controlled by the Spanish crown.[71]

On a larger scale and for regions outside European rule, the missionary orders sought to obtain these demarcations by papal intervention. Japan provides a good example. Situated in the Portuguese hemisphere as demarcated by the treaties of Tordesillas and Zaragoza, the Portuguese crown claimed that it fell under the Portuguese *padroado*, so that after 1549 it effectively became Jesuit-only mission territory. With the Spanish seizure of the Philippines, a new route to Japan opened up, and the Franciscans operating in the Philippines lobbied the papacy to grant their order the right to found missions in India and China in 1576.[72] Yet the Japanese case highlights the complicated relations between the Society of Jesus and political empires because Japan was, by virtue of its being within the *padroado*, organizationally bound to Portuguese ships sailing the *carreira da Índia*, and therefore to the order's Portuguese province. In 1586 the Jesuit general Claudio Aquaviva (1543–1615, Gen. 1580–1615) officially forbade the Jesuits of the Mexican Province to sail via the Philippines to reach Japan, China, or even Macao,[73] so as not to infringe on the Portuguese privileges to control entry into the *padroado* missions. Gregory XIII (1502–85, Pont. 1572–85) granted the Jesuits a new general missionary privilege for Japan in 1585,[74] until the Franciscans forced their way back again in after Clement VIII (1538–1605, Pont. 1592–1605) declared missionary work in Japan free for any order, provided the missionaries travelled via Portuguese India.[75] As military chaplains to Portuguese forces in the 1580s, the Jesuits in turn had made their way into Sri Lanka, for which the Franciscans held the exclusive papal general missionary privilege.[76] Analogous demarcations were made for other regions in the same way. In California, in the seventeenth century, the Dominicans were in charge of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Alta California, the Jesuits of Baja California.[77] When in 1580 the Jesuits abandoned their mission to Hormuz in the Persian Gulf as unfruitful, they passed their station on to the Augustinians.[78] In the same year, Alessandro Valignano, S.J. (1539–1606), successfully opposed sending a secular bishop to Japan as the nature of the country and the political circumstances would not allow for that.[79] As a result, the first Catholic bishop sent to Japan was Luís de Cerqueira, S.J. (1552–1614), in 1598. This helped to further strengthen the Jesuit spiritual monopoly over the Japanese Christians in a strategic way, as those who had the power to draw such demarcations commanded a powerful tool of control, as in seventeenth century Paraguay, where the bishop of Asunción could threaten the Society of Jesus with expulsion from his diocese and the distribution of their territories among other clerics in 1641.[80]

Jesuits and Converts: Spiritual Subjection?

That the Societas Jesu was able to demarcate fields of spiritual activity for itself in cooperation with local or colonial political powers alone did not in itself make it an empire. It provided merely the necessary foundation to achieve it. To do so, they would first have to conquer the local non-Christians spiritually by converting them. Then they would have to establish an exclusive form of spiritual dominion, relegating the converts to a subaltern status through permanent control. Crucial to this process was the equation of Christianity with Latin European Catholic Christendom. In order to believe like European Christians, the converts had to behave like European Christians and to comply with the norms and regulations the missionaries viewed as truly Christian.[81] This also produced more compliant subjects in the political sphere.[82] Where conversions could be or were already made, the converts therefore were made to internalise certain practices in the spiritual-moral sphere of action—smashing their idols, abandoning polygamy, wearing European-style Christian names and clothing, crossing themselves, and, surprisingly important, castigating themselves.[83] By following these practices, they accepted the normative authority of the Society and the disciplinary powers of its members. In most cases there were no attempts to change anything else in the local social structures or practices—given the low numbers of Jesuits actually there, they could not have forced such changes anyway. Crucial to such a strategy was to identify precisely which customs were of an arbitrary social nature that did not conflict with a Christian way of life, and which were not.[84] As long as converts accepted Jesus Christ as their saviour and the Society of Jesus as acting in His name and solely responsible for interpreting His commands (and thus entitled to the same reverence), no other changes were necessary. Where the Societas Jesu relied on the political power structures of the colonial states to build and uphold their own structures, they returned the favour by simultaneously educating their neophytes to be both good Christians and loyal subjects of the king. This was true for the *Estado da Índia* as well as, for instance, the northern frontier regions of Mexico.[85] In seventeenth-century Paraguay and northwestern Mexico such a spiritual conquest helped pave the way for military conquest. People missioned and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

baptized by the Society yet not colonialized by a territorial empire where brought under Spanish and Portuguese control afterwards[86]—though the order rejected that as an infringement on its sphere of action. In the Huron Missions of North America, French Jesuits employed the same approach from 1625 onwards, though with less success.[87]

The main problem of this approach was that it necessarily curbed the ambitions of the order's indigenous affiliates as it denied them equality. Individuals not content with the limited possibilities the order offered them could take advantage of the Jesuit cooperation strategies with colonial authorities by turning the argument against them:

> And moreover, so that the Bateren and Iruman residing in Japan might continue to receive their financial support from the Emperor of South Barbary, we Japanese could not possibly see our true desire satisfied. "Henceforth, do not let Japanese become Bateren!"—we all felt terribly nonplussed by this principle of operation. But you can guess what kind of a feeling it is to know one's real purpose can never be attained. And the reason is that the Southern Barbarians feel that in their design against Japan they will find the natives partial, after all, to the interests of their Native Land. You can be sure of that![88]

The question posed in 1620 as a complaint by the renegade Japanese Jesuit Fabian Fucan (1565–1621) is a complex matter. To what degree did the Jesuits regard their converted Non-European neophytes as spiritual brethren and equal before the Lord? To conceive of mission as spiritual conquest does not necessarily imply that the vanquished are in any way less than the victors. The theoretical framework proposed by the Three Phase Model does not necessarily comply with norm-defining spiritual authority. The acceptance of European practices where deemed religiously necessary should have been sufficient to allow for full access to the order's spiritual domain. To make a long story short, generally speaking this was not what the Jesuits of the old order seem to have thought. They opted to deny their indigenous converts access to full and equal membership in the order, and thus, at least in areas where the Jesuits held a mission monopoly, permanently rendered them Christians of lesser status. In doing so, they reproduced a common pattern of European political expansion[89] within the spiritual phase, in keeping with the contemporary scholastic theology of at least a part of the School of Salamanca.[90] The inhabitants of the metropole—the Jesuits of European descent—commanded within the community of believers and the order a position to which the inhabitants of the periphery, the indigenous converts of Asia, the Americas and Africa, could not ascend. This may be taken as the prime indicator that in the spiritual phase the Jesuit enterprise can be characterized as an imperial project in which spiritual conquest is followed by spiritual colonization. The Societas Jesu not only tried to install itself as the normative spiritual authority among its converts, it also tried—successfully—to deny them full participation in the wielding of this authority.

One reason for this, and I think the most basic one, was the relationship established in Jesuit philosophical and theological thinking between reason and faith, and the implications inherent in this. In his *Summa Theologiae* Aquinas had established an

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

analogy between knowledge gained by rational operation about the physical world and belief gained by rational operation about the spiritual realm.[91] This rationalisation of belief-gaining made "reason," understood as a distinct faculty, an enormously important part of the human soul, as could be justified in recourse to Aquinas and Aristotle alike. A good example is the work of Benito Pereira, S.J. (Benedictus Pererius, 1535–1610), who wrote in 1568 that

> in *De Generatione Animalium*, chapter three, [Aristotle] says that intellectual activity is not connected to any physical activity; [so] either Man is intelligent through another of his parts, and [then] surely through matter, but this does not hold [because] matter is neither the recipient nor the productive principle [i.e. cause] of an immaterial activity, of which [immaterial] nature the intellectual activity is; or Man understands through his form, yet he understands through his intellectual soul, because this [soul] produces and receives understanding directly; therefore the intellectual soul is the true and natural form of Man.[92]

In Thomist philosophical terms, this meant that the intellectual soul, *anima intellectiva*, the seat of the faculty of reason, was what made a human being an individual man or woman, as it interacted with the shapeless matter to form the concrete being in question. Now this could also be taken the other way round: Differences in bodily appearance could be seen as indicators of a different intellectual soul that expressed itself through this peculiar shape; and these differences in appearance could be related to the question of whether such individuals could get to know God and gain the faith necessary for salvation. As Henrique Henriquez, S.J. (1536–1608),[93] put it, this was the reason why Pygmies were not human though they looked like humans, for "if they had the use of reason, they would surely have the image of God imprinted therein."[94] Concerns about such a theological reading of perceived ethnicity had in 1537 already prompted Paul III (1468–1549, Pont. 1534–49) to state in *Sublimis Deus* that the indigenous people of the Americas where indeed capable of understanding the Christian message.[95] However, it did not explicitly state whether that ability was on a par with that of European Christians.

This theology facilitated a de facto colour bar in the non-European provinces of the Society, East and West alike, from the earliest period onward. In Brazil, the first provincial council of 1568 excluded mestizos and *Indios* from membership in the order,[96] as they were in the Peruvian province;[97] earlier experiments with the admission of members of indigenous or mixed descent were regarded as failures because of deviations from spiritual control.[98] In India, only one native Indian was admitted to priesthood in the Society of Jesus during the sixteenth century, the South Indian baptized as Pedro Luís, S.J. (1532/3–1596), and that was possible only because of a direct order by the general in Rome, whom he had petitioned.[99] Although Valignano had singled out Japan in 1577 in that its natives were, prospectively, to be admitted into the Society,[100] in 1595 Francesco Pasio, S.J. (1551/4–1612), still opted for a strictly segregated Asian clergy, with the European members of the order forming an elite leadership and the indigenous ones doing the daily chores of the spiritual work.[101] His argumentation was simple: if indigenous members would

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be admitted to upper-level positions, who would be left to do the down-to-earth fieldwork? Even in contexts such as seventeenth and eighteenth century Paraguay, where at least members of mixed European-American descent were admitted into the order on a more regular basis, still European priests were preferred and sought dearly after, relegating the creole Jesuits to second-rank members only.[102] Those attitudes lingered on longer in some parts of the scholarly work on the topic than we should be comfortable with, like old habits that die hard. In 1988 John Sebes, S.J. could still write on the first years of Javier in India, 1542–8: "Relying, even temporarily, on a native clergy (in South India, Malacca, and the Moluccas) did not augur well for the future. Everywhere one encountered that soft, dreamy and non-enterprising spirit which would never do."[103] Nonetheless, I want to stress that—although the twisted relationships of colonialism, empire and race are well-known[104]—the sixteenth and seventeenth century Jesuit position sketched here cannot properly be called "racist" as it did not embody any clear concept of human races, only of human differences, the supposed reasons for such differences not being clearly delineated.

The Jesuits were of course not the only spiritual organization to build up dominions in such ways. The informal condominium between the Dominican order and the Portuguese *Estado da Índia* in late sixteenth-century Indonesia display similar patterns.[105] The missionary activities of the Franciscans in postconquest South and Central America follow a similar pattern with regard to the mechanisms of spiritual inclusion, exclusion, and control.[106] And these structures were not—this is a point to be duly emphasized—a special Christian phenomenon. In the first half of the sixteenth century, for instance, the *jodo shinshū* school of Japanese Buddhism established a firm hold over many parts of central Honshū in a way "in that the type of power that the Honganji [the school's main temple and spiritual center] wielded was not primarily over the land itself but over the inhabitants of the land."[107] The concurring *jishū* school of Buddhism did the same.[108] In both cases, the priests of the respective organisations wielded considerable spiritual power over their followers by using their normative authority to rule on everyday practices with the threat of exclusion from the community of believers and thus (in their reading) enlightenment and salvation. Chinese *chan* (Japanese *zen*, or Vietnamese *thien*) Buddhists organized a far-flung network between Japan, Vietnam, and southern China in the seventeenth century in close cooperation with Fujienese merchants that established a similar system.[109]

The Problem of Controlling the Keys to Salvation

> "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"
>
> —Matthew 16:26[110]

The promise of conversion was simple: salvation. The basic imperative behind the missionary endeavour was always given as the quest to save as many souls as possible

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from eternal damnation. Spiritual authority works through the implied answer to the lesser known second part of the above-cited verse of the gospel: obedience. To gain access to the salvation promised by the missionaries, people not only had to convert, but to live up to what this conversion entailed, the norms set by the new spiritual authorities for an orthodox life, as delineated above. Punishment for trespassing or deviation would have to be meted out in the form of spiritual sanction, penance, and ultimately the threat of excommunication and eternal damnation. Matthew 16:19 also contains—within the well-known verses used to legitimate the papal claim for spiritual supremacy—the blueprint for this: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

Complications were bound to arise if it no longer seemed plausible to the neophytes that the new spiritual authority—the Society of Jesus—could defend these claims, especially after long phases of missionary absence, which could in their case amount to decades. The Christian community in the castle-town of Ichiku in central Japan, for example, saw seven visits of Jesuit missionaries, of a few days each, over a period of almost seventy years from the initial one in 1550 to the last in 1618, the longest span of absence being twenty-seven years (1578–1605).[111] As the old spiritual authorities generally had many more representatives in proximity to the converts, reversion to the old faith(s) was not only possible but could be tempting. And room was made for such reversion, for example in late sixteenth-century India, where Brahmins devised ways for stray believers to re-enter the Hindu dharma though by their own religious law and tradition that should not have been possible.[112] In more open and syncretic religious environments like Japan and China, reversion was much easier and happened far more often and in greater numbers. However, this may have been due to the superficial way of transmitting elementary Christian tenets that made the converts religiously illiterate, so to say.

In 1657, the papal secretary of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, accused all missionary orders including the Jesuits of elevating Christian doctrine to a secret lore, claiming exclusive domains of action, and banning the ordination of indigenous priests in an effort to keep the populace spiritually dependent on the orders.[113] The spiritual illiteracy of the new believers, their ignorance of even central tenets of Christian dogma, was caused in part by a shortage of missionaries and the simultaneous desire to harvest as many souls as possible. Yet this did have the effect of elevating Christian lore to a secret knowledge only ever fully mastered by the European Jesuits, so that the key to salvation remained firmly in their hands. The aforementioned Henrique Henriquez wrote to Loyola about his work among the Indian Paravas in 1552, saying that "[l]ately I have taken the step of making these Christians understand the mystery of the Holiest Trinity, of the incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the reason why we adore the cross."[114] As the Paravas had embraced Christianity in 1530 and had been tutored by Jesuit missionaries since 1542, no need seems to have been felt to hurry the catechetical instruction of the new believers. The catechisms of Roberto de

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nobili, S.J. (1577–1656), for the Madurai Mission in southern India followed the same pattern,[115] as did those drawn by Alexandre de Rhodes, S.J. (1593–1660), for the Jesuit missions in Vietnam.[116] In the Huron missions of North America's New France it was very easy in most cases for indigenous converts to get baptised, too. A thorough catechesis was not necessary, only if it was to be used as an instrument of exclusion, as a disciplinary measure to bar selected people from baptism.[117] When the missionaries on the spot were not convinced that they could enforce a Christian way of living after baptism, the rite was simply postponed until a time when the position of the Society's missionaries would allow for it, as in early eighteenth-century Baja California.[118]

The Jesuits proved more heavy-handed when it came to salvation, which of course could only be attained by strict adherence to their way of Christian life. As the converts hardly knew how to avoid what was, according to the missionaries, a sin, and how to repent properly once sinned, they were thrown back on the Jesuit interpretation of the Gospel as their only road to paradise. In consequence, the social structures among the new Christians recentred themselves spiritually on the members of the order, who in turn delegated their power to chosen indigenous or mestizo lay brothers, catechumens, and others who were ranked according to how much they partook in the knowledge of the Christian message.[119] According to letters disseminated by the Societas Jesu itself, this began as early as the 1540s with Francis Xavier's decision to recruit baptized Indian youths to police the villages and quite literally smash all attempts at heathen worship and unchristian behaviour while the missionaries were absent, if we are to believe his letters as the Societas Jesu itself chose to disseminate them in print.[120]

Relying on a broad substructure of native and mestizo affiliates of the Society was a practical way to counter the lack of European missionaries in the extra-European mission fields and it was thus widely employed. Though they were not to be admitted into the order, in any case not as full members,[121] these convert circles were firmly institutionalized, with regulations and vows of their own, and swore obedience to the Jesuits. Members fulfilled the spiritual duties of pastoral care in the absence of the missionaries, and complemented their efforts when the missionaries were present. But the legitimacy of their acts depended on (in most cases after the fact) missionary sanction and approval. In India they were called *kanakappilei*,[122] in Japan *dōjuku*, and with the mass of reports dealing with the Japanese mission *dōjuku* became widely established as a technical term for these institutions, as far as New France.[123] Even where the name was avoided deliberately, the corresponding local institutions' structural principles were the same, as in Vietnam.[124] While these men carried the burden of most of the day-to-day spiritual duties of their local believers' communities, they depended on the order for authorization as they themselves lacked full access to the Christian message. In turn, the missionaries depended on them for their inter-cultural and linguistic skills and, of course, their working power, for spreading their message and upholding confidence in it among the new believers. What made it possible for the Jesuits to stay in control of their indigenous subalterns, if they did, was precisely the quid pro quo outlined above: obedience for salvation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Society really did wield the keys to heaven in this situation. The spiritual dependency thus installed facilitated the arrangement of imperial structures, and, as a drawback, the rollback of missionary effort when those structures failed. This was most pronounced in areas where the Jesuits had truly achieved the dominion they had striven for, so that no other Christian spiritual agents could fill the gap, as in Japan. The problem inherent in this was already sensed by some of the Jesuits working in Japan themselves.[125] The domain of Arima in western Japan constituted an extreme example of the potential dangers. Here, the local daimyo had officially invited and supported the Jesuits to missionize the populace in 1576, which reportedly resulted in 15,000 baptisms in one year performed by only two Jesuit priests. When the daimyo died in 1577, his successor reversed the conversion policy, banished the Society, and by 1578 almost all converts had abandoned their new faith.[126] In other areas, for instance in Vietnam, the survival of Christian communities was facilitated by the persistence of the converts' networks centred on the former subalterns of the Society,[127] though communities were very small in comparison with what the Society of Jesus had hoped to achieve when starting their missions. Around the globe, the Jesuit mission finally failed in all areas where the order had succeeded in the quest for spiritual dominion that, as it had been built on the standard early modern European model of expansion, was both cause and product of its extra-European growth.[128] That the missionaries, were acting in and constructing an imperial and colonial framework within the spiritual phase, however convinced of their actions and beliefs they may have been, might well have been one reason for that.

Bibliography

Published primary sources

d'Amiens, Jacques (Jacobus Damianus), S. J. *Synopsis primi saeculi Societatis Iesu*. Tournai: Adrian Quinque, 1641.

Fróis, Luís, S. J. *Die Geschichte Japans (1549–1578)*. Edited by Georg Schurhammer, S. J., Ernst A. Voretzsch, S. J. Leipzig: Asia Major, 1926.

Fucan, Fabian. "Deus Destroyed. Ha Daiusu." In *Deus Destroyed: The Image of Christianity in Early Modern Japan*, George Elison, 3rd ed., 258–91. Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, 1991.

Gonçalvez, Melchior, S. J. "Carta do Padre Melchior Gonçalves aos irmãos de Coimbra. Goa, 9 de Novembro de 1548." In *Documentação para a história das missões do padroado português do oriente: Índia*. Vol. 4, *1458–1550*, edited by Antonio da Silva Rego, doc. 25, 115–21. Lisbon: Divisão de Publ. e Biblioteca, Agência Geral das Colónias, 1950.

Henriquez, Henrique, S. J. (a). "P. Henricus Henriques S. I. P. Ignatio de Loyola, Romam, resp. Sociis Conimbricensibus. Cocino 27 Januarii 1552." In *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu: Documenta Indica*. Vol. 2, *1550–1553*, edited by Josef Wicki, S. J., doc. 64, 298–310. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, 1950.

——. (b). *Summa Theologiae Moralis*. Venice: Damiano Zena, 1600.

Loyola, Iñigo de, S. J. *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus: Translated, with an Introduction and Commentary*, edited by G. E. Ganss. St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970.

Lucena, Afonso de, S. J. *Erinnerungen aus der Christenheit von Ōmura. De algumas cousas que ainda se alembra o Pe Afonso de Lucena que pertencem à christandade de Ōmura [1578–1614].*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Erstmalige, kritische Ausgabe (Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S. I. 34), edited by Josef F. Schütte, S. J. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, 1972.

Maffei, Giovanni Pietro, Johann Georg Götzen (trans.), and David Sartorius. (ed.). *Kurtze Verzeichnuß und historische Beschreibung deren dingen/so von der Societet IESV in Orient/von dem Jar nach CHRISTI Geburt/1542. biß auff das 1568. gehandlet*. Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1586.

Pereira, Benito, S. J. *De Communibus omnium rerum naturalium Principiis & Affectionibus*. Lyon: à Porta, 1585.

Polanco, Juan de, S. J. "Anotaciones sobre las misiones. Roma, c.agosto de 1558." In *Monumenta Historica Japoniae*. Vol. 3, *Documentos del Japón 1558–1562*, edited by Juan Ruiz-de-Medina, S. J., doc. 6, 123–30. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, 1995.

Vaz, Pero, S. J. "Carta do Padre Pero Vaz ao Geral da Companhia. Baçaim, 27 de Decembro de 1568." In *Documentação para a história das missões do padroado português do oriente: Índia*. Vol. 10, *1566–1582*, edited by Antonio da Silva Rego, doc. 53, 473–80. Lisbon: Divisão de Publ. e Biblioteca, Agência Geral das Colónias, 1953.

Secondary sources

Abé, Takao. *The Jesuit Mission to New France. A New Interpretation in the Light of the Earlier Jesuit Experience in Japan*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Abernethy, David B. *The Dynamics of Global Dominance. European Overseas Empires, 1415–1980*. Yale: Yale University Press, 2000.

Albó, Xavier, S. J. "Jesuitas y culturas indigenas: Perú 1568–1606. Su actitud, métodos y criterios de aculturación (Primera Parte)." *América Indígena* 26 (1966): 249–308.

Andaya, Leonard Y. "The 'Informal Portuguese Empire' and the Topasses in the Solor Archipelago and Timor in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 41:3 (2010): 391–420.

Andrade, Tonio. "Beyond Guns, Germs, and Steel: European Expansion and Maritime Asia, 1400–1750." *Journal of Early Modern History* 14 (2010): 165–86.

Alden, Dauril. *The Making of an Enterprise. The Society of Jesus in Portugal, Its Empire, and Beyond 1540–1750*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Arendt, Hannah. *Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft*, vol. 2, *Imperialismus*. Frankfurt: Ullstein, 1975.

Bang, Peter Fibiger and C. A. Bayly. "Tributary Empires—Towards a Global and Comparative History." In *Tributary Empires in Global History*, edited by P. Bang and C. A. Bayly, 1–17. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Bangert, William V., S. J. *A History of the Society of Jesus*. 2nd ed. St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1986.

Boscaro, Adriana. "Toyotomi Hideyoshi and the 1587 Edicts against Christianity." *Oriens Extremus* 20 (1973): 219–41.

Boxer, Charles R. *The Church Militant and Iberian Expansion 1440—1770*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Brendecke, Arndt. *Imperium und Empirie. Funktionen des Wissens in der spanischen Kolonialherrschaft*. Köln: Böhlau, 2009.

Carey, Hilary M. *God's Empire. Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c. 1801–1908*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Clossey, Luke. *Salvation and Globalization in the Early Jesuit Missions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Cohen, Thomas V. "Why the Jesuits Joined." *Canadian Historical Papers* 9:1 (1974): 237–58.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Correia, Pedro L. R. "Alessandro Valignano's Attitude towards Jesuit and Franciscan Concepts of Evangelization in Japan (1587–1597)." *Bulletin of Portuguese-Japanese Studies* 2:1 (2001): 79–108.
Cubitt, Geoffrey. "Conspiracism, Secrecy and Security in Restoration France: Denouncing the Jesuit Menace." *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 38:143.1 (2013): 107–28.
D'Costa, Anthony, S. J. *The Christianisation of the Goa Islands*. Bombay: St. Xavier's College, 1965.
Dobbins, James C. *Jōdo Shinshū: Shin Buddhism in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.
Dubois, Laurent. *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.
Dürr, Renate. "Wechselseitiger Kulturtransfer. Jesuiten und Guaraní in den Reduktionen von Paraguay (1609–1768)." *Zeitsprünge. Forschungen zur Frühen Neuzeit* 11 (2007): 422–40.
Dunch, Ryan. "Beyond Cultural Imperialism: Cultural Theory, Christian Missions, and Global Modernity." *History and Theory* 41 (2002): 301–25.
Elias, Norbert. *What is Sociology? The Collected Works of Norbert Elias*, vol. 5, edited by Artur Bogner, et al. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2012.
Elison, George. *Deus Destroyed: The Image of Christianity in Early Modern Japan*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, 1991.
Fabre, Pierre-Antoine. "Ensayo de geopolítica de las Corrientes espirituales: Alonso Sánchez entre Madrid, Nueva España, Filipinas, las costas da China y Roma, 1579–1593." In *Órdenes Religiosas entre América y Asia. Ideas para una historia misionera de los espacios coloniales*, edited by Elisabetta Corsi, 85–104. Mexico City: Colegio de Mexico, 2008.
Flaig, Egon. *Weltgeschichte der Sklaverei*. 2nd ed. München: Beck, 2011.
Fechner, Fabian. *Entscheidungsprozesse vor Ort. Die Provinzialkongregationen der Provinz Paraguay (1608–1762)*. Regensburg: Schnell + Steiner, 2015.
Feldhay, Rivka. "Thomist Epistemology of Faith: The Road from 'Scientia' to Science." *Science in Context* 20:3 (2007): 401–21.
Fezzi, Luca. "Osservazioni sul De christiana expeditione apud Sinas suscepta ab societatis Iesu dei Nicolas Trigault." *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 35:3 (1999): 541–66.
Fisch, Jörg. *Die europäische Expansion und das Völkerrecht. Die Auseinandersetzungen um den Status der überseeischen Gebiete vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1984.
Friedrich, Markus. "Governance in the Society of Jesus 1540–1773." *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 41:1 (2009): 1–42.
Gómez, J. J. "Conquista spiritual." In *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús: Biográfico-Temático*, vol. 1: *AA–Costa Rica* edited by Charles E. O'Neill, S. J. and Joaquín María Domínguez, S. J. Madrid: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, 2001.
Griffin, Nigel. *"Virtue versus Letters": The Society of Jesus 1550–1580 and the Export of an Idea*. EUI Working Paper 95. Florence: European University Institute, 1984.
Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire. Die neue Weltordnung*. Frankfurt: Campus, 2002.
Hassig, Ross. *Aztec Warfare: Imperial Expansion and Political Control*. 11th ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.
Hausberger, Bernd. "Vita cotidiana en las misiones jesuitas en el noroeste de México." *Iberoamericana. Nueva época* 2:5.3 (2002): 121–35.
——. *Für Gott und König. Die Mission der Jesuiten im kolonialen Mexiko*. Wien: Verlag für Politik und Geschichte, 2000.
Hitzbleck, Kerstin. "Transformationen des Fremden im Spätmittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit." *Itinera. Beiheft zur Schweizerischen Zeitschrift für Geschichte/ Supplément de la Revue Suisse d'Histoire/ Supplemento della Rivista Storica Svizzera* 38 (2015): 5–32.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jorissen, Engelbert. *Das Japanbild im Traktat (1585) des Luis Frois*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1988.

Kalil, Assis Luis Guilherme, and Luiz Estevam de Oliveira Fernandes. “Ciegos o engañados: narrativas sobre a conquista spiritual do Norte da Nova Espanha (séculos XVII e XVIII).” *História Unisinos* 18:2 (2014): 233–47. DOI 10.4013/htu.2014.182.03.

López-Gay, Jésus, S. J. “Father Francesco Pasio (1554–1612), and his Ideas about the Sacerdotal Training of the Japanese.” *Bulletin of Portuguese-Japanese Studies* 2:2 (2001): 27–42.

——. “Javier, Francisco.” In *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús: Biográfico-Temático*, vol. 3: *Infante de Santiago—Piątkiewicz*, edited by Charles E. O’Neill, S. J. and Joaquín María Domínguez, S. J., 2140–41. Madrid: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, 2001.

Ludden, David. “The Process of Empire: Frontiers and Borderlands.” In *Tributary Empires in Global History*, edited by Peter Fibiger Bang and C. A. Bayly, 132–150. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Mattingly, David J. *Imperialism, Power, and Identity. Experiencing the Roman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

McMullin, Neil. *Buddhism and the State in Sixteenth-Century Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Mongini, Gabriele. “Per un profile dell’eresia gesuitica. La Compagnia di Gesù sotto processo.” *Rivista Storica Italiana* 117:1 (2005): 26–65.

Mundadan, Mathias A. “Meeting of Two Theologies in India in the 16th and 17th Centuries.” *Journal of Dharma: An International Quarterly of Religions and Philosophies* 14:1 (1989): 74–92.

Naohiro Asao. “The Sixteenth-Century Unification.” In *The Cambridge History of Japan*, vol. 4, *Early Modern Japan*, edited by John Whitney Hall, 40–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Oliveiro e Costa, João P. “A Route under Pressure. Communication between Nagasaki and Macao (1597–1617).” *Bulletin of Portuguese-Japanese Studies* 1:1 (2000): 75–95.

Pagden, Anthony. “Conquest and Just War. The ‘School of Salamanca’ and the ‘Affair of the Indies’.” In *Empire and Modern Political Thought*, edited by Sankar Muthu, 30–60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Parsons, Timothy H. *The Rule of Empires: Those Who Built Them, Those Who Endured Them, and Why They Always Fall*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Palacín, Luis, S. J. “Brasil.” In *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús: Biográfico-Temático*, vol. 1: *AA–Costa Rica*, edited by Charles E. O’Neill, S. J. and Joaquín María Domínguez, S. J., 524–36. Madrid: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, 2001.

Perniola, Vito, S. J. “Sri Lanka.” In *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús: Biográfico-Temático*, vol. 4: *Piatti–Zwaans* edited by Charles E. O’Neill, S. J. and Joaquín María Domínguez, S. J., 3626–8. Madrid: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, 2001.

Pina, Isabel. “The Jesuit Missions in Japan and in China: Two Distinct Realities. Cultural Adaption and the Assimilation of Natives.” *Bulletin of Portuguese-Japanese Studies* 1:1 (2001): 59–76.

Pino Díaz, Fermín del. “Humanismo clasicista mediterráneo y concepción antropológica del mundo: el caso de los Jesuitas.” *Hispania. Revista española de historia* 56:192 (1996): 29–50.

Pinto, Ana F. “Japanese Elites as Seen by Jesuit Missionaries. Perception of Social and Political Inequality among the Elites.” *Bulletin of Portuguese-Japanese Studies* 1:1 (2001): 29–43.

Pizzorusso, Giovanni. “A Sede apostolica tra chiesa tridentina e chiesa missionaria: circolazione delle conoscenze e giurisdizione pontificia in una prospettiva globale durante l’età moderna.” *Rechtsgeschichte/Legal History* 20 (2012): 382–85.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rei, Claudia. “The Organization of Eastern Merchant Empires.” *Explorations in Economic History* 48 (2011): 116–35.
Repp, Martin. “Die Begegnung zwischen Europa und Ostasien anhand der Auseinandersetzungen um die christliche Gottesvorstellung.” *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 45 (2003): 71–100.
Ribeiro da Silva, Hugo. “A Sé Apostólica, Portugal e o Mundo Atlântico.” *Rechtsgeschichte/Legal History* 20 (2012): 390–93.
Rule, Paul A. *K'ung-tzu or Confucius? The Jesuit Interpretation of Confucianism*. Sidney: Allen and Unwin, 1986.
Said, Edward W. *Kultur und Imperialismus. Einbildungskraft und Politik im Zeitalter der Macht*. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1994.
Sansom, George B. *A History of Japan*, vol. 2, *1334–1615*. Tokyo: Tuttle, 1993.
Schatz, Klaus, S. J. *“…Dass diese Mission eine der blühendsten des Ostens werde…” P. Alexandre de Rhodes (1593–1660) und die frühe Jesuitenmission in Vietnam*. Münster: Aschendorff, 2015.
Schurhammer, Georg, S. J. *Franz Xaver: Sein Leben und seine Zeit, vol. 2.3: Japan und China 1549–1552*. Freiburg: Herder, 1973.
Sebes, John, S. J. “The Precursors of Ricci.” In *East Meets West: The Jesuits in China*, edited by Charles E. Ronan and Bonnie B. C. Oh, 19–61. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1988.
Sievernich, Michael. “Recht und Mission in der Frühen Neuzeit. Normative Texte im kirchlichen Leben der Neuen Welt.” *Rechtsgeschichte/Legal History* 20 (2012): 125–37.
Sievernich, Michael, S. J. “Die Mission und die Missionen der Gesellschaft Jesu.” In *Sendung—Eroberung—Begegnung, Franz Xaver, die Gesellschaft Jesu und die katholische Weltkirche im Zeitalter des Barock (Studien zur außereuropäischen Christentumsgeschichte (Asien, Afrika, Lateinamerika) 8)*, edited by Johannes Meier, 7–30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005.
Subrahmanyam, Sanjay. “Holding the World in Balance. The Connected Histories of the Iberian Overseas Empires, 1500–1640.” *The American Historical Review* 112:5 (2007): 1359–85.
——. “Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia.” *Modern Asian Studies* 31 (1997): 735–62.
——. *The Portuguese Empire in Asia, 1500–1700. A Political and Economic History*. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
Vu Thanh, Hélène. “La mission jésuite du Japon: entre recherche de l'autonomie et maintien du lien à l'Eglise et à Rome (XVIe—XVIIe siècles).” *Rechtsgeschichte/Legal History* 20 (2012): 398–99.
Ward, Haruko N. “Jesuit Encounters with Confucianism in Early Modern Japan.” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 40:4 (2009): 1045–68.
Wheeler, Charles. “Buddhism in the Re-Ordering of an Early Modern World: Chinese Missions to Cochin-China in the Seventeenth Century.” *Journal of Global History* 2 (2007): 303–24. DOI: 10.1017/S1740022807002306.
Wicki, Josef, S. J. “ “Die Ernennung der Provinziäle und Visitatoren der indischen Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu (1549–1600).” *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 49:97 (1980): 339–78.
——. “Luís, Pedro.” In *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús: Biográfico-Temático*, vol. 3: *Infante de Santiago—Piątkiewicz* edited by Charles E. O'Neill, S. J. and Joaquín María Domínguez, S. J., 2440. Madrid: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, 2001.
Winnerling, Tobias. *Vernunft und Imperium. Die Societas Jesu in Indien und Japan, 1542–1574*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.
Wright, Johnathan. *God's Soldiers: Adventure, Politics, Intrigue, and Power. A History of the Jesuits*. New York: Doubleday, 2004.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Xavier, Parathiparambil D. *Goa: A Social History (1510—1640)*. Goa: Rajhauns Vitaran, 1993.

Yesudhas, D. "Indigenization or Adaptation? A Brief Study of Roberto de Nobilis Attitude to Hinduism." *Bangalore Theological Forum* 1:2 (1967): 39–52.

Županov, Ines G. "Le repli du religieux. Les missionnaires jésuites du 17e siècle entre la théologie chrétienne et une éthique païenne." *Annales, Histoire, Sociale, Science* 51:6 (1996): 1201–23.

Notes

* Tobias Winnerling is a Research Assistant with the Chair for Early Modern History at Heinrich-Heine University Düsseldorf, Germany. His main research interests are in early modern European-Asian contacts, social history of knowledge and learning, historical network analysis, and history in video games.

1 This article presents a condensed and reworked version of the main argument of my dissertation: Winnerling, *Vernunft und Imperium.*

2 Cf. Arendt, *Imperialismus*, 37.

3 Cf. Hardt, Negri, *Empire*, 29–30, 35–36.

4 Arendt, *Imperialismus*, 37.

5 Ludden, "The Process of Empire," 133–34.

6 Cf. Flaig, *Weltgeschichte der Sklaverei*, 184–85.

7 Parsons, *The Rule of Empires,* 11.

8 Abernethy, *Dynamics of Global Dominance*, 19.

9 Bang and Bayly, eds., "Tributary Empires," 4.

10 Fisch, *Völkerrecht*, 475.

11 Cf. Ludden, "The Process of Empire," 132.

12 Cf. Mattingly, *Experiencing the Roman Empire*, 6–7.

13 Abernethy, *Dynamics of Global Dominance*, 19.

14 Cf. Ibid., 20; Parson, *The Rule of Empires*, 8–9.

15 Cf. Said, *Kultur und Imperialismus*, 44–45.

16 Cf. Hitzbleck, "Transformationen des Fremden," 29; Hardt, Negri, *Empire*, 137–41.

17 Already sketched out by Arendt, too, cf. *Imperialismus*, 19–20.

18 Cf. Abernethy, *Dynamics of Global Dominance*, 35–36.

19 Elias, *What is Sociology?* 70.

20 Cf. Bang and Bayly, "Tributary Empires," 4.

21 Parsons, *The Rule of Empires*, 447.

22 Cf. Fisch, *Völkerrecht*, 210–20.

23 Cf. Pagden, "Conquest and Just War," 52–53.

24 Ludden, "The Process of Empire," 135.

25 Subrahmanyam, "Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia," 739.

26 Cf. Subrahmanyam, *The Portuguese Empire in Asia,* 48; Rei, "The Organization of Eastern Merchant Empires," 117–18, 123–24.

27 Cf. Andrade, "Beyond Guns, Germs, and Steel," 174; Andaya, "The 'Informal Portuguese Empire'," 393.

28 Naohiro, "The Sixteenth-Century Unification," 62.

29 These characteristics of spiritual expansionism may even be discerned in contexts spatio-temporally and denominationally distinct, such as the nineteenth-century British missionary churches: cf. Carey, *God's Empire*, 16–7.

30 Abernethy, *Dynamics of Global Dominance*, 230.

31 Wright, *God's Soldiers*, 111.

32 Elison, *Deus Destroyed*, 97.

33 Clossey, *Salvation and Globalization,* 59.

34 Griffin, *"Virtue versus Letters,"* 19.

35 Cf. Abernethy, *Dynamics of Global Dominance*, 230.

36 Brendecke, *Imperium und Empirie*, 67.

37 Boscaro, "Toyotomi Hideyoshi and the 1587 Edicts," 230.

38 Repp, "Begegnung zwischen Europa und Ostasien," 92.

39 Dubois, *Avengers of the New World*, 49.

40 Cubitt, "Denouncing the Jesuit menace," 121.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

41 Cf. Wicki, "Die Ernennung der Provinziäle und Visitatoren," 360–68; Oliveiro e Costa, "A Route under Pressure," 80; and Friederich, "Governance in the Society of Jesus," 14–5.
42 Cf. Loyola, *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, chap. 2.1, §208, 143; chap. 5.2, §517, 235; chap. 8.2 §679, 294; chap. 8.3 §682, 295; Schurhammer, *Japan und China 1549–1552,* 365; and Fezzi, "Osservazioni sul De christiana expeditione," 546–47.
43 Sievernich, "Die Mission und die Missionen der Gesellschaft Jesu," 12.
44 Wright, *God's Soldiers*, 81.
45 Dunch, "Beyond Cultural Imperialism," 304.
46 Rule, *K'ung-tzu or Confucius?*, 2.
47 Cf. Mundadan, "Meeting of Two Theologies," 76; and Ward, "Jesuit Encounters with Confucianism," 1054.
48 Cf. Ribeiro da Silva, "A Sé Apostólica, Portugal e o Mundo Atlântico," 391.
49 Cf. Winnerling, *Vernunft und Imperium*, 56–57.
50 Henriquez (a), "Cocino 27 Januarii 1552," 301.
51 Gonçalvez, "Carta do Padre Melchior Gonçalves aos irmãos de Coimbra," 119. Author's translation.
52 Cf. Winnerling, *Vernunft und Imperium*, 120–27.
53 Polanco, "Anotaciones sobre las misiones," 126.
54 Cf. d'Amiens, *Synopsis primi saeculi Societatis Iesu*, 70, 76, 162, 165, 254–57.
55 Ibid., 310.
56 Bangert, *A History of the Society of Jesus*, 156.
57 Cf. Cohen, "Why the Jesuits joined," 248–50.
58 Pino Díaz, "Humanismo clasicista mediterráneo," 30.
59 Cf. Pizzorusso, "A Sede apostolica tra chiesa tridentina," 382.
60 Hassig, *Aztec Warfare*, 19.
61 Ibid., 18–19.
62 Ibid., 20–21.
63 Mattingly, *Experiencing the Roman Empire*, 37.
64 Loyola, *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus,* chap. 7.2, §618.1, 272–73.
65 Cf. Hausberger, "Vita cotidiana," 126; Hausberger, *Für Gott und König*, 234–35; Kalil, Guilherme, Oliveira Fernandes, "Ciegos o engañados," 234: "Para outros, os indígenas, mais ou menos propensos a aceitar a doutrina católica e viver sob novos códigos sociais e morais que com ela se buscava estabelecer, agiam de acordo com sua vontade, seu livre-arbítrio."; Winnerling, *Vernunft und Imperium*, 87.
66 Dürr, "Wechselseitiger Kulturtransfer," 435.
67 Vaz, "Baçaim, 27 de Decembro de 1568," 479.
68 Sievernich, "Die Mission und die Missionen der Gesellschaft Jesu," 8.
69 Cf. Pinto, "Japanese Elites as Seen by Jesuit Missionaries," 30.
70 Cf. Costa, *The Christianisation of the Goa Islands*, 139.
71 Cf. Subrahmanyam, "Holding the World in Balance," 1373; and Hausberger, *Für Gott und König*, 72–4, 84.
72 Correia, "Alessandro Valignano's Attitude," 80.
73 Cf. Fabre, "Ensayo de geopolítica de las Corrientes espirituales," 88–9.
74 Sansom, *A History of Japan. 1334—1615,* 372.
75 Correia, "Alessandro Valignano's Attitude," 80.
76 Perniola, "Sri Lanka," 3626.
77 Kalil, Guilherme, Oliveira Fernandes, "Ciegos o engañados," 236.
78 Alden, *The Making of an Enterprise*, 53.
79 Jorissen, *Das Japanbild im Traktat des Luis Frois*, 107.
80 Fechner, *Entscheidungsprozesse vor Ort*, 201.
81 Cf. Vu Thanh, "La mission jésuite du Japon," 398.
82 Cf. Abernethy, *Dynamics of Global Dominance,* 237.
83 Flagellation was, in contrast to the regulations of the order and Loyola's original intentions, a vital part of demonstrating the piety of converts at least in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Asian missions. Cf. Mongini: "Per un profile dell'eresia gesuitica," 49; Schatz, *P. Alexandre de Rhodes (1593–1660)*, 105; Schurhammer, *Japan und China 1549–1552*, 418–9, 423, 539 n. 87; and Fróis, *Die Geschichte Japans (1549–1578)*, 56, 120, 162, 165, 311, 316, 317, 318, 325, 326, 350.

84 Cf. Županov, "Le repli du religieux," 1206.
85 Hausberger, "Vita cotidiana," 122.
86 Gómez, "Conquista espiritual," 105.
87 Cf. Abé, *The Jesuit Mission to New France*, 114–16, 138–40.
88 Fucan, "Deus Destroyed. Ha Daiusu," 286–87.
89 Cf. Ludden, "The Process of Empire," 134; and Parsons, *The Rule of Empires,* 447.
90 Pagden, "Conquest and Just War," 44.
91 Feldhay, "Thomist Epistemology of Faith," 410.
92 Pereira, *De Communibus omnium rerum naturalium Principiis*, 394. Author's translation.
93 University teacher in Coímbra, Portugal, not to be confused with his aforementioned namesake.
94 Henriquez (b), *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, 32. Author's translation.
95 Pagden, "Conquest and Just War," 38.
96 Palacín, "Brasil," 526.
97 Cf. Albó, "Jesuitas y culturas indigenas," 300–2.
98 Cf. Parsons, *The Rule of Empires,* 149.
99 Wicki, "Luís, Pedro," 2440.
100 Pina, "The Jesuit Missions in Japan and in China," 68.
101 López-Gay, "Father Francesco Pasio," 39.
102 Cf. Fechner, *Entscheidungsprozesse vor Ort,* 270–73.
103 Sebes, "The Precursors of Ricci," 25.
104 Cf. Arendt, *Imperialismus*, 25, 65–69; Carey, God's Empire, 23–27; Hardt, Negri, *Empire*, 203–206.
105 Cf. Andaya, "The 'Informal Portuguese Empire'," 403–404.
106 Cf. Sievernich, "Recht und Mission in der Frühen Neuzeit," 130–32.
107 McMullin, *Buddhism and the State*, 37.
108 Dobbins, *Jōdo Shinshū*, 102.
109 Cf. Wheeler, "Buddhism in the reordering of an early modern world," 317–18.
110 King James version.
111 Cf. Schurhammer, *Japan und China 1549–1552*, 136 n. 16.
112 Boxer, *The Church Militant and Iberian Expansion*, 100; Costa, *Christianisation of the Goa Islands*, 23; and Xavier, *Goa: A Social History*, 116–17.
113 Schatz, *P. Alexandre de Rhodes*, 205.
114 Henriquez (a), "Cocino 27 Januarii 1552," 302. Author's translation.
115 Yesudhas, "Indigenization or Adaptation?" 49.
116 Cf. Schatz, *P. Alexandre de Rhodes*, 134–37.
117 Abé, *The Jesuit Mission to New France,* 108.
118 Hausberger, *Gott und König*, 130.
119 Cf. Winnerling, *Vernunft und Imperium*, 252, 328–29; Schatz, *P. Alexandre de Rhodes*, 155; and Hausberger, *Gott und König*, 299–301.
120 Maffei, *Kurtze Verzeichnuß und historische Beschreibung,* 11.
121 *Juan de Polanco stated this explicitly in 1558*: "Videatur an alii ex indigenis apti redid possint ad conversionen et conservationem aliorum, licet de Societate non sint, sive ad ordines sacros promoveantur sive laici permaneant, et quomodo." Polanco, "Anotaciones sobre las misiones," 127.
122 López-Gay, "Javier, Francisco," 2141.
123 Cf. Abé, *The Jesuit Mission to New France,* 156–57.
124 Cf. Schatz, *P. Alexander de Rhodes*, 153–5; his arguments against similarity of the Vietnamese catechists organization with the *dōjuku* (ibid., 83) do not hold.
125 Cf. Lucena, *Erinnerungen aus der Christenheit von Ōmura*, 161.
126 Elison, *Deus Destroyed*, 27–28.
127 Schatz, *P. Alexander de Rhodes*, 147.
128 Hausberger, *Gott und König*, 76.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0165115316000322 Published online by Cambridge University Press