Toyotomi Hideyoshi and the 1587 Edicts Against Christianity

By Adriana Boscaro
(Venedig)

The debate about the reasons for Hideyoshi's sudden volte-face against Christianity in 1587 is still open, but it is doubtful whether new evidence will appear in support of one thesis or another. I do not intend to reproduce here things already well known to any student of the history of Christianity in Japan, whether historical facts or mere anecdotes. Anyway, it is my opinion that if a great part of Hideyoshi's amazing change must be seen as a result of his ill-tempered character, his reactions are — in the end — the culmination of a long-thought plan.

There is no doubt that Christianity was, in Hideyoshi's mind, a potential danger to the political and social institutions of Japan. Even if it was only later that he expressed his ideas openly, the way he acted is clear evidence of the coherence of his thought. His opposition was a basic one and he actually seldom enforced his first anti-Christian laws: his memoranda were probably intended to keep his Christian vassals (Konishi, Kuroda, Taka-yama, etc.) in check. In fact, in his all-powerful position he had nothing to fear, not even from a league of Christian daimyö: only the thought of support from abroad could disturb him. But it was more from a social and religious point of view that he had to object, and in a letter written in 1591 to the Viceroy of the Indies he sets out clearly the doctrinal reasons for his attitude towards Christianity.

A typical and characteristic picture of religious syncretism emerges from his words. Shintoism, Buddhism and Confucianism are seen as different aspects of a sole reality and praised for their functions as warrenters of social order and peace. Order and peace that the 'heresies' (obviously Christianity in particular) could endanger. Though Hideyoshi manifestly stressed the importance of shintö, the Jesuits seemed to underrate it. In fact,
while they were so carefully attentive in studying all the aspects of Buddhism, they lost sight of the social problems the former involved. Valignano himself has only a few lines about shintō in Chapter III of his *Sumario* where he deals with "Religion and Sects of the Japanese People":

"... Los kami[8] son los dioses antiguos de los japones, los cuales comúnmente fueron reyes y otros fueron hombres señalados que hubo en Japón; y de estos cuentan historias tan imposibles, sucias y de burla, como fueron siempre las historias de los dioses de los gentiles. Y estos kami son más honrados en Japón por una falsa opinión de que pueden en este mundo alguna cosa y que fueron de progenies de reyes y kuge[6] de Japón, que por creerse de ellos que den salvación ni puedan en el otro mundo alguna cosa."[5]

If we compare this assertion with the explanations Hideyoshi himself gave of the socio-political meaning of *shinto* belief, we can see how much the two points of view differ. I have chosen three statements made by Hideyoshi on the matter on different occasions. The first occurs in a conversation with Manuel Lopez, sent to him by Jéronimo Pereira, the captain of the ship from Macao, in 1588, that is after the Edict of Expulsion.

Hideyoshi had said:

"... inasmuch as the Fathers preached a law so hostile to the kami and the hotoke[7] of Japan, I was constrained to banish them. ... Kami and hotoke are none other than the Lords of Japan, who, by their victories and exploits deserve to be worshipped as true kami by the people. Therefore the aim of every Lord of Japan is to end his life with illustrious deeds which may inspire the minds of his subjects so that they will give him this cult of honour and reverence. The law preached by the Fathers, being so opposed to the kami and hotoke of Japan, is for the same reason opposed to the Lords of Japan: although it may be good for other countries, it is not good for Japan. For this reason I have sent the Fathers away. Aiming to deride and to destroy the kami and hotoke, they are, in consequence, trying to deride me and to belittle my memory and glory after my death; therefore I cannot be friendly and well-disposed towards them, unless I want to be hostile and badly-disposed towards myself."[6]

One of Hideyoshi's private letters shows clearly that he was completely persuaded in this, and was not exaggerating his feelings when speaking with

Jesuit Missionaries in the 16th and 17th Centuries (Bonn and Leipzig, 1923), but that they failed to recognise its importance to the Japanese in the social and political context of their lives.


Lopez wrote down this conversation in a letter dated October 10th, 1588 which was included by Coelho in his own of February 24th, 1589, from Katsusa. In *Lettere del Giappone* Et Della Cina De Gl'Anni M. D. XXXIX. & M.D.XC. Scritte al R.P. Generale della Compagnia di Giesv, In Roma, Appresso Luigi Zannetti, M.D.XCI., pp. 136—137.
the foreigners. Writing from Odawara\[8\] during the siege against the Hōjō\[9\] in 1590, he tells Gosa\[10\] (a lady-in-waiting to his legal wife) "... and thus from now on I intend to see to the welfare of the country: so that this time I will achieve as great meritorious deeds as possible ... until my name shall remain for posterity ... ."

The second statement appears in the above cited letter to the Viceroy of the Indies (1591).

"... Ours is the land of the Gods, and God is mind. Everything in nature comes into existence because of mind. Without God there can be no spirituality. Without God there can be no way. God rules in times of prosperity as in times of decline. God is positive and negative and unfathomable. Thus, God is the root and source of all existence. This God is spoken of by Buddhism in India, Confucianism in China, and Shinto in Japan. To know Shinto is to know Buddhism as well as Confucianism."

The third one is to be found in a letter to the Governor of the Philippines, Don Francisco Tello, after the San Felipe affair and the martyrdom of 1597. In this case no mention is made of Buddhism, but again the emphasis is on Shintoism, considered as 'the pith and core of the Japanese social structure'. To explain his thoughts about the total refusal of the Christian propaganda even more clearly, Hideyoshi adds:

"... and if perchance, either religious or secular Japanese proceeded to your kingdoms and preached the law of Shinto therein, disquieting and disturbing the public peace and tranquillity thereby, would you, as lord of the soil, be pleased thereat? Certainly not; and therefore by this you can judge what I have done."

It was indeed quite difficult for the Jesuits to grasp the basic importance of shintō, partly because they could not accept the human nature of the shintō divinities. And the various facets of shintō were indeed hard to make out because of the lack of a written doctrine and especially since there was an ambiguous boundary line between popular shintō and the shintō which was later to become the State religion. As Dr. Anesaki pointed out "... One would miss the point if one overlooked the popular enthusiasm for the achievements of the dictator combined with the revival of Shintō

---

8 Quoted by BOXER, The Christian Century ... , p. 169. Professor BOXER's comment reads: "The logic of this retort is indeed unanswerable; although there is no need to suppose that it carried the slightest conviction to the closed mind of a Roman Catholic conquistador, who naturally considered that the activities of the Franciscans were inspired by God, and therefore above human interference, whereas those of the Shinto priests were motivated by the Devil, and as such entitled to be forcibly suppressed."
9 On this subject, Professor ALVAREZ-TALADRIZ underlines the fact that Fabian Fukan\[11\], the renegade Jesuit brother, turned this statement against the divinity of Jesus Christ in his Ha Deus\[12\], Cfr. Sumario, pp. 59—60, note 8.
person. Moreover the restoration of national unity and prosperity ... aroused a new belief that Japan was the 'Land of the Gods', a Shintō belief diametrically opposed to the Christian conception of deity."

ideas, long prepared for and now finding an object of hero-worship in his
As it appears from his own words, Hideyoshi had nothing to object to in the persons of the missionaries themselves, whom he realized were good people and whom he actually highly esteemed. But he could not permit a religion which undermined the foundation of the social order of the country.

It is in this light that I would like to examine a memorandum in eleven items given by Hideyoshi just a day before the very famous Edict against the Christians. It bears the date 18th day of the 6th lunar month of Tenshō (23 July 1587). We know that in the evening of that same day the Vice-Provincial Gaspar Coelho received Hideyoshi's couriers who brought with them the unexpected 'Four Questions', and that these plunged him into the utmost bewilderment. The next day, July 24th, Hideyoshi notified the Fathers of his Edict of Expulsion.

We have then three documents, issued within 24 hours of each other, the study of which clarifies Hideyoshi's ideas about Christianity. To avoid confusion between these three documents while comparing the different items, I shall conventionally call the Memorandum in Eleven Points Document A, the 'Four Questions' addressed to Coelho Document B, and the Expulsion Edict in Five Points Document C. Western scholars speak...

---


11 I think that the following passage is the most definite statement on the matter. From his standpoint as a despotic ruler he (= Hideyoshi) was undoubtedly right to regard Christian propaganda as subversive, for no system can survive unchanged once the assumptions upon which it is based are undermined. However high their purpose, what the Jesuits were doing, in Japan as well as in India and China, was to challenge a national tradition and through it the existing political structure. This last is an animal that always defends itself when attacked, and consequently Hideyoshi's reaction, however deplorable, was to be expected and does not seem to need any fuller explanation." G. B. SANSOM, The Western World and Japan, London, 1965, p. 129.

12 I quote from Frois who was the first to make Hideyoshi's will known in Europe. "... Que queria saber (1) porque causa os padres hiaõ com tanta fede, incitando aos homens a se fazerem Christãos, & a fazellos tambem por força; (2) & porque destruyaõ os templos & varelhas dos Cãmis & Fotoquês [kami and hotoke], perseguindo seus Bonzos & não se accommodating com elles, (3) & porque comiaõ cavallos & vacas, sendo causa tão fora de rezaõ, por serem animaes tão serviçães & proveitosos à republica, (4) & porque os Portugueses comprauaõ muitos Iapões & os leuauaõ casiuos pera suas terras ... ".

Frois' famous letter from Arima, dated February 20th, 1588, was printed as early as 1589—1590 in Latin, Italian, German, Spanish, French and distributed widely through all European countries. The original Portuguese text was reprinted, together with other reports from Japan, in Cartas Que Os Padres E Irmãos da Companhia de Jesus escreverão dos Reynos de Iapão & China aos de mesma Companhia da India, & Europa, desde anno de 1549 até o de 1589 [sic! 1589], 2 vols., Evora, 1598. Hereafter cited as Cartas. The above passage in Cartas, I, f. 207 v.

13 I consider the 'Four Questions' as a document (though they were taken verbally to Coelho), in so far as they were recorded by Frois in the above quoted letter.
quite extensively about Doc. B and Doc. C, but strangely they seem to neglect Doc. A to which, on the contrary, Japanese scholars generally devote a great deal of space.\footnote{14}

A particular study of Doc. A is the one by Watanabe Yosuke in which the author gives his interpretation of the course of the events.\footnote{15} Taking his standpoint on the fact that Hideyoshi used to reissue his edicts after a few days either to enforce or to lighten them, the author concludes that Doc. A must have been compiled for the central provinces where the 'damages' of Christianity were less serious, while Doc. C, heavier in its consequences, was intended for Kyūshū\footnote{16} where the Christian influence was stronger. This is a theoretically acceptable opinion, but I think that some of the items of Doc. A were too important not to be made known to the Kyūshū daimyō. As we shall see, Hideyoshi stresses three facts: a) only the lower classes are free to choose the faith they want and, on the other hand, the lords are forbidden to force them into conversion; b) the congregations of Christian people can be even more dangerous than the Buddhist sect of the \textit{ikkō}\footnote{17}; c) his vassals must keep in mind that the grant of the land is a temporary one.

The second point is actually the clue to Doc. A. In the 15th and 16th centuries the \textit{ikkō} had become a political strength which the \textit{daimyō} could hardly face. Their tight organization allowed them to fight with success against the great landowners, from whom they demanded social reforms and better treatment. Since many of the believers were farmers, there were many uprisings (known as \textit{ikkō-ikki}\footnote{18}) which devastated part of the country. As the Christian organisational structure appeared to Hideyoshi so very similar to that of the \textit{ikkō}, especially in their blind devotion to a 'chief' who was not Hideyoshi himself, the parallel was easily made. To stress the dangers of Christian 'aggression' even more firmly, he reminds his vassals of the ill fate of the lord of Kaga, Togashi Masachika\footnote{19}, turned

\begin{footnotes}

\footnotetext[14]{See for example Yoshida Kogorō, \textit{Kirishitan daimyō}, Shibundo, 1966, pp. 102—104; Ebrisawa Arimichi, \textit{Kirishitanshi no kenkyū}, Shinjinbutsu ōraisha, 1971 (1st ed. 1942), pp. 112—117; and Nihon kirishitanshi, Hanawa Shobō, 1966, pp. 265—271, but the texts of the edicts in all these works must be carefully checked.}

\footnotetext[15]{The work by Watanabe appeared in 1939 in \textit{Tōzai kōshō shiron} with the title "Waga shiryō yori mitaru sengoku jidai tōzai kōshō shi" (pp. 421—472), with particular reference to Chap. 4 "Tenshukyō no kinzei" (pp. 460—467).}

\footnotetext[16]{Followers of the \textit{Jōdo shinshū}\footnote{20} founded by Shinran\footnote{21} (1173—1262). The original meaning of \textit{ikkō} (or \textit{hilatsu}) is 'earnestly' or 'one sided' and it stresses the genuine and total belief in Buddha Amida\footnote{22} of the believers. They had no philosophical background. One of their strongholds was the Ishiyama Honganji in Osaka\footnote{23} (see note 36).}

\footnotetext[17]{Togashi Masachika (1455?—1488), shugo\footnote{24} of southern Kaga, fought bitterly against the \textit{ikkō} party of Rennyo\footnote{25} (the chief abbot of the Kyōto Honganji) and was finally thrown out of his territories. He took refuge in Etchu\footnote{26} where he committed suicide. This happened in 1486 and up to 1576 the \textit{ikkō} were the de facto rulers}

\end{footnotes}
out from his domains by the ikkō a century before: a clear warning to all the lords.

To conclude this first part, I think that the evidence for a pre-existing unfavourable attitude towards Christianity is to be found in this Notice of Eleven Items with Vermillion Seal. Even if it was announced only one day before the Edict of Expulsion, it is proof that the latter cannot be ascribed to the fumes of the Portuguese wine.

We shall now examine Doc. A and Doc. C item by item, with reference also to Doc. B. As far as I know Doc. A has never been translated into any Western language: for this reason I shall give the original text, the transliteration and a literal translation of every item, with a comment. For conformity, Doc. C will be treated in the same way though it appears translated in many texts.

A few words on the history of Doc. A seem here necessary. A copy of it, dating back only to 1804 (Bunka 1), is preserved in the Jingū Bunko Toshokan of Ise in a copybook entitled Goshuin shishoku kokaku ("Red sealed documents [copied for the purpose of keeping] old practice of the office of Shintō priests"), which covers 75 items of descriptive or epitomar documents in 78 leaves. Unfortunately, no older codex is now extant. The document was discovered by Kuwata Tadachika, brought to Tōkyō in 1919 (Taishō 8), copied by a scribe of the Shiryō Hensanjo of Tōkyō Imperial University and collated by scholars. This copy is now preserved in the Hensanjo Library with the press-mark 2012—250 (see Plates 1—2). A year later, another copy was taken by another scribe of the same Hensanjo, but again from the Ise copybook. The handwriting in the second copy is in a more liberal style though the arrangement of characters is very similar to the first one. This copy has the press-mark 2012—144 in the Hensanjo Library. Watanabe probably used these two copies also for his article (see note 15), and the collation gives only some slight differences. To my great regret, I was not able to see the Ise copy, although it would have been of greater interest if it were — at least — a copy of the 16th or early 17th century, if not of Hideyoshi's day. I have followed the first Hensanjo copy (no. 2012—250) after collating it with the second one (no. 2012—144) and Watanabe's version. Some controversial points will be discussed as they arise.

The exemplar of Doc. C (the Edict of Expulsion) preserved in the Matsuura Shiryō Hakubutsukan in Hirado is a copy from Hideyoshi's day. (See Pl. 3.)

of the whole province of Echizen. Such an exploit was without doubt vividly impressed on Hideyoshi's mind.

At the time of the borrowing, the copybook was at the Jingū Shidō.

I am grateful to the Matsuura Shiryō Hakubutsukan for the permission to reproduce the document. A transcription of it is in Hirado Matsuura shiryo.
Inasmuch as regards the monto converted by the bateren, this should be at their own discretion.

This first item refers to the lower classes and leaves them free to choose their faith. But more than that, it points to the prohibition (see items 2 and 8) for the daimyō to force their subjects to be converted. I feel that rather than allowing individual freedom of belief (that is rather than being addressed to the lower classes themselves), this clause is a clear warning addressed to the lords.

Bateren monto[39] means the Japanese people converted by the bateren. One should note that bateren monto has never the meaning of ‘bateren and monto’, but that of ‘monto converted by the bateren’, i.e., Japanese Christians. A few words to illustrate these two terms better. Bateren[40] is a phonetic corruption of the Portuguese word padre and it stands to indicate, in this context, the Jesuit Fathers. I shall always use the Japanese rendering. Monto[43] is the usual term to indicate a follower, a believer of any faith, but it was at the time (and it is still now) conventionally used to indicate the followers of the ikkōshū[44]. So when the term monto is found alone it applies mostly to the ikkō, while bateren monto applies to Christian people. Although in other edicts or memoranda the term monto may also include the samurai, from the reading of the following items we can see that this first item excludes them completely.
I have given counties and provinces [to the lords] as a fief, but it is reported that though the peasants and others within the parishes of temples within their own fiefs have no aspirations [to become bateren monto], my vassals (= the lords) have urged them to become the monto of bateren: such a thing leads to unlawfulness, and such is a bad thing.

This item presents some difficulties in its rendering and requires added words and some explanation of the terms. The implied subject is Hideyoshi and he stresses the fact that the lords do not own the land, but that they received it by him in temporary usufruct. This statement has a deeper significance: the redistribution of the fiefs (kuniwake [45]) was in fact one of the foundation of his home policy. The ease with which he could replace his vassals gives an idea of his effective power over Japan. In this way he could move his most reliable men to strategic positions and break down every possibility of allegiance against himself. When such an order reached one of the daimyō, he was compelled to leave immediately together with his family and retainers, to be soon replaced by another one. In this light it is easy to understand why Hideyoshi prohibited his vassals converting the peasants forcibly. Lower classes and the land constituted a unity, not the daimyō and the lower people: therefore Hideyoshi's vassals had no rights at all over their 'temporary' subjects.

The first meaning of o-fuchi [46] is an allowance of a fixed amount of rice: o-fuchi ni therefore means 'for the purpose of subsistence', and it may also be an enfeoffment of various amount of land instead of rice. Sono chigyō stands for o-fuchi, and though chigyō [47] has the special meaning of 'property rights in land exercised by a person in direct control', the usage renders it with 'fief' — a term which I retain in the translation.

Terauke-byakushō ika [48] are the farmers, the peasants and other lower classes who are parishioners of various Buddhist sects. It must be remembered that the temple certificate system (terauke seido [49]) came into being throughout the country in the Tokugawa period. During Hideyoshi's years, terauke meant the obligation of a temple to control its parishioners from [45] 和分 [46] 御扶持 [47] 知行 [48] 寺請百姓以下
[49] 寺請制度
quarter to quarter, though the people within the same area did not necessarily belong to one special sect. The people themselves could individually belong to temples or shrines based on their own preferences.

The central part of the item contains Hideyoshi’s rebuke to his vassals, guilty of ordering their subjects to act against the social order. In fact it had often happened that — for religious but mostly for economic reasons — the lords had pushed their people into conversion. If it is also true that when the lord changed persuasion, the bulk of his subjects would quickly return to the formerly abjured faith, the danger remained.

The Jesuits supported a policy of slow penetration and adaptation to the existing social institutions, aiming at converting the upper class and leaving it to convince the mass by use of ‘persuasive’ methods. Therefore no censure could be made of the bateren themselves in this specific context, and no mention of them in fact appears in the item. All the blame goes to the kyūnin[26][27].

The clause ends with rifujin ni nari sōrō dan kusegoto ni sōrō koto; “such a thing leads to unlawfulness, and such is a bad thing”. Hideyoshi knew very well that even if he left freedom of belief to the peasants and farmers he had nothing to fear from them, while he could find obstacles if his vassals pushed their people into conversion: and he condemns such behaviour. We shall meet the term kusegoto[26] again; for the moment it is sufficient to observe that at that time kusegoto was simply a moral and legal concept of something which one should not do. It did not imply any kind of punishment, while in the Tokugawa period it came to mean an official oral rebuke listed among the slightest punishments which, at their most serious, could lead to confinement.

Incidentally, Hideyoshi’s firm belief that the peasants had no aspirations towards the new faith (kokorozashi mo kore naki tokoro) should be noted. Therefore, the freedom ‘offered’ in the first item loses a great part of its significance.

(3) 其國郡知行之儀給人二被下候事者當座之儀二候給人者

替り候といへとも百性ハ不替者二候条理不盡之儀何か

に於て於有之ハ給人ヲ曲事被仰出候間可成其意候変[28]

As for the fiefs allotted to my vassals in the counties and provinces, [this fact] is only a temporary one. Because the vassals can be replaced, but the farmers must not, it must be understood that if there are some

[26] In the 16th century the kyūnin were vassals on whom a chūgyō was bestowed in the form of land, which was called kyūchi[24]. They were considered first rank vassals and they controlled minor samurai in war and in peace. In the Tokugawa period they were not allowed to have fiefs. See also item 3.

[28] (3) Hitotsu Sono kokugun chūgyō no gi kyūnin ni kudasare sōrō koto wa tōsa no gi ni sōrō kyūnin wa kari sōrō to iedoma hyakushō wa karawazaru mono ni sōrō jō rifujin no gi nani ka ni tsuite kore aru ni ote wa kyūnin wo kusegoto ōseitasare sōrō aida sono l wo nasubeku sōrō koto. Only slight differences can be found when comparing the texts.
unlawful deeds [among the vassals against the farmers] the vassals (= the recipients of the fief) should be reprimanded for it as a bad thing. This item is very clear and it does not differ much from other memoranda usually given by the kanpaku. One must merely underline that not a single mention of religion is made here, but that Hideyoshi again stresses the fact that the land — and as a consequence also the farmers — do not belong to the vassals.

We have already seen the meaning of kyūnin (see note 27), but we must observe two different uses of it in this item. The first kyūnin (ni) has the usual meaning of 'first rank vassal', while the second kyūnin (wa) means daimyō in that the speaker is Hideyoshi and to him also the daimyō were kyūnin. To make it clearer we should remember the various levels of the warrior society as seen by the Regent: a) Hideyoshi himself; b) big daimyō, vassals to Hideyoshi; c) kyūnin, first rank vassals, vassals to b; d) small vassals; e) peasants.

(4) 式百町二千貫より上之者伴天連二成候おるてハ

奉得○公儀御意次第二成可申事

In a case where the persons given a fief bigger than 200 chō (in area or) 2—3,000 kan [in tax] become Christian, it can be only upon the agreement of the kōgi.

After leaving freedom of choice to the peasants, Hideyoshi begins to put the vassals under control. Christianity is not yet forbidden, but it is obvious that the approval of the kōgi (= public body) is a condition which overrules any personal inclination. The kōgi, which in the Tokugawa period will be identified with the shogunate, stands here for the local daimyō's government.

One should note the continuous shifting between permission and prohibition which finally gives the impression that the latter is stronger. Furthermore, a certain ambiguity strengthens this impression, as may be seen in the 5th item.

(5) 右之知行より下を取候者ハ八八宗九宗之儀候間其主

一人宛ハ心次第可申事

---

29 (4) Hitotsu Nihyaku chō ni-sanzen kan yori ue no mono bateren ni nari sōro [ni] ote wa kōgi [no] gyoi e iatematsuri shidai ni nashimosu beki koto. A peculiarity should be noted here: in Ms. 2012—250 there is a blank, but no kanji seems to be missing. Ms. 2012—144 is regular.

30 The people allowed to become Christian without the permission of the kōgi were therefore very limited in power and such fiefs were surely scattered all over the country among bigger fiefs. We can roughly calculate that their revenue was not higher than 20—25,000 koku: this meant that they were on the bottom steps of the official lists of taxable lords.

31 (5) Hitotsu Migi no chigyō yori shita wo tōri sōro mono wa hasshū kushū no gi [ni] sōro aida sono shu (arui) ichinin (hitori) zutsu wa kokoro shidai naru beki koto.
As for the vassal who is given a chigyō smaller than the one mentioned above, he himself can choose any kind of sect at his own discretion.

Hasshū kushū (eight or nine sects) stands for the various Buddhist sects and excludes Christianity. In fact, too many years have passed since Christianity was believed to be a branch sect of Buddhism at the time of the Yamaguchi document for one to suppose that Hideyoshi could be including Christianity as well in this expression. And even if it were so, the limitation to the person of the head of the family alone excluded every danger of mass-conversion. In fact, sono shu ichinin zutsu has a restrictive meaning: the master of the family himself and alone, not including the members of his family and the servants.

Compare with item 9 where Christianity is put on a level with any Buddhist sect (again expressed as hasshū kushū) and is thus permitted to the lower classes.

We have heard that the baterenmonto have assembled in groups similar but different from the ikkō. It is well known that groups of ikkō established a jinai within each county and rejected the payment of taxes to the lords, that they pushed all the people of the province of Kaga towards the ikkō sect and banished Togashi, master of that province; that the ikkō enfoeffed their chigyō to the bonzes of the ikkō sect and further confiscated the neighbouring province of Echizen: it was a very dangerous condition for the tenka.

This item, together with no. 8, is the most important, the clue to the fact on which Hideyoshi was to base his prohibition of Christianity. Hideyoshi

32 The text of the document given by Ouchi Yoshinaga to Father Torres reads: "For what concerns the Daidōji in the district of Yamaguchi in the country of Yoshiki in the province of Suwō, I give permission to you in accordance with the desire of the monks who came from a Western region to establish the very temple in order to promote Buddhist religion. 28th day, 8th month, Tenbun 21."

For the latest discussions of this document see MATSUDA Kiichi, "Ouchi Yoshinaga no Daidōji saikyōjō ni tsuite", Komonjo kenkyū, no. 4, 1970, pp. 20-36.

33 (6) Hitotsu Baterenmonto no gi wa ikkōshū yori mo hoka ni moshiai sōro jō ikkoshimesare sōro ikkōshū sono kokugun ni fainai wo tate kyūnin e nengu wo nasazu narabini Kaga [no] kuni ikkoku mono ni nasairišōtōte kokushu no Togashi wa iokushū no boso [no] moto e chigyō seshime sonoue Echizen made tori sōrotenka no sawari ni nari sōro gi sono kakure naku sōro koto.

(56) 山口 (57) 大内義長 (58) 大道寺 (59) 吉敷
(60) 周防 (61) 天文
had participated under Nobunaga in the bloody fights against the monks of the *ikkōshū* at Nagashima (1574) and in Osaka (1580), and he himself had defeated the monks of the Negorodera and of Saiga (1585). Therefore he was very aware of the danger that the rebellion fomented by the *ikkō* represented to the social institutions of the country.

Hideyoshi’s mind seems to move in the following direction. First of all a statement: the *bateren monto* assemble in groups very similar to those of the *ikkōshū*. Secondly: what have been the actions of the *ikkō*: (1) to group in *jinai* (fortified temple domains); (2) to refuse to pay the taxes to their lords (and finally to Hideyoshi himself); (3) to push the people of Kaga towards the *ikkōshū*; (4) to banish Togashi, lord of Kaga; (5) to hand over their *chigyō* (which they did not own) to the bonzes of the *ikkōshū*; (6) to confiscate the province of Echizen also.

First stated conclusion: all these actions are dangerous for the country (*tenka*); second conclusion, here implied but clearly expressed in item 8: if the *bateren monto* are similar to the *ikkō*, and if the actions of the *ikkō* are dangerous for the *tenka*, the actions of the *bateren monto* will similarly be dangerous for the *tenka*, or even more dangerous. When Hideyoshi says that the gatherings of the *bateren monto* are “similar but different” from those of the *ikkō*, the sentence must be understood as “in a very similar manner, but in a different character compared with the *ikkō*”, as he was perfectly aware that the Christians did not equal the intemperance of the *ikkō*. But something of which he was surely thinking and which likened the two, was the obedience that the *bateren monto* were compelled to give — through the person of the Father Provincial — to a foreign chief: the Pope. The fact that the powerful Portuguese were tightly bound to the Roman Church, and the fact that the Christian lords could ask the Portuguese for help was a dangerous circle that Hideyoshi wanted to break.

Two interesting terms appear here for the first time: *jinai* and *tenka*. *Jinai* (etimologically the precinct or compound of a temple) stands for *jinai-machi* and can be translated as ‘temple towns’, in the meaning of ‘fortified temple domains’. I shall keep the Japanese rendering in opposition to *tera* which appear in the next item. The *jinai* were powerful religio-political centres formed by a community of ‘believers’ which surrounded a temple or a town. The most important at that time was the Ishiyama Hon-\-ganji in Osaka.

---

See note 17.

Though Hideyoshi also reproaches the Christians with the breaking down of temples in item 2 of Doc. C and in the second of the ‘Four Questions’ (Doc. B), he knew very well that those were sporadic cases which had nothing to do with the organized uprisings and the struggles with the other sects that the *ikkō* used to carry on.

Founded by Rennyo in 1496, by Nobunaga’s time it offered a strong resistance under its chief abbot Kōsa Kennyo. For the story of the Honkanji and
Tenka had, in a broader sense, the meaning of all that exists under heaven (ame ga shita), but never with the very specific one of the Chinese t'ien hsia. More strictly it stood for ‘state’, ‘empire’, hence Japan. The usage of the word tenka goes back to the Taika Reform[72], obviously with different connotations. In the 16th century, Nobunaga used it for the first time in his seal tenka jubu[73]. The Jesuits reported the term tenka (spelt tenca and sometimes wrongly tensa) in their works and letters[74], always giving to it the meaning of ‘monarchy’ or ‘empire’ which must be understood, anyway, as ‘government of the Ruler’ (who was called tenkasama) not as ‘government of the emperor’. Tenka stood then, at that time, for the country or the government of Japan. It is with precisely this meaning that Hideyoshi uses it in this memorandum[75].

Though the Honganji monto have been permitted to keep tera in every place of the country, we are not willing to support jinai as before.

This item makes only a clear distinction between jinai and tera. Only the latter are allowed, small temples where the bonzes live supported by their believers. True religious centres, and therefore not politically dangerous.


38 It is interesting to note the various translations one can find for tenka lubu[76]: "Rule the Empire by Force", "(Spreading) Martial Spirit under Heaven", "Domination over the country with arms", in which the two meanings of tenka appear clearly interchangeable.


40 The fact that Hideyoshi signed some of his private letters tenka in kana[77] does not mean that he identified himself with it. In this case tenka stands for denka[78], that is the title of honour he deserved as a kanpaku. In fact, we find that such a signature appears only in the letters written in the period 1585—1592, that is from the moment he was appointed kanpaku until he left the title to become taiko[79].

41 (7) Hitotsu Honganji monto sono bōzu tsutsuura ni tera wo tatesase yuru-shiki sōrō [to] iedomo jinai ni maemon [no] gotoku niwa otsukerarezu sōrō koto. I have preferred here Watanabe’s version which gives tsutsuura, as the writing in the two Mss. is rather difficult and has no clear meaning. In fact, less clearly in Ms. 2012—250 and better in Ms. 2012—144, the two kanji can be read tenama[77] (place name?), but it makes no sense in the translation. Watanabe, probably after examining the Ise copy, thought he could interpret the two signs[79] as being tsutsuura[79], in the meaning of ‘through the whole country’.

[72]大化改新 (73) 天下布武 (74) てんか (75) 殿下
[76]大関 (77) 天満 (78) てん (80) つ

These tera are even permitted in every part of the country without limitation as the word tsutsuuraura shows. But they must be well distinct from the jinai which were generally put at strategic points and which are from now on forbidden.

[8] 国郡又者在所を持候大名其家中之者共伴天連門徒二押付
成候事ハ本願寺門徒之寺内を立しより太不可然義候間

天下之わわり＝可成候条其分別無之者八可被加御成敗候事

That the daimyō in possession of a province or of a county or of a smaller piece of land urge their vassals to become bateren monto, this should be prohibited more intensely than in the case of the Honganji monto who established a jinai because it may be a greater trouble for the tenka: he who does not understand this should be punished.

Here we finally come to the point: but it is not a prohibition of Christianity as religion. It is not a refusal of its axioms, or a defense of shintō as in item 1 of Doc. C. It is a strong censure of the fact that some lords, great and small, have urged their vassals to become bateren monto. It is as if Hideyoshi were stressing the fact — so often repeated — that the lords do not own the land and therefore cannot do as they like with their vassals. Furthermore, Christianity is here compared not only with the ikkōshū, but more specifically with the ikkō who have established a jinai. As we have seen in item 6, the jinai were greatly feared by Hideyoshi who considered them a nest of rebellion: a congregation of Christian people could be even more dangerous. The thought of Portuguese help — in money, men, and especially in firearms — to the Christian lords was obviously always present in Hideyoshi's mind.

As he could do nothing — at a personal level — if a daimyō really wanted to become a Christian (the sole example of Takayama Ukon (Nagafusa) [81]

---

42 It is interesting to note that other scholars also (YOSHIDA, ERISAWA), while trying to interpret the handwriting with different solutions, are inclined to accept tsutsuuraura as the best rendering.

43 [8] Hitotsu Kokugun mata wa zaisho wo modi sōrō daimyō sono katchū no mano-domo bateren monto ni osuitsuke nashisōrō koto wa Honganji monto no jinai wo tateshi yori hanahada shikarubekarazaru gi [ni] sōrō aido tenka no sawari ni naru bekusōrō jō sono tanbutsu kore naki mono wa gosoiTai [wol] kuwarubeku sōro koto. In this item Ms. 2012—144 is right in giving ‘tenka no sawari ni’ while the scribe of Ms. 2012—250 copied ‘sasaiTai’.

44 Coelho’s behaviour, especially, appeared rather suspicious to Hideyoshi. Already during the first interview of May 1586 in the castle of Osaka, the Jesuit had offered the kanpaku not only the two Portuguese ships he had asked for, but also armed help from Portuguese India. After the Edict of Expulsion was issued, Coelho tried to convince the lord of Arima to form an armed coalition with the other Christian daimyō against the kanpaku. Arima obviously refused. Coelho then asked the Spanish and Portuguese of Manila, Macao and Goa for men and firearms. He obtained refusals in reply and the few firearms he did succeed in obtaining were abruptly sent back by Valignano, who severely censured Coelho’s conduct.

[81] 岡山石近 (長房)
should suffice, he had to break down the peril by isolating them and forbidding mass-conversion.

(9) 伴天連門徒心さし次第第二下々成候義ハ八宗九宗之義務候聞
不苦夏46

As for the lower classes who become bateren monto at their own discretion, it is permitted as it is for any other Buddhist sect.

The theme of the freedom of faith for the subordinates had already been expressed several times. It can be objected that such a freedom was easily given by Hideyoshi who, as we have seen, was convinced that the shimojimo had no aspiration to become Christian (remember the kokorozashi mo kore naki of item 2), but it is the repetition of kokorozashi shidai ni ("according to one's private sentiments", "at one's own discretion") which is meant to be clearly understood by the lords. In this case Hideyoshi must have thought that once the lord was forbidden to convert himself, once he was forbidden to force his people into mass-conversion, even if a shimojimo individually chose to become a Christian, there was no danger.

In this item Christianity is compared to the Buddhist sects (hasshū kushū, see also item 5) without any worry: it is even kurushikarazaru, that is 'something permitted in so far as it gives no trouble'.

(10) 人之売買停止之要47

Because it is unlawful to sell Japanese people to Great China, to Southern barbarians and to Korea, the selling and buying of men in Japan shall be prohibited.

Such an item may be surprising at a first reading, but it is much less astonishing if we compare it with the last point of Doc. B, the 'Four Questions' addressed to Coelho. The question was "why used the Portuguese to buy many Japanese and take them as their slaves into their lands?". Coelho's reply was "... and as for the Japanese whom the Portuguese used to buy, they used to buy them because other Japanese used to sell them, and this weighed heavily with the Fathers, and they used to do everything they could to stop it, but they could not do more, because the lords of the country and other people used to sell them, and if the Lord of the Tenka had wanted he could easily have put a stop to it, ordering the Lords of the...

---

46 (1552?—1615), daimyō in Settsu[83]. He was baptized in 1564 and given the name of Justo. He had the title of 'Ukon-tayu' and was thus called by the Jesuits Justo Ucondono. He died in Manila where he had been exiled by Ieyasu[84]. On the evening preceding the issue of the Edict, Hideyoshi had sent him a message ordering him to abjure his faith if he wanted to keep his domains. Takayama Ukon refused and Hideyoshi exiled him to Kaga. In Frois' words, his denial threw Hideyoshi into the utmost rage.

47 (9) Hitotsu Bateren monto kokorozashi shidai ni shimojimo nari sooro gi wa hasshū kushū no gi ni sai sooro a ga kurushikarazaru koto.

(10) Hitotsu Daitō Nanban Kōrai e Nihonjin wo uritsukawashi sooro koto kusegoto tsuki Nihon ni oite hito no baibai (urikai) chōji no koto.
Ports where the ships go not to allow any Japanese to be sold under great penalty. Hideyoshi did not take this matter further in the Edict of Expulsion (Doc. C), because Portuguese commerce was too important for him to condemn it for this reason.

About the traffic of slaves in Japanese territory there are different viewpoints on how long it lasted and whether the Jesuits themselves tolerated it. According to some Japanese sources it seems that the Jesuits connived at it and allowed the traffic to go on for many years. Western writers generally deny it or support the thesis that the Jesuits could not do much to stop it. It is Professor Boxer’s opinion that, in spite of all their efforts, the Jesuits were successful in putting an end to it only a quarter of a century later, i.e., in 1596.

On this matter I refer to Professor Alvarez-Taladriz, “Apuntes sobre el Cristianismo y la Esclavitud en Japón,” whose deep investigation of Western and Japanese sources makes it clear that the Fathers had no authority to oppose the merchants, but that they tried in every way to stop this commerce, which existed in Japan long before the arrival of the Portuguese.

To sell and buy cattle and horses for the purpose of killing and eating them, is also prohibited.

This last item, also, is an indirect thrust against the Christians which reminds us of the third point in Doc. B.

Thus, forbidding practices which have nothing to do with the faith, but which were connected in some way with the Christians, together with the previous items of limitations in freedom, Hideyoshi put heavy obstacles in the way of the propagation of the Christian faith in Japan.

---

48 The Portuguese text by Frois reads: "... porque os Portugueses compravão muitos Iapões & os levavao casiuos pera suas terras", with the reply "... E quanto aos Iapões que os Portugueses compravão, elles os compravão porque outros Iapões lhos vendiaä, & aos padres lhes pesava muito disso, & faziaä quanto podiaä para o impedir, mas não podiaä fazer mais, porque os mesmos senhores das terras & mais gentios lhos vendiaä, & que se sua Alteza quisesse elle poderia dar facilmente remedio, mandando aos senhores dos portos onde vão os navioä, sob graues penas, que não deixassem vender nenhum Iapão." Cartas, I, f. 208r.

49 Cfr. C. R. Boxer, Fidalgos in the Far East 1550—1770, London & New York, 1968, pp. 230—234. Actually, the Crown of Portugal was very attentive to this problem and a decree by King Sebastian dated March 1571 stated, for example, that "the purchase or acquisition of Japanese of either sex as slaves was strictly forbidden on pain of confiscation of the property of all offenders”. The problem was to render it executive owing to the great distance. That the Jesuits were pushing in the background is evident, "... principally because of the hindrance to the conversion of the heathen which arises from this practice”. C. R. Boxer, The Great Ship from Amacon, Lisboa, 1963, p. 36.

50 On pp. 498—511 of his comment to Valignano’s Adiciones del Sumario de Japón (1592).

51 (11) Hitotsu Gyuba wo urikai korosiu taberukoto kore mata kusegoto naru beki koto.

52 Frois: "... & porque comiaä cauallos & vacas, sendo cousa tão fora de rezaä, por serem animaes tão servicaes & proveitosos a republica ... ". Cartas, I, f. 207v.
The above stipulations are strictly prohibitive: if there are persons who violate them they must be immediately punished.

24th July 1587 (seal)

This is a fixed way of ending such memoranda: it must not been taken as a prohibition addressed specifically to Christianity.

A last remark: in the two copies at the Shiryō Hensanjo Library, in Watanabe's article and in other scholars' works the date is always the 18th day of the 6th month, that is one day before the Edict of Expulsion. Only one scholar, Ebisawa, and in only one of his works, is uncertain whether it is the 18th or the 19th. This may suggest that Hideyoshi's volte-face was as unexpected as generally stated, but I do not think this can be an acceptable opinion.

Anyway, regardless of the date, the core of the matter involving the whole nation was that the man responsible for its social security had finally taken sides.

We now turn to Doc. C (Pl. 3), that is the famous Edict of Expulsion in Five Points.

I have thought it preferable to present Frois' translation as well, for two reasons: firstly because it was through his words that European people came to know that Japan was no longer a Promised Land for Catholic proselytism, and secondly because all the versions given by Western texts depend heavily on his translation. The Portuguese is followed by Boxer's for a quick rendering.

I shall again give an item-by-item translation, comparing it with the other two documents and then presenting my personal interpretation of one or two points.

**Document C**

(1)  日本八神国より逐りしたん図より邪法を授候儀太以不可

然候事

---

54 Miği no jōjō kataku öchisereowannu moshi ibon (ihan) no yakara kore araba tachimachi genka [ni] shosararu beki mono nari / Tenshō jūgonen rokugatsu jūhachinichi / goshuin.


56 Cartas, I, f. 208r.

57 R. C. BOXER, *The Christian Century...*, p. 148. The author's comment on Frois' rendering says "It reads rather oddly to Western ears, but Frois explicitly states that it was translated ad verbum from the original, and indeed the Oriental flavor is obvious". *Op. cit.*, p. 469, note 7.

58 (1) Hitotsu Nihon wa shinkoku taru tokoro kirishitan koku yori jahō wo sazuke sōrō gi hanahada motte shikaru bekarazu sōrō koto.
Because Japan is a country of the gods it is very reprehensible to impose a bad religion from the Christian countries.

The definition of Japan as "country of the gods" is a drastic and definitive assertion which speaks clearly of Hideyoshi's intentions, as we have seen from the very beginning.

As Japan is a country of the gods, any faith which denies this axiom is against the law of Japan and must be fought. There is no way out of it, as Hideyoshi himself often repeated verbally to the Jesuits.

No open mention of the Fathers is made here (the word bateren appears only in item 3), but it is the rendering of sazuke soro[87] (instead of sazukari soro) which stresses the idea that the 'bad religion' is being imposed on the Japanese people by someone.

(2) 吊国郎之者を近付門徒にし神社神闇を破却させ前代未聞

It is unheard-of for someone to approach the people of the province and counties, to convert them to his own religion and to urge them to destroy the jinja and the bukkaku. The bestowal of chigyo as counties, provinces and smaller lands on the vassals is a temporary one. In every aspect of things people must observe the regulations of the tenka and do things with its agreement: he who, among subordinates, violates such regulations shall be punished.

The item may be divided into three parts. If we compare the original with Frois' translation we can see that, in the first sentence, Frois has put "we"
(Fathers) as a subject, while the Japanese text has an implied subject which may be 'the Fathers', but more likely is 'someone, any person'. In fact, as the sentence refers to the destroyers of shintō and Buddhist temples (jinja, bukkaku), there is a certain ambiguous reference to both the Christians and the ikkō. But the fact that this was given directly to the Jesuits, surely attracted Frois' attention to the Christians alone. The Jesuits were still suffering from the blow of the 'Four Questions' and this first part of the item was terribly similar to the second question, "porque destruyã­o os templos & varellas dos Cãmis & Fotoquês, perseguindo seus Bonzos & não se acommodando com elles." No one can deny that the Christian converts could easily be charged with the destruction of temples, but I think Hideyoshi took this good occasion to make a move against the ikkō also. Anyway, the keyword is that "monto ni nashi": we have already seen the meaning of the term monto in item 1 of Doc. A. To have retained the word bateren has, for me, the scope of enlarging its field of meaning.

The second part goes over and over again the fact that the kyûnin (see items 2 and 3 of Doc. A and note 27) did not own the land they lived on. Such a statement emphasizes the prohibition against pushing the subordinates into conversion (see also items 1, 2 and 8 of Doc. A), and warns the lords that they are not allowed to bestow the lands on the bateren (the same reproach had been made to the ikkō in item 6 of Doc. A, in so far as they were guilty of enfoeffing their chigyo to the bonzes of the ikkôshû). As a result, the confiscation of Nagasaki and Mogi soon followed.

The third part begins with tenka yori no gohatto (the regulations given by the government), which include every kind of rule, religious and secular. I find it difficult to agree with Frois-Boxer's rendering of this last sentence. For me, the shimojimo, i.e., the subordinates, are the subject of the sentence, the ones who must not violate the regulations of the tenka: they are not the "canaille which is stirred up to commit outrages."

---

63 Coelho's reply was a masterpiece of cant: "... nem èra entre nos costume de fazer Christãos por força, nem ainda que elles quisessem podiaõ forçar os Iapães pois estauão em suas terras liures, & os padres não tinham nelas nem poder, & que o que forçaua aos Iapães era a verdade da lei que se lhes pregaua, da qual elles mouidos se fazião Christãos, & como entendiaõ que na lei dos Cãmis & Fotoquês não auia saluac;ão, elles mesmos destruião seus templos & varellas, & fazião em seu lugar igrejas a Deos ... " Cartas, I, f. 207 v. English translation in Boxer, The Christian Century ..., p. 146. I like to think that Hideyoshi did not put a subject in the item on purpose: a subtle reply to Coelho.

64 As early as 1569, Omura Sumitada made an oral agreement with Father Cosme de Torres to hand over the place called Nagasaki. In 1580 there was a much discussed written transaction. For the latest observations see Diego PACHECO, "The Founding of the Port of Nagasaki and its Cession to the Society of Jesus", Monumenta Nipponica, XXV, 3-4, (1970), pp. 303-323.
If the bateren are willing to make the Japanese their parishioners with the rules of their wisdom at their own discretion, such a will as this breaks Buddhism in the Japanese area and such is wrong. So that the bateren should not be retained in the land of Japan and they must be ready to go back home within twenty days from today. If during this period, there is someone among the subordinates who acts against the bateren in an unreasonable manner, such is illegal.

This is the clue item. The Fathers are openly accused of bringing troubles onto Japanese soil and are ordered to leave the country.

This item, also, is divided into three parts, but with a logical succession which is lacking in the preceding one: the preaching of the Gospel being against the laws of Buddhism, the Fathers must go back and it is forbidden to do them harm.

My opinion is that the subject of the first sentence is the bateren and not 'the Lord of the tenka'. There is not the slightest allusion to the possibility that Hideyoshi 'allowed the Fathers to propagate their sect'. I think that Hideyoshi avoided speaking about it on purpose: in fact he had allowed the Fathers to proselytize up to this very moment and future events tells us that he did not do much to stop them. The point seems to me to be somewhat different. We had the previous statement (item 1) that 'Japan is the land of the gods', now we come to the defence of Buddhism — clearly expressed by the term buppō which Frois does not translate. We have already seen that Buddhism was thought to be one of the inseparable components of the Japanese social structure and that it was considered an important

---

Frois: "O terceiro se o senhor da Tenca tiver por bem, que segundo a vontade & intenção dos Christãos, os padres procedam com sua seita, assim como temos dito atras, se ficão quebrando as leis de Iapão: & sendo isto cousa tão mal feita, determino que os padres não estejão nas terras de Iapão. Pelo que doje a vinte dias concertando suas cousas, se tornem para seu reino, & se neste tempo alguém lhe fizer algum mal, serão por isso castigado."

Boxer: "If the Lord of the Tenka allowed the padres to propagate their sect, as the Christians wish and intend, this is contrary to the laws of Japan, as previously stated. Since such a thing is intolerable, I am resolved that the padres should not stay on Japanese soil. I therefore order that having settled their affairs within twenty days, they must return to their own country. If anyone should harm them within this period, the culprit will be punished."
factor in the stability of the country's welfare. Hideyoshi's attacks against the ikkō had this very same meaning and they were fought as disrupters of the established order. But as they belonged — all the same — to the Buddhist world, the kanpaku's aim was to reduce them back to a suitable monkish life, rather than eliminate them completely: this also owing to the fact that Nobunaga had already done good work.

But as the Fathers' preaching 'breaks Buddhism' (buppō wo aiyaburu), that is the social order, this fact will inevitably cause disorder: therefore it is forbidden.

One more observation to underline the fact that this item is strictly 'confined' to the Christians. Up to now, all reference to the followers of any faith has been rendered with the term montō (specifically montō, bateren montō and Honganji montō): we have already discussed the value of this word (Doc. A, item 1). Furthermore, to indicate the persons the Fathers were trying to convert, we had shimojimo and hyakushō for the lower class, kyūnin and daimyō for he upper one. Not one of these appears in the present item, but dannō is used. Danna is a Buddhist term and indicates the parishioners who support a temple, regardless of the sect they belong to. The meaning is clear: all the Japanese are dannō, that is they belong to a Buddhist temple. The bateren would break this unity: for this reason they must be punished.

The remaining part is so well known that it needs no comment. The Fathers have twenty days to make their preparations for leaving Japan and going back, undisturbed, to their countries.

(4) 黒船之儀ハ商売之事ニ候間各別に候条年月を經諸事売買い

たすへき事

As for the matter of the black ships as it concerns only trade it is a different thing and they can maintain such trade continuously.
This is the first (even if not definitive) official differentiation made by Hideyoshi between God and Mammon. We have already seen that the Kyushu lords were quick to learn that to receive the missionaries in their states also meant having the Portuguese ships land in their ports. This was well known to the Jesuits also. The Father-Visitor Alessandro Valignano wrote extensively on this problem in his Sumario. He judged the situation with detachment. First of all he remarks the great weight that the arrival of the ‘black ships’ had on conversions (a fact which had to be accepted) and then, basing his request on this particular situation, he states the necessity for the Pope to issue a Bull ordering all the Portuguese ships, under pain of excommunication, not to enter the ports of the daimyō who persecuted Christians. It was probably very difficult for the authorities in Rome to understand the reasons for such a request, but in effect Valignano was quite right. Portuguese commerce was very important for the Japanese especially after the decision of the Ming to shut all their ports to the Japanese owing to the frequent raids of the wakó, the Japanese pirates. Because of the impossibility of having regular commerce with the Chinese Empire, the Japanese had to make use of the Portuguese traders as an invaluable go-between. Already Nobunaga had understood this and repeatedly protected the Jesuits in order to facilitate this commerce.

Hideyoshi repeats here that ‘trade is a different thing’: but only with the arrival of the Dutch and the English in the 17th century was there a clear separation between religion and commerce.

(5) 自今以後仏法のさまたけを不成輩に商人之僕ハ不急申申つ

れにてもきりした人国より往還くるしからす候奈可成其意

事

己上

天正十五年六月十九日

72 a ... la principal ayuda que los Padres tuvieron para eso fueron los navíos de los portugueses, que van todos los años de la China a Japón, los cuales deseando los señores de Shimo que fuesen a sus puertos, por los grandes intereses que sacan de ello con sus derechos, y pareciendo a cada uno de ellos que irían a sus puertos de mejor gana si tuviesen Padres y cristianos, concedieron, aunque eran gentiles, que los Padres hiciesen iglesias y cristianidad en sus puertos ... " Sumario, p. 164; 

"... y porque a las veces acontece entrar los portugueses con sus navíos en tierras de señores gentiles, que persiguen gravemente a la cristianidad y a los Padres, y hacen mil desafueros destruyendo y quemando iglesias y las imágenes, de que se sigue muy grande escándalo y abatimiento de la religión cristiana, ya que no podemos hacer que ellos entren en estos puertos que nosotros queremos, parece conveniente y necesario alcanzarse un breve de Su Santidad, con pena de excomunión, que no entren los portugueses en puertos de señores que persiguen la cristianidad o no quieren que se haga conversión en sus tierras ... ", Sumario, p. 169.

73 (5) Hitotsu Jikon i go buppō no samatage wo nasazaru tomogara wa shōnin no gi wa mō[sun] oyobasu izunenitemo kirishtan koku yori ōkan kurushikarazu sōrō jō sono i [wo] nasu beki koto / Ijō / Tenshō jafonen rokugatsu jūkunichi.
It must be understood and observed that from now on the people who do not trouble Buddhism including not only the tradesmen but also anyone even coming from Christian countries, can come and go as long as it is not troublesome. Here ending. 24th July 1587.

It is interesting to observe Frois' translation here. Where the text says 'kirishitan koku yori' he translates it directly as 'que vierem da India', that is that the Christian countries of the text are identified solely with the part of the Indies under Portuguese dominion.

In this fifth item, one can feel Hideyoshi's worry that commerce — any kind of commerce — may suffer from this edict against Christianity, and that he is hastening to make clear to everybody that freedom of movement is given to anyone who does not disturb Buddhism. The hint to the Christian countries has no reference at all to the missionaries themselves, but to people in general. However, while ni temo (= even) refers grammatically only to izure (= anyone), from the context one can see that it is applied also to kirishitan koku yori, so that we read that it is permitted 'not only to the traders but also to anyone even coming from Christian countries' to come to Japan.

---

74 *Frois: "O quinto, da qui por diante, não somente mercadores, mas quaequer outras pessoas que vierem da India, & não forem impedimento as leis dos Cãmis & Fotoquas, podem vir livremente, & assi o saibão. Aos quinze annos da era de Tenxon, aos dezanoue dias da sexta lua."

*Boxer: "Henceforward not only merchants, but anyone else coming from India, who does not interfere with the laws of the Shinto and Buddhist deities may come freely to Japan, and thus let them take due note of this. On the nineteenth day of the sixth month of the fifteenth year of Tensho."
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