A Tale of Two *Templa*: Sacred Spaces, Intercultural Encounter, and the First Jesuits in Italy and Japan

Frank Lacopo
The Pennsylvania State University

Jesuits in Japan: Interaction and Connectivity

The Portuguese sailor and trader Mendes Pinto, later a companion of the Jesuit Francis Xavier, claimed to have "discovered" Japan in 1542.[1] Although he had an expedient personality, his description of Japan and the South China Sea trade is strikingly accurate and gives his claim credibility. Even if he was not the very first European to tread Japanese soil, he was undoubtedly "one of the earliest Portuguese travelers to that country, which he visited three or four times between 1544 and 1556." This potentially earliest European voyager to Japan was an associate of Francis Xavier both before and during the Jesuit leader's early missionary efforts in Japan, a fact that that prolific member of the Society of Jesus' own reliable correspondence corroborates. Pinto indeed helped to finance one of the first Jesuit churches in Japan in 1551 and seems to have taken the Society's *Exercises* and become a Jesuit himself in 1554.[2] European trade, exploration, and missionary activity in the South China Sea were demonstrably intertwined during the mid- and late-1540s. The Jesuits were thus at the forefront of intercultural interaction between Reformation Europe and warring states-period Japan.

Xavier and his small retinue initially met benign circumstances in Japan – surprising since the islands hosted ongoing internecine war during what has been called its "warring states" or *Sengoku* period (c.1467-c.1603). Xavier's landing spot in the Satsuma region of Kagoshima prefecture was enjoying a respite from violence in 1549.[3] Xavier noted of the initial landing:

---

[1] C. R. Boxer, *The Christian Century in Japan 1549-1650* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951), 20-23.

[2] Boxer, *The Christian Century in Japan*, 20.

[3] Ibid., 41.

> By the favor of God we all arrived at Japan in perfect health on the 15th of August, 1549. We landed at Cagoxima [Kagoshima], the native place of our companions. We were received in the most friendly way by all the people of the city, especially the relations of Paul, the Japanese convert, all of whom had the blessing to receive the light of truth from heaven, and by Paul's persuasion became Christians. During our stay at Cagoxima the people appeared to be wonderfully delighted with the doctrines of the divine law, so entirely new to their ears.[4]

This fortuitous alignment allowed Xavier to begin negotiations immediately with local notables for permission to establish a center of missionary operations. An early Japanese adherent to and personal translator for Xavier named Yajirō informed the Jesuits that, at least according to some interpretations, the Buddhist deity Dainichi takes a three-in-one form, and thus seemed similar enough to the Christian god to allow for a syncretic argument that existing Buddhist cosmologies in fact fit with Christianity.[5] Xavier embraced this coincidence as an opportunity to argue for syncretism.[6] Despite the extreme tenuousness of the Dainichi-Christian god parallelism, the Jesuits seem to have enjoyed early success: "[B]y means of daily sermons and disputes with the bonzes [Xavier's term for local Buddhist scholars], the sorcerers, and other such men, we converted to the religion of Jesus Christ a great number of persons, several of whom were nobles."[7]

---

[4] Francis Xavier, "Letter from Japan, to the Society of Jesus in Europe, 1552," on Fordham University History Sourcebook, accessed November 17, 2017, https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/mod/1552xavier4.asp.

[5] Michael Cooper, "A Mission Interrupted," 395.

[6] While the Jesuits are traditionally portrayed as especially syncretic in all contexts, Xavier and his band were isolated apologists in this early period. Francisco Javier Clavigero, the first notable Jesuit syncretist in Latin America, wrote the authoritative (that is, doctrinal) account of the Virgin of Guadalupe's appearance in 1782, more than two centuries after Xavier's death. See Stafford Poole, *Our Lady of Guadalupe*: *The Origins and Sources of a Mexican National Symbol*, *1531-1797* (Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 1997), 201-202. José de Acosta (c. 1540-1600), the first prominent Jesuit in Latin America spent his tenure abroad condemning the "idolatry" of native peoples and even criticizing local secular priests of being too accommodating of indigenous spiritual practices. This became a Latin American Jesuit project from their arrival in Brazil in 1549. See Francis X. Clooney, "Roberto de Nobili's Dialogue on Eternal Life and an Early Jesuit Evaluation of Religion in South India," in *The Jesuits*: *Cultures*, *Sciences*, *and the Arts*, *1540-1773*, ed. John W. O'Malley, Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Steven J. Harris, and T. Frank Kennedy (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 408.

[7] Francis Xavier, to the Society in Europe, January 29, 1552, in *The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier*, ed. Henry James Coleridge, vol. 2 (London: Burns and Oates, 1872), 336.

Unsurprisingly, Xavier attributes his and the Jesuits' success to a combination of divine favor and their own rhetorical prowess. In the face of Jesuit preaching, the bonzes allegedly "could not defend [their religious claims]."[8]

The Jesuits' opportunity to establish a physical base of Japanese operations came in 1551 when duke Ōuchi Yoshitaka of Yamaguchi granted to Xavier an abandoned temple that could serve as a mission. The Jesuit leader's good fortune was most likely a result of his revised approach to presenting himself and his companions. In mid-1551, Xavier appeared before duke Ōuchi in silken robes becoming not of a poor mendicant, but a Portuguese emissary from Goa.[9] As Michael Cooper explains, the Jesuit project in Japan "offers an instructive case study in missiology" that featured a "break from traditional missionary methods employed in India, Africa, and Latin America."[10] While Cooper refers principally to the Japanese Jesuits' methods for ascertaining financial resources through trade – deemed uncouth in other Jesuit missionary contexts – the order's display behavior constituted an additional opportunity for them to break tested European frameworks. Richard Trexler shows that Mediterranean Europeans steeped in Latin Christianity often recognized public humility as a means for clerics to express status and garner acknowledgement. The duke of Yamaguchi, on the other hand, responded positively (and charitably) to the gifts and the trappings of diplomatic formality.[11]

Tracking the Jesuits' first physical establishment in Japan is difficult, but not impossible. The Jesuits, normally prolific writers, were

---

[8] Ibid., 336.
[9] Boxer, *The Christian Century in Japan*, 27.
[10] Cooper, "A Mission Interrupted," 393.
[11] Richard Trexler, *Public Life in Renaissance Florence* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991) remains the central text in the field of early modern public display. Pages 49-50 are particularly revelatory of clerical display customs as concerns sacred space. Churches built for and maintained by the mendicant orders (Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians) contained architectural features that suggested their status as dispensers of public goods, including crypts for local peoples' burial. By suggesting a mission of selflessness and humility for the commonweal, European clerics (somewhat oxymoronically) aggrandized themselves.

more concerned with the theological debates that occurred within their second-hand temple and spilled almost no ink describing the structure itself. If there are any sources in Japanese that describe the building as a venue for Jesuit interaction with Japanese religious and lay people, they remain in early modern Japanese and thus inaccessible to most Western scholars, including myself. The best source for the temple's existence and its period of Jesuit occupation is the Portuguese interpreter and sailor Rodrigues Tçezza's account of the relevant events, which he must have received at second-hand owing to his very young age at the time of the relevant events. Tçezza reproduces the text of the deed allegedly granted to the Jesuits from duke Yoshitaka: "[W]e, the duke of the kingdom of Suwō [a contemporary place name], hand over through this deed signed by us the site of the monastery of Daidōji of this city of Yamaguchi of the kingdom of Suwō to the priest [Xavier]…so that he may build a monastery and temple on it…"[12] Daidōji temple, as is suggested in the deed, came with land that Xavier and his companions deemed suitable as the site for a college.

The first months of Daidōji's Jesuit occupation must have seemed to the Jesuits in residence like their days at university and a fulfilment of their evangelical mission all at once. The local bonzes, undoubtedly men of equal intellect as the cream of the University of Paris' crop (and they do all appear to be men according to Xavier's accounts), frequented Daidōji's chambers for theological conversation, always through translators such as Yajirō. Xavier elated that "[t]he Japanese are led by reason in everything more than any other people, and in general they are all so insatiable of information and so importunate in their questions, that there is no end either to their arguments with us, or to their talking over our answers among themselves."[13] In other words, their open minds made the Japanese ideal

---

[12] Reproduced in Georg Schurhammer, *Francis Xavier: His Life, His Times*, trans. M. Joseph Costelloe, vol. 4 (Rome: The Jesuit Historical Institute, 1982), 220.
[13] Francis Xavier, to the Society in Europe, 337-338.

candidates for conversion.[14] The bonzes, for their part, relished in what Xavier called, in his Latin Christian parlance, "disputation," or theological conversation and argument.[15] Xavier's band and Yamaguchi's bonzes discussed creation, the plausibility of the immortal soul, and the relation of the human self to the divine. Though the bonzes adhered to Buddhist fundamentals that taught the mutability of the self – and thus the impossibility of a personal soul in the strictest sense – the superficial similarities between Dainichi and the Trinitarian Christian god gave the Jesuits hope that Japanese recognition of a three-in-one divinity spoke to some natural law that imparted knowledge of "true" religion to the Japanese despite geographical isolation.[16]

For its short history, this first Jesuit conversionary space in Yamaguchi thus served as the setting for one of the most fascinating and dramatic events of intercultural encounter in world history. Daidōji was dedicated to none other than the deity Dainichi. This first locus of "conversion" in Japan seemed to Japanese, both scholarly and lay, to be a venue where foreigners evangelized some new message of Dainichi, with no serious conceits of overthrowing Buddhism. Xavier and his companions only discovered after extended discussion with the Yamaguchi bonzes that Dainichi was in fact the creator deity in the Shingon Buddhist sect, an esoteric school of Japanese Buddhist thought stemming from Mahayana thought in India and transplanted to Japan via Chinese esoteric theology.[17]

---

[14] As early as 1549, Xavier wrote to his fellow Jesuits at Coimbra that the "Japanese nation appeared to be extremely well disposed to receive the preaching of the Gospel. It is very circumspect and prudent, judging of things by motives of reason, and also wonderfully curious to learn anything new that is brought to it. For this reason I for my part have conceived a great hope, relying on the assistance of God, that very considerable fruit will result among some of the Japanese, perhaps in all of them, and that a great number of those wandering souls will join themselves to the fold of the holy Church, unless indeed our own sins hinder our Lord God from vouchsafing to use us as the instruments of his glory." Xavier, to the Fathers and Brothers at the College of Coimbra, June 22, 1549, in *The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier*, 178-179.

[15] Schurhammer, *Francis Xavier*, 220-222.

[16] Neil S. Fujita. *Japan's Encounter with Christianity: The Catholic Mission in Pre-Modern Japan* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 40-41.

[17] Fujita. *Japan's Encounter with Christianity*, 395. For more on Shingon Buddhism and Dainichi's place within it, see Ibid., 29-30.

Though tripartite, Dainichi had no son incarnate and did not exist before the world in the same way that the Christian god was absolutely eternal. The idea that Dainichi could be crucified was preposterous. Given more efficient and accurate interlocution, this revelation may have come to the scholars of Daidōji much sooner. In the Yamaguchi monastery's decidedly Buddhist setting, the Jesuits merely appeared to many as especially strange missionaries from India. Considering that their base of operations was in Goa, this was not an entirely misleading impression. There are, indeed, reports of well-to-do Japanese offering alms to Xavier and his company as if the Jesuits were poor holy men from India, not an uncommon sight in sixteenth-century Japan.[18]

Upon this unfortunate discovery of theological incompatibility, Daidōji became to the Jesuits a fortress against less accommodating non-Christians. The temple became the site of what Georg Schurhammer calls a "war" between the Jesuits and the bonzes.[19] Soon before leaving for new evangelical pursuits in China (where he would die), Xavier ordered the rest in his company to stop equating Dainichi with the Christian god, who was to go by the name *Deus* or *Deusu* thenceforth.[20] To the Japanese bonzes, Daidōji's sacred space had been defiled by distorters and exploiters of Shingon Buddhism. Unarmed bonzes were not the greatest danger to the Jesuits, either. Though Yamaguchi seemed peaceful upon the Jesuits' arrival, Japan was embroiled in a period of warring states. The Mōri clan, one of the period's greatest naval powers, took a strong stance against Christianity and thus made Daidōji into a locus for xenophobic behavior and a flashpoint in a military and political history in which spirituality was of secondary concern. The new religion that the Jesuits proffered from Daidōji meant little to the Mōri, who were principally occupied with taking over Yamaguchi and its hinterlands from the weakening Ōuchi clan and their

---

[18] Ibid., 25.
[19] Schurhammer, *Francis Xavier*, 226.
[20] Schurhammer, *Francis Xavier*, 222-226.

allies, with whom the Jesuits numbered.[21] Knowing Japanese politics better than the Jesuits, the conservative Buddhist contingents of Yamaguchi aligned with Mōri Motonari. In return for their support, Daidōji was forcibly turned over to the Shingon bonzes.[22]

Surprisingly, the abrupt arrival and strangeness of the Jesuits in combination with the political and military unrest that plagued their mission did not deter some inhabitants of Yamaguchi from converting to Catholicism and remaining Catholic despite the revelation that Dainichi had nothing to do with Christ. Even in the face of persecution at the hands of warring *daimyō* unsympathetic to Christianity, including an increasingly hostile Toyotomi Hideyoshi, the converts of Daidōji remained Christians decades after the temple's confiscation. In 1586, the high-ranking Jesuit Luis Frois recorded the appearance of Christians who approached his ship at sea near Japan. They reported that they were "Christians from Yamaguchi, baptized by that most holy father, Master Francis [Xavier], who came to Japan. It is now some thirty-seven years that we [the Japanese converts] have been Christians."[23] It is difficult to say how many converts Xavier and his companions actually accumulated, since Jesuit reports are suspect to exaggeration. Georg Schurhammer, perhaps still the foremost authority on Francis Xavier, hazards a guess of over two thousand.[24] Xavier himself claims to have converted five hundred by July 1551, but his reports are inconsistent and there is no suggestion that he kept an accurate record at Daidōji.[25] For Frois to happen upon some of Daidōji's converts by chance as late as 1586, though, Xavier's converts must certainly have been about.

---

[21] Jurgis Elisonas, "Christianity and the Daimyo," in *The Cambridge History of Japan*, ed. John Whitney Hall, vol. 4 (Cambridge" Cambridge University Press, 1991), 315.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Luis Frois, Letter of October 4, 1586, reproduced in Schurhammer, *Francis Xavier*, 233-234.

[24] Schurhammer, Francis Xavier, 235, n. 100.

[25] Francis Xavier, to the Society at Goa, July 1551, in *The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier*, 301.

The Roman *Casa dei Catecumeni*: Papal Power over Conversionary Space

The histories of conversionary spaces are inextricable from their broader political and social contexts. While the Jesuits' headquarters resided in Rome, even the eternal city and seat of the papacy comprised a precarious environment for the earliest Jesuits' conversionary activities. Thanks to the reigns of strong popes such as Alexander VI, born Rodrigo Borja (r.1492-1503), the papacy established firm political influence over the city of Rome. To say that the papacy consolidated power over Roman secular authorities is a misled perspective, since the papal throne, the College of Cardinals, and other papal advisors very often belonged to one of the leading Roman families – the Medici, the della Rovere, or the Colonna. Papal power in early modern Rome was inextricable from secular power and all of the vying that came with it. Mid-sixteenth-century Rome was, like contemporary Yamaguchi, a politically and socially turbulent place that remained benign just long enough for the nascent Jesuit Order to establish a house of conversion.

The idea of setting up a house of conversion for Jews and Muslims in Rome was older than the Society of Jesus itself (founded 1540). On April 7, 1533, Pope Clement VII (r.1523-1534) issued a bull entitled *Sempiterno Regi* that called for institutions to be established across Christendom for non-Christians to convert "ex Judaismo, et Mahometica...ad fidei Christi," or "from Judaism and Islam (lit. 'Muhammad-ism') to the faith of Christ."[26] Clement's bull is thoroughly an artifact of the Catholic church during the early Reformation, as it mainly concerned *conversos* – Jews compelled to convert to Christianity in Spain c.1492 in order to avoid expulsion from Iberia.[27] The Protestant Reformation, which historians generally concede began with Martin Luther's 1517 protests against the Church's abuses of indulgences, instilled within papal circles new paranoia over the supposed

---

[26] Clement VII, *Sempiterno regi* (April 7, 1533), in *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, ed. Shlomo Simonsohn (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1990), 1856-1864.
[27] Clement VII, *Sempiterno regi*.

machinations of heterodox Christians and non-Christians in Europe. Even those who had visibly received baptism were not to be trusted.[28] The papal and broader Catholic conversionary agenda existed only on paper for a decade. From 1533 to 1543, the Papal See was reeling within a context of early Reformation, preoccupied with coordinating Catholic expansion into the Americas on the heels of Spanish *conquistadores*, and absorbed in the first stages of urban restoration and recovery projects after the 1527 Sack of Rome.

Rome was in no shape to host a functional conversion house, or *Casa dei Catecumeni*, until the mid-sixteenth century, for after the siege,

> Plague and famine seized the city, and in the winter of 1527-1528 doors, windows and woodwork in the city, even to many of the roofbeams, had been burned, every piece of ironwork torn out even to the nails...The victims were cardinals and nobles at one end of the social scale; at the other were the wretched Jewish rabbis who had "no shirts on their backs, no bread, no wood in the house.[29]

The city's infrastructure – architectural, administrative, and spiritual – fell into disarray for years and *ad hoc* social and political organization became the norm. In 1540, for instance, when the Jesuits' principal founder Ignatius of Loyola began taking in young Roman Jews interested in conversion, he and his companions had to rent an apartment from their personal funds to house the catechumens.[30] After three years, on February 19, 1543, Pope Paul III finally issued a bull that permitted the creation of a conversion house in a building adjacent to the church of St. John de Mercatello in an area of the city between the medieval population core to the north near the Vatican and

---

[28] For an excellent discussion of *conversos* and *moriscos* (recently converted former Muslims), the extent to which those groups may or may not have genuinely adhered to their new faith, and the social and political problems surrounding them, see Mark D. Meyerson, *The Muslims of Valencia in the Age of Fernando and Isabel*: *Between Coexistence and Crusade* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

[29] Peter Partner, *Renaissance Rome 1500-1559*: *A Portrait of a Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976).

[30] Lance Gabriel Lazar, *Working in the Vineyard of the Lord*: *Jesuit Confraternities in Early Modern Italy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 112.

the Jewish quarter to the south.[31] Paul III called for the foundation of a monastery, a hospital (meaning in in the early modern context simply a place for individuals' improvement), and a confraternity (a group of charitable laymen) to conduct the house's daily functions.[32] The monastery was to be set up "pro puellis," or "for the little [Jewish] boys."[33] While this phrase is imprecise and somewhat up to interpretation, it seems relatively clear that from the beginning Paul intended the house to send non-Christian boys on the path to priesthood. How far the choice to pursue the priesthood was left to the volition of young converts is unclear based on the available documentation. Isolated accounts such as one that reports a teenage girl named Anna del Monte's forced matriculation into the house, however, gives a glimpse into the abusive and coercive behavior that surely took place.[34] The extent to which the papacy intended conversion in the *Casa* to be voluntary as a matter of all-encompassing policy nevertheless remains obscure.

Whatever the case was precisely along those lines, the Papacy had much more control over the conversion house in Rome than the one in Yamaguchi owing to the Roman house's proximity to the Vatican and the Popes' jurisdiction over Rome and its charitable institutions. Paul chose Ioannes de Torano, the Jesuit proprietor of St. John de Mercatello, as the *Casa*'s director. Like the Yamaguchi house founded eight years later, the Roman *Casa dei Catecumeni* was to be a Jesuit house. The house was also similar to Daidōji in that it acted as an unlikely locus of activity for some of the period's most important political and religious actors.

Through ecclesiastical actors' activities, it is easier to determine how compulsory conversion was intended to be for the *Casa*'s residents. Ignatius of Loyola pressured Paul III in 1542 to allow Jews to retain the

---

[31] Paul III, bull of February 19, 1543, in Simonsohn, ed., *The Apostolic See and the Jews*. 2329-2334.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Lazar, *Working in the Vineyard of the Lord*, 117.

property that they held as Jews after their conversion. The pope obliged and in the same year issued the bull *Cupientes Iudeos* to confirm the allowance.[35] By 1558, the confraternal organization originally associated with the conversion house supported around 200 catechumens.[36] While catechumens such as Anna del Monte, a young woman, may have been coerced to convert, the papacy did ensure some benefits for landowning converts who were principally male and older.

The original conversion house under the jurisdiction of Ioannes de Torono did not last. The papal bulls passed over the next several years show developing papal preference for the laymen of the *Casa*'s confraternity over the Jesuit administration. On February 15, 1544, Paul III redistributed the house's tasks and granted more administrative power to the confraternity.[37] After the bull's implementation, the Jesuits were relegated to evangelism to the Jewish community – just to the Casa's west – and the more mundane work of ministering directly to the catechumens.[38] Though the house's structure sat adjacent to a Jesuit church, the Jesuits were stripped of most major decision-making responsibilities. The pope seems to have been happy with the house's performance and mission, but not necessarily the Jesuits within it. A May 14, 1546 bull demonstrates this continued papal favor in that it exempts the *Casa* of all taxation.[39] If papal bulls can be taken as indicators of the *Casa*'s success, the house was thriving thanks to its high profile in the papacy's purview and its accumulation of privileges.

Those privileges continued after Paul III's death. His successor, Julius III, issued two bulls – on August 25, 1550 and September 14, 1551 –

---

[35] Robert Aleksandyr Maryks, *The Jesuit Order as a Synagoge of Jews*: *Jesuits of Jewish Ancestry and Pure-of-Blood Laws in the Early Society of Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 62.

[36] Ibid., 63.

[37] Paul III, *Ad monasteria* (February 15, 1544), in *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, 2398-2400.

[38] The bull also guaranteed all non-Christians the ability to convert through the house even if they had been convicted of a crime or sentenced to death.

[39] Paul III, bull of May 14, 1546, in *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, 2534-2535.

confirming the house's exemption from taxes.[40] This twofold repetition of a previous papal edict can be read either as needed enforcement against civic authorities who were attempting to tax the *Casa* or simple assurances to the house of continued papal support at a juncture of administrative change. Either way, the papacy was emphatically on the *Casa*'s side.

The confraternity was clearly the target of and the audience for of these bulls, as the documents explicitly designate the confraternity (or, as we learn in the bull of 1551, the recently promoted archconfraternity) as the subject. The Jesuits are marginalized considering their (possibly intentional) absence from the bulls. The final straw in papal-Jesuit relations seems to have come on or immediately before October 7, 1553, when Julius III called for the immediate removal of Ioannes de Torano and the transfer of all Jesuit property in the *Casa* – including the structure itself – to the lay archconfraternity.[41] What was the reason for the dramatic demise of the Jesuits in their *Casa* by papal fiat? Published primary sources give little clue while available secondary sources have little to say. Lance Lazar and others paint a picture of the house's history in which Jesuit clerical authority smoothly transitions into confraternal administration while neglecting what must have been a turbulent if obscure transition.[42] The truth of the matter on Ioannes is hard to detect and calls for further research.

Conclusions: Sacred and Political Spaces

The geographical separation and divergent cultural contexts of Daidōji Temple and the *Casa dei Catecumeni* should not hinder their comparison. While from one perspective the houses' two histories are Japanese and Roman – the manner in which they have been treated in the extant literature – those histories are also comparable as spatially-oriented and connective

---

[40] Julius III, bull of August 25, 1550, in *The Apostolic See and the Jews*. 2748-2749; Julius III, papal confirmation of *motu proprio* of September 14, 1551, in *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, 2797.

[41] Julius III, *Ex superne dispositionis* (October 2, 1553), in *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, 2895-2898.

[42] Lazar, *Working in the Vineyard of the Lord*, 114-116.

through their common Jesuit association. Though on opposite sides of the world, two principal actors in the conversion houses' histories – Ignatius of Loyola and Francis Xavier – were close associates at the University of Paris and later in their earliest ministries in the 1530s.[43] As this research has hopefully shown, these conversionary histories run deep with many tributaries and rivulets, some well-documented and others profoundly obscure. While the principal historical figures involved – Jesuits, bonzes, and popes – were principally concerned with matters of theology and the aggrandizement of their religious factions, political, social, and even economic forces were inextricably bound to these Jesuit spaces. Impersonal historical forces along with spiritual convictions were present across the globe in the fascinating loci of intercultural interaction that were Jesuit conversionary spaces.

Beyond the fascinating stories that they tell, what is the purpose of studying global conversionary spaces in the sixteenth century? The answer may lie further afield than the bounds of the spaces themselves. Nicholas Terpstra has recently suggested that the European age of Reformation is best conceptualized not as a principally religious set of phenomena, but rather as a time of increased movement of peoples and ideas across Europe.[44] Early modern Europe saw the appearance of religious refugees on a massive scale. In order for people to be refugees, they must move from one place to another and must do so owing to forces outside their control. Religious refugees, following this rather simple line of reasoning, are reluctant travelers for religious reasons. Within early modern Europe, confessional struggles compelled devoutly religious people unwilling to convert whenever politics demanded it to move to a more hospitable kingdom or state, especially after the Peace of Westphalia cemented the principle of *cuius regio*, *eius religio* (roughly "to whom the territory belongs, so his religion will reign"). English

---

[43] For an excellent treatment of the earliest Jesuits from a biographical perspective, see John O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993).

[44] Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World*, *passim*.

Catholics moved to the Low Countries, French Protestants moved to America, and Jews moved wherever they could find temporary respite from extremist purgators of the Christian community.[45] In the sixteenth century, Jesuit clerics could be refugees from their spaces as well. With a comparative perspective on Rome and Japan, this phenomenon is clearly global.

The European age of Reformation drove both refugees and evangelists to travel further and under more extreme conditions than they had at any time during the Middle Ages.[46] Individuals who were previously considered principally religious figures look much more subject to political and social concerns when one takes a perspective on the spaces into which they moved, which they changed, and from which were forced. The increased movement of and clash between peoples was a global sixteenth-century phenomenon articulated in Iberian Jewish refugees to Italy, transatlantic *conquistadores*, and warring *daimyō*. Religion comprised only one of many reasons people moved, though a focus on the places where that movement precipitated political and social history is a good place to start understanding the structural undercurrents that made sixteenth-century history happen.

---

[45] For a striking example of the sudden harm that could befall Jewish communities, even before the reformation, see R. Po-chia Hsia, *Trent 1475*: *Stories of a Ritual Murder Trial* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

[46] For a more extreme example of religious orders' movement to new territories in the Middle Ages, see, for example, Frank Lacopo, "Reform and the Welsh Cistercian Houses: Colonialism and Postcolonialism," *Hortulus* 13 (2018) (forthcoming).