

X. THE CHURCH MILITANT AND MERCANTILE

Although the emphasis in this work has been laid more on the secular than on the religious history of the City of the Name of God, yet the two are so closely interwoven that any attempt to exclude the purely religious factor would be exceedingly misleading. No City was more aptly named; for whilst Macao was founded as a place of trade, it speedily became the headquarters of Christian missionary activity in the Far East, and its importance in this respect continued long after its commercial prosperity was a thing of the past. "Christians and Spices" was Vasco da Gama's succinct definition of that mixture of God and Mammon which had brought the Portuguese to the East, and it must be admitted that they lost none of their ardour in the pursuit of souls even when the Spice Trade had fallen irrevocably into heretic hands. Whatever we may think of the results of Portuguese missionary endeavour, and however we may criticise some of the methods they used, it would be both churlish and unjust to ignore the noble ideal which inspired it, or to refuse our meed of admiration to the devoted workers in the mission-field. It is the more necessary to enter this caveat, as readers will find some of the less edifying aspects of apostolic zeal dealt with in this chapter, which, it must be remembered, tells only a part of the story, even when due allowance is made for the prejudices of the age. The epic of the Portuguese Jesuits in China still awaits its historian; and it is to be hoped that one of their compatriots will come forward to do for them what Father Serafim Leite has done for the story of the Jesuits in Brazil, or Father Rodrigues for those of Portugal proper. The history is one well worth the telling, apart from the fact that the Portuguese have suffered through the greater stress laid by foreign writers on the achievements of their

French and Flemish colleagues. Thus the works of Martini, Couplet and Le Comte are remembered where the pioneer labours of Semedo, Gouvea and Magalhais are forgotten. The most superficial student of the history of China's foreign relations is familiar with the names of Ricci, Schall and Verbiest, but he has probably never heard of the scarcely less influential Thomas Pereira, Joseph Soares and João Mourão. Unfamiliarity with the numerous but not readily available Portuguese sources has led to scant justice being done to these remarkable men, and it is not generally realised that the Portuguese Jesuits of Peking corresponded with the Royal Society of London, with the Imperial Academy of Russia and with the Royal Academy of Paris.

For the rest, one of the most famous French Jesuits, Père Amiot, wrote from Peking in 1752 that the Portuguese Padres made many more converts than their French colleagues. It was primarily as missionaries and not as scientists or as sinologists that the Jesuits came to China, although this simple fact is often in danger of being overlooked by some of their uncritical panegyrists who see them only as cultural interpreters between East and West. Nor are modern Portuguese writers to be absolved from blame in allowing the achievements of their countrymen to go by default. Where for instance in Lusitanian literature can one find any reference to Padre João Duarte S.J., who worked for over fifty years in China, not dancing attendance at the Court of Peking, but proselytising in the hinterland of Hunan? What have they to say of Padre Martinho Correa, who likewise spent over half a century as an active missionary in the Yangtse valley, or of Antonio Joseph Henriques, the proto-martyr of Kiangsu? Such brief facts as are known about these men and others of their ilk, are to be culled from the works of scholars like Pfister, Cordier and Henri Bernard. The seeker after knowledge in some modern Portuguese historical works would welcome a great deal less turgid rhetoric about the golden days of the dynasty of Aviz, and would prefer more facts and figures gained from a diligent perusal of the numerous documents in the Archives at Lisbon and Evora. If the work of the Portuguese Jesuits in China has been ignored or misrepresented, this is largely

due to the ignorance or indifference of their own countrymen.

Criticism of the Portuguese Jesuits in China was not lacking from the earliest times, and can best be dealt with by its discussion under three heads. The first of these is the hotly contested question of the *Padroado*, or Patronage claimed or exercised by the Portuguese Crown over all missionaries in China and Japan; secondly, the no less bitterly discussed problem of the Chinese (Confucian) Rites; and lastly, the vexed matter of the revenues which the Fathers of the Society derived from trade. All these problems were more or less closely interwoven, but it will be more profitable to consider them separately as far as possible.

The *Padroado* can be defined on the right of patronage granted by the Holy See to the Crown of Portugal in matters of evangelisation and ecclesiastical administration in the region vaguely known as *India*, extending from the Cape of Good Hope to Japan. Numerous Papal briefs and bulls between 1418 and 1690 dealt with the privileges and duties appertaining to the Portuguese *Padroado* in Africa and Asia, as extended or modified from time to time by different Popes. The most important of these privileges was a Papal prohibition forbidding any missionary from sailing to "India" save by way of Lisbon and on board a Portuguese ship. Another much cherished privilege was the right of the Portuguese Crown to nominate or to confirm all appointments to vacant Bishoprics or other high ecclesiastical offices in Asia. Generally speaking, the effect of the *Padroado* when enforced with its full vigour, was to give the rulers of Portugal a monopoly in the religious and ecclesiastical sphere as complete as the naval and commercial domination which they sought to enforce in the Indian Ocean at the point of the sword.

The foundation of Spanish rule in the Philippines was the first serious blow struck against this monopoly of the Portuguese Crown, for the Spaniards stubbornly refused to acknowledge the validity of the *Padroado* in the countries bordering on the China Sea. Manila was soon in open rivalry with Macao for the leadership of the Far Eastern mission-field, the struggle largely taking the form of the Friars in the Philippines against the Jesuits in Macao. Although the So-

ciety of Jesus was not the first in the Far Eastern mission field, the energy and ability of its members, coupled with the strong support given it by the Crown of Portugal, soon enabled it to forge ahead of the Monastic Orders. The Jesuits indeed claimed — and for a time were granted — a monopoly of this field to the exclusion of all other Orders. So insistent were the Portuguese on their rights, that we find their Spanish monarch, King Philip II, writing to the Viceroy of India in 1595, to the effect that no Spanish monks from the Philippines were to be allowed in China or Japan, which were to be regarded as strictly Jesuit preserves. It is true that he gave a loophole by adding that if it should be necessary to have missionaries other than Jesuits at Macao, an exception was to be made in favour of Portuguese Capuchins from Malacca. These orders, and others of similar tenour promulgated from time to time between 1580 and 1600 by the Iberian Crown, were no more obeyed than were the parallel instructions forbidding all trade and intercourse between Manila and Macao. Already in March 1596, we find the Jesuit Bishop Pedro Martins writing from Macao that eight Spanish Franciscan friars were proselytizing in Japan "in disobedience of the Briefs of the Holy Father and the Edicts of the King". The aggrieved Prelate added that these Capuchins "had asked for the sum of ten thousand *cruzados* in alms from a Lady of the land, threatening her with dire pains and penalties in the next life if she did not give them, besides saying other things which caused great consternation". Unfortunately the lady's name is not stated, but the allegation probably refers to Gracia, the Christian wife of the talented (but agnostic) Daimyo, Hosokawa Tadaoki.

Relations between the Frairs and the Jesuits were still further exacerbated by Hideyoshi's persecution of Christianity inaugurated by the 'great martyrdom' of 1597, which each branch of the Church of Rome accused the other of having provoked. Nor did their common sufferings draw the members of the persecuted community together as might have been expected, but served in some ways to sharpen their differences. The Jesuits' attitude can be summed up in the words of one of their Order, Dom Affonso

have added. For when during one of the periodic Mahratta invasions a certain Bishop of the Propaganda sought refuge on Portuguese soil, the Viceroy and his Council with more Christian charity than the famous Jesuit, granted him the asylum he craved, — despite their standing instructions to ship all these prelates back to Europe if they could lay hands on them.

Supporters of the *Padroado* were not limited to Viceroys and Jesuits, but included all patriotic Portuguese. Thus we find the Macaonese Capuchin Friar, Jacinto de Deus, writing to the Prince-Regent Dom Pedro in October 1671, . . . "As a loyal vassal of Your Highness, I warn you that it behoves neither Your Highness' service nor the peace and quiet of the Religious Orders, principally that of Saint Francis, to admit the validity of Briefs from Rome, in what concerns the responsible ecclesiastical posts in this State, since the ambition of places and dignities is destructive of our poverty, and the rights of India are transferred to Rome. Moreover the persons concerned are usually incapable, and not being sufficiently meritorious to obtain promotion in the normal way, they seek for it by way of Rome. Your Highness should shut this door altogether, by ordering Viceroys and dignitaries of the Church not to recognise the validity of such offices, posts or appointments. Furthermore, Sire, it is not good to have foreigners in these parts. Up till now they have made not a single convert in so far as is known; those that they claim in books published in Europe, are pure falsehoods. This harvest was sown and reaped by Portuguese, and Portuguese alone are fitted for it".

Unfortunately for themselves these intransigent patriots were merely kicking against the pricks, for their protests were being swamped by the march of events. Father Vieira complained that the Prince-Regent had allowed Spanish Friars from the Philippines to enter the China mission-field by way of Macao; and he intimated that this privilege (which had been denied them when there was a Spanish dynasty on the throne of Portugal) was granted at the instance of the Dominican Archbishop of Evora, Frei Domingos de Guzman, bastard son of the Duke of Medina-Sidonia and hence a distant cousin of Dom Pedro. Although

Mendes, Patriarch of Ethiopia, who wrote from Goa to the College of the Propaganda Fide at Rome *circa* 1640, that "these crazy Friars are ruining the China Mission with their rashness, as they did that of Japan, which as long as it was the preserve of the Jesuit Fathers with their great learning and prudence, was left in peace and quiet". These complaints were echoed by the secular authorities of Portuguese India, most of whom sided with the Jesuits; thus we find the Viceroy, Count of Aveiras, writing to the King in March 1643, concerning the prevalent ecclesiastical feuds in Macao, "in the Secretariat at Lisbon you will find the history of the troubles which have racked Macao for the last thirty years, owing to the Governors of the Bishopric being Friars who were swayed by their prejudices . . . and this has been verified in the present dispute between the commissary of the Holy Office and the governor of the said Bishopric who is a crazy Capuchin Friar."

Nor was it only Spanish friars — foolish or otherwise — who aroused the bitter criticism of the zealous defenders of the Portuguese *Padroado*. The vials of their wrath were also poured out on the heads of the French missionaries nominated by the Holy See and subsidised by Louis XIVth of France. Padre Antonio Vieira, greatest of Portuguese Jesuits, wrote from Rome in January 1673, to his friend Duarte Ribeiro de Macedo, Portuguese Minister at Paris; — "The secular and ecclesiastical authorities in India always stoutly resisted the Bishops sent out by the Propaganda, and in fact they even went so far as to arrest and ship back to Europe some of them, one of whom is now in Rome. And the Viceroy João Nunes da Cunha, shortly before his death [in 1668] wrote a letter to Cardinal Ursino, containing these formal words, that if Bishops came out to India who had not been nominated by the King of Portugal, he would have them hung publicly in Goa, even at the risk of the Congregation of the Propaganda declaring them as Martyrs; and neither should His Eminence nor the Congregation think that they could escape him anywhere, since he had plenty of soldiers and armed at that". "Thus far our friend", concluded Antonio Vieira, "who left in Portugal but few heirs of his spirit and determination". And in India too, he might

BOXER, Fidalgos in the Far East

11

this permission was subsequently revoked by a royal order of 1685, which insisted that all missionaries of whatever nationality proceeding to China must embark at Lisbon in Portuguese ships, the Viceroy replied that its enforcement was impractical. The majority of missionaries left in French ships and there was nothing to prevent them from disembarking direct at Canton. The Count of Alvor also pointed out that he could not prevent foreign Jesuits at Macao from taking the oath of obedience to the French Bishops of the Propaganda; concluding with the melancholy prophecy that if these politico-religious dissensions persisted, "all missionaries alike would be expelled from that Empire, and China will then be as completely closed to the sowers of the Gospel seed as Japan has been for so many years". It was the stringent orders to protect the Crown *Jus Patronatus* against all comers, which led the Governor of Macao to arrest some Spanish Friars from the Philippines who were on their way to Cambodia in 1686. The Senate protested against this act, pointing out that the Spanish authorities might take reprisals by interdicting the profitable but ostensibly illegal Macao-Manila trade. Much more serious was the arrest of the Papal Legate, Charles Maillard de Tournon, Patriarch of Antioch, after his return from Peking in 1707. But in this as in many other instances, the problem of the Portuguese *Padroado* was involved with that of the Chinese Rites, which agitated the Roman Catholic Church in China for over a century, and to which we must turn our attention briefly.

Volumes have been written on this bitterly debated question, with the outline at least of which the majority of readers are presumed to be familiar. For the benefit of those who are not, it can be stated in general terms as follows. The founder of the Peking mission, Father Matteo Ricci, and his followers attempted to show that the moral doctrine of Confucius in no way conflicted with Christian morality, and that the ritual observances connected with the cult of the Sage's memory were purely secular and of no religious significance. The majority of the Jesuits accepted Ricci's view that the ancient followers of Confucius believed in the one universal God of the Christians, and claimed that the

so-called Ancestor Worship of the Chinese was, if rightly understood, merely the formal token of respect paid to the memory of the illustrious dead. Ricci's conclusions had early been challenged by Longobardi, João Rodriguez and other Jesuits. But the Company as a whole accepted his point of view, whilst the most bitter and sustained opposition thereto came from the Mendicant Orders. Their principal spokesman in the 17th century was the widely-travelled and outspoken Spanish Dominican, Fray Domingo Fernández de Navarrete who carried the controversy into the realm of vituperation in the published and unpublished attacks he made on the rival Order. The Jesuit contention that the ancient Chinese had a knowledge of the One True God roused him to fury. Answering his own question *Was Confucius Saved?* he retorts witheringly that since Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, Seneca *et al* were irretrievably damned, how much the more Confucius "who was not worthy to kiss their feet"! There was almost no crime in the calendar of which he did not accuse the Jesuits of the Far Eastern Missions, from denial of their faith and marrying Japanese women, to falsification of printed devotional texts and advocacy of converting China by force of arms. Calvin and Knox between them would have been hard put to concoct a more scathing indictment of Jesuit morality; and irrespective of the merits of Navarrete's case, the wide circulation which the first of his treatises enjoyed in Europe (the second was suppressed by the Inquisition whilst in the press) did the Jesuit cause great harm; particularly since it came from the pen of an eminent dignitary of the Church who ended his life as Archbishop of San Domingo in the Antilles.

It would be as tedious as unprofitable to tread the thorny path of this controversy here, and we shall limit ourselves to glancing at its effects in Macao. Navarrete himself created a great furore by breaking his arrest at Canton (where the Jesuits stood bail for the good behaviour of the imprisoned missionaries in 1667-70) and taking refuge clandestinely in the Dominican convent at Macao, whence he escaped to India with the aid of the Captain-General, Dom Alvaro da Silva, in January 1670. Luckily for his captive coreligionists, the Kwangtung provincial authorities turned

a blind eye to this rash escapade, which otherwise might well have cost his colleagues their lives, and in any case added fuel to the flames of the already fierce controversy. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, the Holy See divided the China Mission into the three dioceses of Peking, Nanking and Macao, the jurisdiction of this last being limited to the provinces of the "Two Kwang" as Kwangtung and Kwangsi were commonly termed. The first Bishop of Macao, properly so-called (for his predecessors had been Bishops of Japan or of China residing in Macao) was Dom João do Casal, a cantankerous and patriotic Prelate who fought stubbornly for what he conceived to be the rights and privileges of the Portuguese *Padroado*. When this representative of the Church Militant came up against another Prelate as obstinate as himself, a conflict was inevitably precipitated which had the worst consequences for the future of the China Mission and the Company of Jesus.

Charles Thomas Maillard de Tournon, who reached Macao in April 1705, after a lengthy voyage via Pondicherry and Manila, was charged with the task of enforcing the Papal condemnation of the Confucian ancestor-worshipping and funeral Rites, which decree had hitherto been evaded or ignored by the Jesuits on one pretext or another. The Bishop and the Patriarch were on bad terms from the start, but an open breach between them was avoided until after the return of the latter from his unsuccessful visit to Peking, where he fell foul of the Emperor Kang-hsi on the definition of the Confucian Rites. Bishop Casal then came out into the open, and acting on orders from Goa, formally declined to recognise the validity of the Patriarch's jurisdiction in his diocese, on the grounds that de Tournon was not provided with the authorization of the King of Portugal, as he should have been in accordance with the Papal Bulls guaranteeing the rights of the *Padroado*. The Bishop not only refused to publish the Legate's decree formally condemning the Rites which the latter had read at Nanking in January 1707, but ordered all the ecclesiastical authorities in Macao to decline obedience to the Patriarch and to treat as null and void any censures or excommunications which the latter might publish. Tournon was not the man to back

down in the face of any threats, and he speedily retorted in kind; with the result that censures, denunciations and finally excommunications fell thicker than leaves in Vallambrosa between the rival parties, who in accordance with time-honoured precedents resorted to proving their respective doctrines orthodox with apostolic blows and knocks.

Bishop Casal had the unanimous support of his flock to begin with, but first the Augustinians and later the Dominicans deserted him for the side of the Patriarch, and this led to the Viceroy of Goa ordering the forcible deportation of the former to India in 1711. Meanwhile the quarrel was both complicated and exacerbated by one of the periodical disputes between the Captain-General and the Senate which likewise culminated in armed rioting and bloodshed. It is not necessary to probe further into the unsavoury details of these fratricidal quarrels, since as a sarcastic Spanish writer in Manila observed, "it is a matter as extensive as alien to my duty, and thus I can excuse myself from treating the business at length by referring the curious reader to the Italian and Portuguese pens which have written a great deal thereon, albeit not in great conformity". Two common misconceptions, based on the use of Italian and French sources to the exclusion of the Portuguese, may perhaps be mentioned *en passant*. The first is that the hapless Legate was thrown into a prison dungeon by the Portuguese authorities at the behest of Kang-hsi, where he perished miserably. The second is that the opposition of the Macao government to the Legate was simply and solely inspired by the Jesuits, who, in the words of another Spanish chronicler, "deeply mortified his character, since they have great influence with the leaders who govern that colony". Both of these assertions are exaggerated. Tournon was not, properly speaking, imprisoned at Macao, but confined in his quarters (a large and commodious building), at first under open and later under a closer form of arrest, his servants and domestics having free egress and entrance at all times. Furthermore his confinement, such as it was, was not due to any orders from Kang-hsi, but to those sent by the Viceroy and Archbishop of Goa, to whom the matter had been referred by the authorities at Macao. His death may have been

hastened by the privations he underwent but these were largely self-imposed. As regards the second allegation, whilst it is indubitably true that the Jesuits had as a rule great influence with the local governors, this was not so with Diogo do Pinho Teixeira, who held office in 1706-1710, and whose attitude was prompted not by Jesuit intrigues but by his instructions from the Viceroy at Goa. Neither was Bishop Casal a Jesuit, nor unduly under the influence of the Society. The local disturbances only subsided with the death of the Papal Legate in June 1710, a few months after he had received his Cardinal's birretta from Rome. Pope Clement XI published a Brief in March 1711, criticising the Bishop of Macao and annulling the censures fulminated by the latter against the Patriarch and against those who had recognised his authority. The ultrapius King John Vth of Portugal likewise disowned the proceedings of his over-zealous subordinates at Goa and Macao (who had nevertheless merely been acting on the letter of their standing instructions from the Court of Lisbon), and richly endowed the Augustinian Convent at Macao, by way of rewarding its inmates for their support of the Patriarch.

Neither the remonstrances of the Jesuits and the representatives of the Portuguese Crown nor the opposition of the Emperor Kang-hsi, deterred the Pope from pressing his condemnation of the Chinese Rites, which he denounced more strongly than ever in the Bull *Ex illa die*, published at Rome in March 1715, and at Canton and Peking in August and November respectively of the following year. Bishop Casal and his fellow die-hards in Macao held out for another four years, only taking this oath in December 1721, at the hands of the next Papal Legate, Carlos Melchior Mezzabarba, Patriarch of Alexandria, who, unlike his unlucky predecessor, came out *via* Lisbon in a Portuguese ship and with the authorization of the Lusitanian Crown. Mezzabarba's audience with the aged K'ang-Hsi did not leave the Emperor with the favourable impressions which the Roman Curia had hoped to inspire. After hearing the Legate's arguments and reading the Bull *Ex illa die*, the Manchu monarch commented acidulously that Europeans were small-minded

people, incapable of grasping the profundities of Confucian philosophy. He dismissed the dispute as a storm in a teacup, and compared the Roman Catholic missionaries to the superstitious Buddhist and Taoist priesthood. Since Mezza-barba was a less intransigent type than de Tournon, he was sufficiently impressed by the arguments of the Jesuits and by his chilly reception at the Court of Peking, to depart from the spirit of his instructions and to publish a somewhat equivocal declaration at Macao on the 4th November 1721, thus affording a loophole for the evasion of the Brief *Ex illa die*. This provided the Jesuits with sufficient excuse to ignore the repeated Papal declarations, until finally Pope Benedict XIVth in the Bull *Ex quo singulari* dated 14 July 1742, compelled all missionaries in China and the neighbouring countries to subscribe unequivocally to the most formal and categorical denunciation of the Chinese Rites contained in this Bull which they swore to observe "exactly, absolutely and inviolably and to accomplish it without any tergiversation whatsoever".

Even this uncompromising declaration was insufficient to achieve the desired end, if we are to believe the evidence of the Franciscan Bishop of Macao, Frei Hilario de Santa Rosa, in 1748. Writing to the King in January of that year, he stated that his colleague of Nanking, Frei Francisco de Santa Rosa de Viterbo, complained that the Jesuit missionaries of his diocese stirred up the native Christians to oppose his enforcement of the Papal Briefs, which they themselves had solemnly sworn to observe. This attitude of the Jesuits as a body doubtless accounts for the reluctance of the Holy See to confirm King John Vth's nominee, Dom Polycarp de Souza, for the Bishopric of Peking. Writing to his Jewish friend, Ribeiro Sanches, then physician at the Court of Moscow in 1742, Polycarp states categorically that the sole objection of the Roman Curia to his appointment was the fact that he was a Jesuit. Not until the death of Pope Clement XI and the accession of his successor, did Rome finally give way to Lisbon and formally confirm the Royal nominee. Subsequent Jesuit opposition to the Papal Bulls was more latent than vocal, but it doubtless helped to induce the Holy See

to modify its stand of centuries by formally abrogating the condemnatory oath in December 1939. Thus Wisdom has belatedly been justified of her Jesuit children, but only after incalculable harm had been done by this bitter controversy to the cause they had most at heart.

There remains for our consideration the question of the Jesuits' commercial operations in the Far East. These were indubitably extensive, and date back to the palmy days of the Japan mission in the sixteenth century when they had a large stake in the cargo of the Great Ship from Amacon. A document of 1621 in the archives of the Society at Rome gives the value of their annual investment as between 3,000 and 5,000 *cruzados*, but other papers of a decade earlier affirm that their profits from the sale of silks did not exceed 4,000 *cruzados* yearly. This commercial traffic was several times forbidden by the King, who ordered the government at Goa to provide an equivalent sum from fixed rents or customs charges instead. These orders were never enforced, and the right of the Jesuits to trade to Japan was officially reaffirmed by a Royal Declaration of 1611. The extension of their missionary activities from Japan to China brought with it a corresponding increase in their commercial activities, on the grounds which were fairly and succinctly set forth by Peter Mundy when half-a-dozen English sailors deserted their ships to take service on a Jesuit-owned vessel bound for Tongking. "For here these Padres trade in shipping, goods, and building, alleading the necessity off itt, as the greatt charge they are att in sending their breatheren to sundry posts where they have residences, with their Maintenance, etts. there, As upp to Paquin [Peking] to the King of China every yeare goe some from hence with presentts, who for thatt purpose lett the haire off their head and beard grow, and travell disguised in China habitt, almost all the way by water, likewise to sundry other places hereabouts, as Champa, Couchinchina, etts., where they say they convert many".

Protestant Peter Mundy, it may be observed in passing, took a more charitable view of this Jesuit trading, than did some of their Catholic co-religionists, to wit, the Friars from the Philippines. Fray Diego Aduarte O.P. who recom-

mended the abandonment of Macao and the forcible deportation of its citizens to Portuguese India in 1619, had already written some fifteen years earlier apropos of Jesuit commerce in the Far East, — "At Macao in China, where they had a theological college, a store was operated next door with direct communication to the college, so that the presiding Padre whose commercial acumen was considerable, could conveniently go backwards and forwards". He further alleges that the Jesuits "live in great style, one priest having been known to go about in his litter accompanied by sixty horsemen They speak of the dried radish-leaves which they consume for their nourishment, but make no mention of the very delectable chicken which follows." These criticisms however were relatively mild in comparison with the venomous attacks of Navarrete some fifty years later.

In the course of his printed (but unpublished) *Controversias Antiguas y Modernas de la Mision de la Gran China* of 1679, the Dominican prelate loses no opportunity of stressing the alleged mercantile propensities of the Jesuits. Thus in quoting an admittedly rather smug and sanctimonious description by Father Diego Morales S.J. of their College in Macao as a "house of knowledge, garden of sanctity and school of Apostles", Navarrete adds sneeringly that to be strictly truthful it was likewise "a house of trade and warehouse of merchandise". He refers elsewhere in the same work to the extensive commerce driven by the Fathers of the Jesuit Province of Japan (which of course operated in China and Indochina since 1640), whose scope aroused adverse criticism from Father Antonio de Gouvea S.J. and his colleagues of the China Mission. He also states, and this we can well believe, that this commerce was particularly resented by the Macaoese merchants, whose spokesman, Bento Pereira de Faria, showed Navarrete a letter from the Senate in July 1669, complaining that "as long as the Company was inspired by the zeal of Saint Ignatius it was the true Company, but now that this has expired and it is solely occupied with merchandising, commerce and trade, it is no longer the Company". These words are an echo of those employed three years earlier by the Viceroy of India, Anto-

nio de Melo de Castro, who is said to have stated that "the Jesuit Fathers in Portugal and Castile were Fathers of the Company of Jesus, but that the Jesuit Fathers in India were Fathers of the Dutch East India Company, and did not concern themselves with anything but their own selfish interests, neither did they regard the truth nor tell it from their pulpits".

Exact figures as to the extent of this trade are hard if not impossible to come by, but there can be no doubt that it was both profitable and far-reaching. Padre Antonio de Gouvea, doyen of Portuguese Jesuits in China at the time, told Navarrete that Father Marini had reached Macao in 1669 with over fifty thousand *cruzados* worth of commercial goods. This it must be remembered was but nine years after the Jesuits had suffered a heavy blow through the destruction by a Dutch fleet at Macassar of five out of six Macaoese ships in whose cargoes they were deeply interested. So much so, that their losses on this occasion (which Navarrete and others described as a judgment of God) induced them to intrigue strenuously and successfully against the Dutch embassy to the Manchu Court in 1666 and 1667, — or so the Hollanders professed to believe, although the Jesuits can hardly have been expected to have acted otherwise, in view of what would have happened to them if the Dutch ever got a good footing at Peking. Leaving the sphere of conjecture for that of fact, similar accusations against Jesuit commerce were made throughout the Iberian colonial empire from Brazil to the Philippines, where matters came to a climax in 1683 with the arrest and deportation of Archbishop Pardo from Manila at the instigation of the Jesuits. The celebrated Padre Antonio Vieira S.J., rejected a proposal to allow the Jesuits of the Maranhão to trade, with the forthright observation, "our trade is only that of Souls, nor have we any other way of keeping in good repute with God and with the World, save by a most exact and strict observance of this precept."

As far as Macao and the China Mission was concerned, it can be stated categorically that whatever profits the Fathers made in their commerce, they expended on and in their mission-field as they claimed. When the Company

was suppressed by Pombal in 1759, and the Jesuit College at Macao seized and searched by the agents of the Crown three years later, they could find none of the vast treasure popularly believed to be stored there. Nor has recent research been more fortunate, although local tradition — remembering doubtless that the Jesuits originally built and owned the citadel of São Paulo do Monte — believes as firmly and as fatuously as ever in the existence of a secret hoard of gold, silver and precious stones, stored away in the passages of a hitherto undiscovered subterranean tunnel connecting the old collegiate church with the citadel and with Green Island. It must be remembered that the vast expenditure for the upkeep of their mission stations from Cochín-China to Peking was only partly covered by irregular remittances from Europe at the end of a tedious and tenuous route. If they made good money they also spent it on good works; and the fair-minded Peter Mundy wrote nothing more nor less than the truth when he observed of the Macao Jesuits, "And to speake truly, they Neither spare Cost nor labour, Dilligence nor Daunger to attaine their purpose," — *Ad majorem Dei gloriam*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- PADRE MANUEL TEIXEIRA, *Macao e a sua Diocese*. Vol. II (Macao, 1940).
Arquivo Portuguez Oriental; Fasciculos 5 and 6 (Nova-Goa, 1866-76).
 Domingo Fernández de Navarrete O. P. *Controversias antiguas y modernas de la Mission de la gran China*. (Printed but not published, Madrid 1679).
 J. L. D'AZEVEDO, *Cartas do Padre Antonio Vieira S. J.* (Vol. III Coimbra 1928).
Boletim Ecclesiastico de Macau Vol. 34. Sept/Oct 1937 (Macao, 1937).
 CASIMIRO DIAZ O.S.A. *Conquistas temporal e espiritual de las islas Filipinas* Tomo II (Madrid 1898).
 FRAY J. MARTINEZ DE ZUNIGA, *Historia de las islas Philipinas* (Sampaloc, 1803).
 Abbé Huc, *Christianity in China, Tartary and Thibet*. Vol. III (London, 1858).

- Travels of Peter Mundy* (Hak. Soc. edition). Vol. III. (London, 1919).
 C. R. BOXER, *The Affair of the Madre de Deus* (London 1929).
Revista de Historia Vol. IX pp. 256-270. (Peking Jesuits); Vol. XI pp. 241-259 (correspondence of Bishop Polycarp with Dr. Ribeiro Sanches in 1734-50); and Vol. I pp. 175-9 (The Viceroy Antonio de Melo de Castro and the Inquisition at Goa). (Lisbon, 1912-21).
 PADRE ANTONIO VIEIRA S. J. Holograph letter dated Bahia, 10. viii. 1688 in the author's collection.