Surveillance & Society

Article

Anti-*Kirishitan* Surveillance in Early Modern Japan

James Harry Morris

University of Tsukuba, Japan
morris.harry.gu@u.tsukuba.ac.jp

Abstract

From 1614 to 1873 Christianity was outlawed in Japan. The Tokugawa Shogunate, which ruled Japan for most of this period, built rigorous and complicated systems of surveillance in order to monitor their population's religious habits. This paper seeks to describe the evolution of Edo period (1603–1868) anti-Christian religious surveillance. The first two sections of the paper explore the development of surveillance under the first three Tokugawa leaders. The following sections focus on the evolution of these systems (the recruitment of informants, temple registration, the composition of registries, and tests of faith) in subsequent periods and includes some short passages from previously untranslated contemporaneous documents. Finally, the paper offers some thoughts on the efficacy of anti-Christian surveillance, arguing that the toleration of the existence of hidden communities resulted from changes in Christian behaviour that made them harder to discover and a willingness on the part of the authorities to tolerate illegal activity due to economic disincentive and a reduction in the threat that Christianity posed.

Introduction

In early 1614, Shōgun 将軍 Tokugawa Hidetada 徳川秀忠 (1579–1632) and his retired father Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康 (1542–1616) promulgated the *Bateren tsuihō no fumi* 伴天連追放之文 (Edict on the Expulsion of the Padres),[1] which outlawed the promulgation of and adherence to Christianity (Screech 2012: 8–9; Boxer 1951: 319–20). The immediate result of this edict was the expulsion of some 98 of 145 missionary personnel, 65 of 250 native lay catechists, and 350 prominent *Kirishitan* キリシタン[2] families (Miyazaki 2003: 12; Takase 2001: 39; Boxer 1951: 322, 327–28). It also marked the beginning of a sustained period of anti-*Kirishitan* persecution against the some 300,000 to 800,000 converts and their descendants that would continue for two and a half centuries.[3] This paper explores the systems of surveillance instituted by the *Tokugawa bakufu* 徳川幕府 (Tokugawa Shogunate) during the anti-*Kirishitan* persecutions. The paper focuses on three principal areas that in many cases overlapped: the

[1] Also known as the *Hai Kirishitan bun* 排吉利支丹文.

[2] The term *Kirishitan* refers to sixteenth and seventeenth century Roman Catholic Christianity in Japan. It can be used to refer to both the religion itself and its adherents. The term is derived from the Portuguese *Christão/Cristão* and it has various historical and contemporary characterizations have been used including 幾利紫旦, 貴理志端, 鬼利至端, 貴理死貪, and most commonly 吉利支丹, 切死丹, きりしたん, or キリシタン (Shinmura 2008: 591).

[3] Estimations of the number of converts vary radically, liberal estimations suggest as many as 750,000 to 800,000 converts (Üçerler 2015: 52; Anesaki 1963: 244n1), whilst more conservative estimations suggest that the number of converts did not greatly exceed 300,000 (Boxer 1951: 320–21; Nosco 1993: 5; Laures 1954: 177; Gonoi 2002: 99).

Morris, James Harry. 2018. Anti-*Kirishitan* Surveillance in Early Modern Japan. *Surveillance & Society* 16(4): 410-431.
https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/index | ISSN: 1477-7487

recruitment of informants, the composition of registers, and tests of religious affiliation. It argues that these systems of surveillance were effective for controlling and monitoring the outward behaviour of the population, and drawing on Peter Nosco's work it explores possible reasons why knowledge of the continued existence of *Kirishitan* communities did not always result in action or attention on the part of the authorities.

Background

From the genesis of the Ōnin War (*Ōnin no Ran* 応仁の乱) in 1467, Japan faced over two centuries of civil war during which different *daimyō* 大名 (Feudal Lord/s) fought for control of local territories and ultimately the country. The first Christian missionaries arrived amid these conflicts in 1549 and had gained between 300,000 and 600,000 converts by 1614 (Boxer 1951: 320–21; Nosco 1993: 5; Laures 1954: 177; Gonoi 2002: 99; Üçerler 2015: 52). Shortly after the arrival of the missionaries, the country was pacified and unified under the consecutive leadership of Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1534–82), Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 (1537–98), and Tokugawa Ieyasu. These leaders sought to solidify their control over the country. This consolidation of power included implementing means to control religious groups such as the *Jōdo Shinshū* 浄土真宗 sect *Ikkō Ikki* 一向一揆, which had grown powerful, administering its own provinces and controlling its own military (Hall 1981: 11). Nobunaga suppressed the *Ikkō Ikki*, and his successor, Hideyoshi, disarmed the Buddhist sects, led campaigns against Buddhist sectarians, and implemented anti-*Kirishitan* policies (Elison 1981: 71–74; Elison 1973: 112–34; Berry 1982: 85–87,104; McMullin 1984: 236–63).

From 1600 to 1868, Japan was ruled by the Tokugawa *bakufu*, who as noted ushered in a period of sustained anti-*Kirishitan* persecution. The *bakufu* also built on the policies of their predecessors by issuing a series of directives to regulate Buddhism (Williams 2009: 30–34). As such, there was a continuity in the religious policy of Nobunaga, Hideyoshi, and the Tokugawa *bakufu*. Nevertheless, unlike their predecessors the Tokugawa *bakufu* was able to establish control over the Buddhist institutions consolidating its power through events such as the 1627 *shie chokkyo jiken* 紫衣勅許事件 (the purple robe incident) when the *bakufu* usurped the power of the Imperial household by stripping some 150 clerics of their imperially awarded robes and titles (ibid.: 34–41). Over time *bakufu* political institutions exerted their authority over the administrative aspects of Buddhism, and most the population became affiliated with Buddhist temples (Williams 2005: 7).

Given all this, it must be noted at the outset that anti-*Kirishitan* policy was tied to a wider spectrum of policies aimed at controlling the religious affiliation and practice of the *bakufu*'s subjects. Indeed, other religions and sects that the *bakufu* viewed as heterodox such as the Nichiren Buddhist (*Nichiren shū* 日蓮宗) sect *Fujufuse* 不受不施 were also persecuted during the period (Stone 1994: 243–46). In a more general sense, the Edo period (*Edo jidai* 江戸時代, 1603–1868) persecutions reflect a recurring response to the emergence of new religions and sects present in Japanese history, with other prominent examples of persecution including the thirteenth century persecutions of Nichiren 日蓮 (1222–82) and his followers, and the persecution of Protestants during the early Meiji period (*Meiji jidai* 明治時代, 1868–1912) (Habito and Stone 1999: 236; Stone 1994: 235–37; Ion 2009: 94–125).

With the exception of Nam-Lin Hur (2007) in his *Death and Social Order in Tokugawa Japan: Buddhism, Anti-Christianity, and the Danka System,* few scholars have explicitly explored the systems of surveillance implemented during the Edo-period anti-*Kirishitan* persecutions as forms of surveillance.[4] Studies of surveillance in Japan have overwhelmingly focused on the modern era (Murakami Wood, Lyon, and Abe 2007: 551–68), and those scholars who have explored historical systems of surveillance such as Hidenobu

[4] Jason Ānada Josephson (2012: 41) also provides a cursory exploration of the Edo-period religious persecutions and surveillance in his *The Invention of Religion in Japan*.

Jinnai (1995) and David L. Howell (2005) have tended to overlook the surveillance of religion. Indeed, Howell (ibid.: 16) goes so far as to state that

> with the exception of its virulent attacks on heterodox ideologies that appeared to reject the premises of Tokugawa rule—such as Christianity, the Fuju-fuse sect of Nichiren Buddhism, and some of the so-called new religions that appeared in the nineteenth century—the state did not make much effort to police popular thought.

Studies that explore religious surveillance have tended to focus on the increasing controls placed on religion in the first half of the twentieth century (Garon 1997; Reader 1991; Clammer 1997). Academic interest in Japan also increased following the reluctance of the police to monitor potential dangerous religious groups in the post-war period (Murakami Wood, Lyon, and Abe 2007: 553–54; Cooper 2004: 61), the Tokyo subway sarin attack (*Chikatestsu Sarin Jiken* 地下鉄サリン事件) by members of Aum Shinrikyo (*Ōm Shinrikyō* オウム真理教) in 1995, and the new systems of religious surveillance established following the Aum attacks (Mullins and Nakano 2016: 7; Ejima 2014: 192–209). Some scholars, such as William Woodard (1972) have also explored aspects of religious surveillance during the Allied Occupation of Japan. According to David Murakami Wood, David Lyon, and Kiyoshi Abe (2007: 551–53), Japanese studies of surveillance have tended to mirror Western studies in their use of the thought of Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, and neo-Marxist thinkers, but have simultaneously adopted positions that are much "more strongly influenced by Marxist sociological traditions." Other scholars such as Christopher Harding (2015: 3) have highlighted the importance attributed to internalised forms of surveillance by Japanese scholars. Although the anti-*Kirishitan* persecutions have received a great deal of historiographical attention, an exploration that treats relevant aspects of the persecutions as forms of surveillance has the potential to reveal new insights on both Japanese history and surveillance therein. This paper aims to be one potential starting point.

Ieyasu and Hidetada

As noted under Ieyasu and Hidetada, anti-*Kirishitan* persecution initially focused on the expulsion of missionary personnel and prominent believers. Internal exile also took place (Cieslik 1954: 3; Ross 1994: 96). The authorities destroyed churches (Screech 2012: 9) and gravesites and seized religious items (Tamamuro 2009: 16–17). Although their number is unknown, apostates (*korobi Kirishitan* 転びキリシタン)[5] in Nagasaki were required to gain certificates signifying their registration to a temple (*korobi Kirishitan terauke shōmon* 転吉利支丹寺請証文) as evidence of their conversion to Buddhism (Tamamuro 2009: 16; Gonoi 1990: 232). Despite all this, persecution was a domainal affair and its severity radically diverged across Japan. On one hand, there were areas such as Kokura domain (*Kokura han* 小倉藩) where following the edict some 2,047 *Kirishitan* were arrested (Tamamuro 2009: 16), and on the other hand there were domains such as Sendai (*Sendai han* 仙台藩) where relatively independent *daimyō* did not enact the law (Takagi 2001: 174). Moreover, whilst martyrdoms occurred throughout the 1610s (listed in Table 1), other issues and matters of policy took precedence, such as the Siege of Osaka (*Ōsaka no Jin* 大坂の陣) in 1614 and 1615, offering respite to the *Kirishitan* (Boxer 1951: 330–31; Elison 1973: 161; Ross 1994: 96). In fact, Charles Boxer (1951: 331–32) goes so far as to state that until 1618 anti-*Kirishitan* legislation was generally ignored, although he notes that "so far as the Bakufu was concerned, this 'blind eye' was applied only to the native Christians of Nagasaki, and not to the European missionaries whom they were resolved to expel by all means" (332).

1618 was a turning point for *bakufu* policy. That year a list containing the names of priests in hiding written by a former Jesuit apologist and author known as Habian ハビアン (1565–1621)[6] was presented to the authorities (Elison 1973: 163; Boxer 1951: 334). The revelation that missionaries continued to exist

---

5 This term referred to ordinary believers who had apostatised. The terms *korobi bateren* 転びバテレン and *korobi iruman* 転びイルマン referred to apostate priests and *iruman* respectively (Shinmura 2008: 1068).

6 Known variously as Fabian, Fukansai Habian 不干斎巴鼻庵, Hapian ハピアン, Habiyan ハビヤン, and Fukan 不干.

in hiding resulted in an intensification of persecution. The number of martyrs increased 240 per cent (to sixty-eight) and the following year increased another thirty per cent (to eighty-eight) (Boxer 1951: 448). In Nagasaki 長崎, closed ecclesiastical buildings were destroyed and the land repurposed, whilst the bodies of dead *Kirishitan* were exhumed and the graveyards desecrated (334). Nevertheless, it was not only the severity of the persecution that changed, the now solo Hidetada also began to institute new measures in order to aid the *bakufu*'s eradication of Christianity. One such measure was the offering of rewards (*Kenshō sonin* 懸賞訴人/*Kōgi hōshō* 公儀褒賞) to and employment of informants (*Sonin* 訴人). The extent to which the aforementioned Habian acted as a government informant is unclear (Hibbard 1963: xvii), however in 1619 an ex-Jesuit priest Araki Ryōhaku 荒木了伯[7] voluntarily apostatised and joined the authorities as an informant and interpreter (Cieslik 1974: 29n107; Alden 1996: 136). The general public were also offered the reward of thirty pieces of silver for informing on priests with this information being displayed on wooden notice boards called *kōsatsu* 高札 or *seisatsu* 制札 (Kataoka 1984: 500). Nevertheless, this policy change was one confined to Nagasaki (500–1), an area in which numerous government spies were already active (Boxer 1951: 332).

Year	Total Martyrs
1614	63
1615	13
1616	13
1617	20
1618	68
1619	88
1620	17
1621	20
1622	132

Table 1: *Martyrdoms under Ieyasu and Hidetada (Boxer 1951: 448).*[8]

Whilst martyrdom figures dropped in 1620 and 1621, the discovery of missionaries being smuggled into Japan[9] as well as continued baptisms numbering up to 17,000 between 1614 and 1626 (Elisonas 1991: 368) led Hidetada to again intensify his policy. In 1622, he issued execution orders for all imprisoned members of religious orders and those who concealed them (Ross 1994: 98), resulting in a 560 per cent increase in the number of martyrdoms (Boxer 1951: 448). Smuggled priests Augustinian Pedro de Zuñiga and Dominican Luis Flores, as well as those responsible for attempting to smuggle them, were among the executed (Kataoka 1984: 277–79). As was the case in 1618, this intensification was not only reflected in "body count" but in the evolution of policy. Since 1614, *Kirishitan* had often gathered at martyrdoms to sing, pray, and collect relics. Such practices were tolerated in hopes that "the victims' sufferings would induce onlookers to recant their religion" (Boxer 1951: 342). However, realising that current policy was not having the desired effect, Hidetada now sought to restrict such practices, ordering the bodies of martyrs to be burnt, and for those who sang and prayed at martyrdom sites to be punished through execution or public humiliation depending on their gender (Ross 1994: 98). The system offering rewards to informants displayed on *kōsatsu* was extended to Kyōto 京都 (Kataoka 1984: 503). For Andrew Ross (1994: 98), these intensifications in anti-*Kirishitan* policy marked the beginning of the *bakufu*'s realisation that methods of martyrdom and expulsion were having little effect on Christianity.

---

[7] Baptized as Thomas or Antonio.

[8] These figures should be taken as a bare minimum.

[9] Notably Augustinian Pedro de Zuñiga and Dominican Luis Flores in 1620 (Kataoka 1984: 272–79; Ross 1994: 98, 101). Boxer (1951: 355) notes the smuggling of some twenty Jesuits into Japan between 1615 and 1616 alone, whilst Jurgis Elisonas (1991: 368) notes a general increase of the Jesuits numbers from twenty-seven in 1614 to thirty-six in 1621.

Sustained anti-*Kirishitan* persecution began under Ieyasu and Hidetada. The application of anti-*Kirishitan* policy to the native Japanese was often ignored and persecution varied in terms of severity (and existence) on a domainal basis. Nevertheless, the first eight years of anti-*Kirishitan* policy saw the *bakufu* institute measures that in subsequent periods would form the basis of their anti-*Kirishitan* surveillance network. These included the requirement for apostates to produce temple registration certificates, the use of high-profile apostate informants, the offering of rewards for informants, and the punishment of those implicated in aiding missionaries (smugglers) or witnessing at martyrdom sites. In the following sections of this paper, the evolution of these elements of anti-*Kirishitan* policy into an organised system of anti-*Kirishitan* surveillance is explored.

Iemitsu

In 1623, Hidetada retired and was succeeded by his son Iemitsu 家光 (1604–51). Iemitsu was the first Shōgun born into the role and by the time of his succession most of the powerful *daimyō* of his grandfather's generation had died (Cieslik 1954: 13). He was therefore able to wield an unprecedented level of authority (ibid.). As such, "Iemitsu not only brought in new approaches to the problem of extirpating Christianity, he also enforced the existing edicts in a more organized and thorough way than either of his predecessors" (Ross 1994: 98).

Following the discovery of *Kirishitan* communities and priests in the capital Edo 江戸 (modern-day Tokyo) in 1623, Iemitsu endeavoured to strengthen anti-*Kirishitan* legislation (ibid.: 99). He called on all *daimyō* to enforce anti-*Kirishitan* legislation more thoroughly (Cieslik 1954: 35–40). He erected *kōsatsu* in Edo (Kataoka 1984: 503) and extended the use of temple registration certificates to apostates in the city (Cieslik 1954: 18n30). Then in December he martyred fifty *Kirishitan* and the following year he killed a further thirty-seven there (30–32). Of the second group only twenty-four were *Kirishitan,* the other thirteen were people who had in some way sheltered or assisted *Kirishitan* including Iemitsu's own bodyguard (who had been unaware of *Kirishitan* hidden in his house) and page (who had unknowingly leased his home to *Kirishitan*) (Cieslik 1954: 32, 34; Boxer 1951: 357; Ross 1994: 99). In order to influence the *daimyō,* the executions were held on the *Tōkaidō* 東海道, the busy road leading to western Japan, rather than at the city's execution sites (Cieslik 1954: 25). The move was efficacious, and by 1624 all *daimyō* had instituted and increased anti-*Kirishitan* measures within their domains (Ross 1994: 99).

The role of informants was central in the aforementioned Great Martyrdom of Edo (*Edo no Daijunkyō* 江戸の大殉教). According to Hubert Cieslik (1954: 15–16) working with several contemporaneous sources, the discovery of *Kirishitan* in Edo was spurred by the testimony of the servant of *Kirishitan* Hara Mondo 原主水[10] (1587–1623). The servant, a convert who was experiencing financial difficulties, reported on the secret gatherings of *Kirishitan* in Edo and provided a list of high ranking *Kirishitan* and missionaries present in the capital to the governor of the north of Edo (*Edo Kitamachi Bugyō* 江戸北町奉行), Yonezu Kanbē 米津勘兵衛 (1563–1625), in return for the financial rewards associated with denouncing *Kirishitan* (ibid.: 15–16). Other informants were also used in order to locate missionaries such as Francis Galvez (?–1623), his catechist and host who were martyred during the executions (17). The Jesuit Annual Letter reports that the day following the first executions (December 5, 1623):

> on an elevated spot before a vast throng of people an official ceremony took place in which the main informer was given a reward and the populace informed by the authorities that in the future any else who gave information on this same crime would receive a similar reward. The payment the betrayer received was the fine house of one of those executed, plus 30 pieces of gold . . .. (quoted in Cieslik 1954: 30)

Whilst the document continues to state that this led to the immediate chastisement of the informer (Cieslik 1954: 30), according to the same source Iemitsu's policy of executing those implicated in aiding

[10] Also known as Hara Tanenobu 原胤信.

Kirishitan knowingly or unknowingly resulted in the spread of such fear that non-*Kirishitan* informants aware of the existence of *Kirishitan* (i.e., acquaintances) increased manifold (ibid.: 34). The use of informants had proven itself to be an effective means by which to discover and locate *Kirishitan* and missionaries, and the following year in 1625 rewards for informants on priests increased to one hundred pieces of silver with some areas offering as much as three hundred pieces (Shimizu 1986: 178; Kataoka 1984: 502–3).

The martyrdom of missionary personnel almost doubled under Iemitsu's rule from forty-six between 1614 and 1623 to eighty-eight between 1624 and 1639, whereas the martyrdom of ordinary believers almost quadrupled from 390 to 1,520 (Shimizu 1986: 173). Nevertheless, according to Cieslik (1954: 41), from 1625 the *bakufu* began to shift its policy to focus on "apostates, not martyrs." Iemitsu built and expanded upon the systems and procedures set out by his predecessors, from 1633 *kōsatsu* were introduced throughout Japan (Miyazaki 2003: 12; Kataoka 1984: 503). From the 1630s onwards, temple registration was expanded to the general populace in a system known as *terauke seido* 寺請制度 or *danka seido* 檀家制度 so that all needed to confirm their non-*Kirishitan* religious identity (Hur 2007: 15), with certificates (*terauke shōmon* 寺請証文/*terauke jō* 寺請状) becoming necessary for all Japanese from 1638 (Tamamuro 2001: 262).[11] New systems were also created or old systems adjusted in order to make the discovery of *Kirishitan* part of their remit. For instance, in 1642 the system of remuneration for informants was combined with a system of neighbourhood associations based on units of five households[12] known as the *goningumi* 五人組 (five family groups) (Miyazaki 2003: 12). Whilst the *goningumi* had existed nationwide since 1633, their combination with the system of remuneration for informants made informing an explicit duty of these groups (Shimizu 1986: 193). The signing of oaths (*korobi kakimono* 転び書物) by apostates was instituted on a national level in 1635 (Kataoka 1984: 505), and a system of confirming non-*Kirishitan* religious identity by treading on Christian objects and representations (*fumie* 踏み絵) in ceremony called *ebumi* or *efumi* 絵踏み was also gradually implemented on a wide scale (DaCosta Kaufmann 2010: 140).

Under Iemitsu, the *bakufu*'s systems of surveillance and persecution were centralised and systematised in the institution of the *shūmon aratame* 宗門改 (Inquisition), which was established in 1640 (Elison 1973: 195). The first *shūmon aratame yaku* Inoue Masashige 井上政重 (1585–1661) adopted methods that stressed apostasy over martyrdom (Elison 1973: 187, 191–96; Hur 2007: 71), a contemporaneously popular stance that saw the *bakufu* use Buddhism to assist in the conversion of *Kirishitan*[13] and highlighted the importance of *bumin* 撫民 (nurturing the populace) (Hur 2007: 71–74). Such practices were so effective that by the 1660s Christianity was virtually non-existent (Elisonas 1991: 370). The *shūmon aratame yaku* was in direct contact with the *daimyō,* shogunal vassals, prefectural governors, and magistrates, whilst the Office of Temples and Shrines (*jisha bugyō* 寺社奉行) maintained contact with its local offices and the towns built around temples and shrines (Shimizu 1986: 211). Simultaneously, the *shūmon aratame yaku* and *jisha bugyō* maintained contact with each other (ibid.: 211).

Given all this, two general systems of surveillance can be identified. On one hand, there were systems of surveillance such as those associated with the *shūmon aratame* that were tied to the political system and carried out by political institutions, and on the other hand there were forms of surveillance such as *terauke seido* carried out by religious institutions on behalf of the political authorities. In the following sections, these systems of surveillance are explored in greater detail.

[11] Other scholars quote the date of 1635 (Miyazaki 2001: 20; Miyazaki 2003: 12–13; Shimizu 1986: 182).

[12] On occasion the groups could be made up of four or six families instead.

[13] The number of temples nationwide increased from 13,037 to 469,934 during the Edo period (Kitagawa 1990: 164)

Year	Total Martyrs
1623	76
1624	198
1625	7
1626	22
1627	120
1628	62
1629	79
1630	316
1631	46
1632	120
1633	88
1634	100
1635	?
1636	18
1637	129
1638	90
1639	5
1640	63
1641–1642	?
1643	54
1644	?
1645	9
1646–1648	?
1649	23 (uncertain)
1650	74 (uncertain)

Table 2: *Martyrdoms under Iemitsu (Boxer 1951: 448).*[14]

Kōsatsu and the *Goningumi*

Anti-*Kirishitan kōsatsu* were used until the early Meiji period (Shimizu 1986: 178–79), and the offer of rewards was likely a motivating factor for informants (Tamamuro 2009: 20). Nosco (1996: 151) notes that being accused of being a *Kirishitan* could lead to imprisonment without the facts being corroborated. On the other hand, Tamamuro Fumio (2009: 20–21) states that because there are few sources that refer to the payment of informants, it is possible that the system of rewards was little more than a ploy to expose *Kirishitan*. Despite this, it is important to note that *kōsatsu* not only acted to advertise the offering of rewards to informants, but as a reminder of the law and in the most basic sense as anti-*Kirishitan* propaganda.

Rewards for informants were increased throughout Iemitsu's rule and the rules of his successors. The table below (translated from Kataoka Yakichi's (1984) *Nihon Kirishitan Junkyōshi*) shows a general increase in the rewards offered to informants for denouncing missionaries and *Kirishitan*. These were no small sums of money: Tamamuro (2009: 20) notes that two hundred silver coins was equivalent to twenty years' consumption of rice for a family of four. Shimizu Hirokazu (1986: 180) provides a higher estimate of the value of remuneration noting that one hundred silver pieces (according to 1633 prices) could purchase 141.8 *koku* 石[15] (21,270 kg) of rice, whilst five hundred silver pieces could buy (according to prices in 1674) 358 *koku* 石 (53,745 kg). Despite this, by the end of the seventeenth century *Kirishitan* were a rarity and missionaries did not exist outside of prison. The high increases in potential payments for informants on priests and religious brothers were therefore meaningless in a situation in which it was

[14] These figures should be taken as a bare minimum.

[15] One *koku* is equivalent to the amount of rice consumed by a single person in a year (150 kg).

highly unlikely that the authorities would be required to pay said remuneration. Payments for ordinary believers in comparison did not increase dramatically over the period, perhaps suggesting that the authorities expected to remunerate informants for finding these more numerous religious criminals. Kataoka Yakichi (1984) offers the following breakdown of figures:

Year	Padre (*Bateren* ばてれん)	Religious Brothers (*Iruman* いるまん)	Catechists (*Dōjuku* 同宿) and Ordinary *Kirishitan* (*Shūmon* 宗門)	Apostates Who Returned to Christianity (*Tachikaerimono* 立返り者)
1619	30	-	-	-
1626	100	-	-	-
1633	100	To be decided according to rank	To be decided according to rank	To be decided according to rank
1635	100	50	30 for a catechist	
1636	300 or 200	To be decided according to rank	To be decided according to rank	To be decided according to rank
1638	200	100	50 or 30	-
1653	300	200	50 or 30	-
1674	500	300	50 or 100	-
1677	300	200	50 or 30	-
1682	500	300	100	300

Table 3: *Rewards for Different Types of Kirishitan (Measured in Silver Pieces) (Kataoka 1984: 502)*

The contents of *kōsatsu* varied, however. The following document, translated from photographs taken in the *Byakkotai Kinenkan* 白虎隊記念館 in Aizu Wakamatsu 会津若松, is a typical example of the 1682 *kōsatsu*. A similar specimen with slight differences can be found in the Laures Kirishitan Bunko Database (a) along with an alternative English translation. Another English translation of a 1682 *kōsatsu* is offered by Michael Laver (2011: 64). Nevertheless, printed below is the first English translation of the Aizu version of the text. The text is divided into three principal parts: a reminder of the legal status of Christianity, instructions and information on rewards for informants, and information on the punishment of those who have aided *Kirishitan*. It is interesting to note that the text explicitly states that rewards will be given to an informant regardless of the informant's own religious affiliation, perhaps suggesting that in the past a number of informants had been drawn from *Kirishitan* circles. Indeed, modern-day studies show that some informants are motivated by a desire to reform or repent and fear of incarceration (Madinger 2000: 51–52, 57–58), and presumably these factors manifested themselves during the Edo period in *Kirishitan*-on-*Kirishitan* informing.

The text reads as follows:

> Ordained
>
> For successive years, the *Kirishitan* religion has been banned. If you find a suspicious person,[16] you should lodge a complaint with the authorities. As a reward, we will supply:
>
> The informant of a *Bateren.* 500 silver coins.
> The informant of an *Iruman.* 300 silver coins.
> The informant of a *Tachikaerimono*. The same amount [as above].
> The informant of a *dōjuku* or an ordinary adherent. 100 silver coins.
>
> The foregoing has been decreed. Even if the informant is a *dōjuku* or an ordinary adherent, they shall receive (according to the person against which a complaint is lodged) the 500 silver coins. If it is discovered that you have done something like hiding [a *Kirishitan*], the village headman of

[16] As an interesting note, the term could also be translated as "a person of incomplete understanding."

> that place, the *goningumi* etc., even your family [household] will be punished. It has so been ordained.
>
> The ninth lunar month of the second of the Tenna Era [November 1682]
> The Bugyō.[17] (Morris 2018: 309–10)

As previously noted, in 1642 the system of remuneration for informants and for the *goningumi* were combined (Miyazaki 2003: 12). *Goningumi* were networks that covered all aspects of local administration, but also provided a form of anti-*Kirishitan* surveillance by obliging members to watch one another, their employees, and tenants for whose actions they were made responsible (Turnbull 1998: 44; Takekoshi 2004: 392, 395–96). The above *kōsatsu* notes that if a person is discovered to be aiding *Kirishitan* then their village headman, *goningumi*, and family will be punished. This refers to the principals of *renza* 連座 (the extension of complicity to a social group) and *enza* 縁座 (the extension of complicity to family members), which meant that a crime committed by one member could render all members of the *goningumi* responsible and deserving of punishment (Frédéric 2002: 788; Kataoka 1984: 499; Sansom 1963: 12–13; Henderson 1970: 223). Depending on locality, punishments could range from fines to execution (Shimizu 1986: 194; Kataoka 1984: 499–500).

The aiding of *Kirishitan* by others was a problem very apparent to the *bakufu*: two of the seven most common reasons for execution related to aiding *Kirishitan* and a further two related to failure or refusal to act as an informant (Boxer 1951: 341–42). The *goningumi* system provided the *bakufu* with more control over both problem areas by making members of a person's wider social network complicit in the crime and by offering greater non-monetary incentives to inform. Prior to the combination of the *goningumi* and the system of remunerations, the motivations of informants could only be monetary and personal: based on revenge, jealousy, patriotism or ideology, the potential of non-monetary personal gain, for example, moving up the social ladder or the potential to increase self-worth or esteem (Madinger 2000: 53–60). However, the combination of these systems meant that all people with knowledge of the existence of *Kirishitan* were motivated by fear to inform on members of their group in order to ensure the survival (or peace of mind) of both themselves and their loved ones. John Madinger (ibid.: 51) notes that fear especially when related to self-preservation is a highly important factor motivating modern-day informants noting that "people who become informants out of fear generally do so because they are threatened by either the law or by other criminals." We might also assume that self-preservation and fear were highly important for motivating Edo-period informants.

Whilst scholars such as Laver (2011: 68) attest to the efficacy of the *goningumi* system for gaining informants, it is also apparent that the *goningumi* system allowed families in predominantly *Kirishitan* areas to subvert authority and continue their religious practices in hiding (Nosco 1993: 8; Nosco 2007: 89; Harrington 1980: 324–25). As noted, the extent to which informing took place is unclear. Nevertheless, the great success of the combined *goningumi*-remuneration system is that it made all in society responsible for the policing of Christianity. It created a system in which each Japanese was effectively an a priori informant whose duty (or obligation) was to inform on *Kirishitan*. Of course, individuals with knowledge of *Kirishitan* could exercise their freedom of personal choice to reject this role and not to inform, but this ran the risk of execution for the individual and his larger social network should the authorities gain such information from another source.

Terauke Seido

In conjunction with developing a system of surveillance and persecution tied to *bakufu* political structures and centres of power, the Tokugawa leaders also sought to make Buddhist institutions instruments of religious surveillance and persecution. Under Ieyasu, apostates had been required to gain certification of temple registration in order to prove their conversion to Buddhism (Tamamuro 2009: 16), and from the 1630s this was extended to the general population (Hur 2007: 15). All Japanese were required to become

[17] The governor.

parishioners of a temple to affirm their non-*Kirishitan* religious identity (ibid.), and from the late 1630s certificates of registration were made necessary for all Japanese (Tamamuro 2001: 262; Miyazaki 2001: 20; Miyazaki 2003: 12; Shimizu 1986: 182). In 1635, the Office of Temples and Shrines (*jisha bugyō* 寺社奉行) was created (Tamamuro 2009: 17) and oversaw the creation of administrative head temples (*furegashira jiin* 触頭寺院) for each Buddhist sect. Head temples in turn required their branch temples "to expose Christians in all villages" (ibid.: 17–18.). This was first set into law in 1660, when a *bakufu* edict stated:

> Peasants and townspeople are to be investigated by five-household mutual responsibility groups (*goningumi*) and parish temples (*danna-dera* 檀那寺). Investigations should be conducted on anyone whose religion is suspect. (quoted in Tamamuro 2009: 22)

Alongside the *goningumi,* parish temples were thereby made responsible for monitoring religious affiliation (ibid.: 22). The network of head and branch temples served to create a system of religious monitoring through supplying certificates of temple registration (ibid.: 18). Every temple provided non-*Kirishitan* with certificates (of various forms), and following this a register (*shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō* 宗門人別改帳)[18] was compiled by village leaders or local officials (Hur 2007: 15–16; Kataoka 1984: 509). These registers recorded not only religious affiliation, but census-like information including age, marriage, immigration, deaths, and births (Tamamuro 2001: 262). Many temples also kept their own registers known as *kakochō* 過去帳 or *ekōchō* 回向帳 (Hur 2007: 16).

As such, two processes of religious monitoring were taking place: certifying by the abbot of a temple that those affiliated with it were not *Kirishitan* (*terauke seido*) and the creation of a register recording religious affiliation and other details by the local authority to be submitted to the government (ibid.: 15–16). This system radically increased the power of Buddhism, providing them with legal responsibility over their parishioners and creating permanent temple–parishioner relationships that required parishioners to participate in rituals, to use the temple for funerary services, and to make financial contributions (Tamamuro 2009: 22; Hur 2007: 16; Reader 1991: 86).

Terauke seido allowed for the creation of various types of registers including the aforementioned *kakochō* and *ekōchō,* as well as individual family (*koseki* 戸籍) (Tamamuro 2009: 23). However, perhaps most important for a study of this nature is the *shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō*, which recorded the contents of temple certificates, the religious affiliation of local inhabitants, gender, names, and the number of people in a family amongst other things (Shimizu 1986: 184–85; Tamamuro 2001: 262–63; Gonoi 1990: 234). These records existed in a variety of formats and under a variety of names (Matsuura 2009: 131–33). The oldest existent copy of such a document comes from 1634 (Shimizu 1986: 184; Gonoi 1990: 233), however, at that time the compilation of these registries was confined to Kyōto, Kyūshū 九州, and other areas with a historically large *Kirishitan* presence (Tamamuro 2001: 262).

In 1664 or 1665, all domains were ordered to establish offices of religious investigation (*shūmon bugyō* 宗門奉行/*jisha bugyō* 寺社奉行) (Elisonas 1991: 370; Tamamuro 2001: 262). These offices were to oversee the collection and composition of *shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō*, and from 1671 the registers were given a standardised format (Tamamuro 2001: 262; Shimizu 1986: 225–26). Following the collection of the register, a page summary for each town unit was to be sent to the *bakufu* (Tamamuro 2001: 263). The *terauke seido* system and the collection of registers therefore created a sort of dual surveillance on the local level: first, individuals were screened by the local temple and following this, the local authorities. Nevertheless, whilst *terauke seido* focused primarily on religious surveillance, the composition of *shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō* established a wider system of population surveillance. Within this wider system of surveillance, religious affiliation was a single concern amongst many. Despite this, both political and religious systems of surveillance were intertwined and complemented each other.

[18] Alternatively *shūshi ninbetsu chō* 宗旨人別改帳.

Around 1735, a forged document claiming to be written in 1613 by the *bakufu* entitled the *Gojōmoku Shūmon Danna Ukeai no Okite* 御条目宗門檀那請合之掟 (Rules Concerning the Certification of Religious Affiliation for Parishioners)[19] appeared (Tamamuro 2001: 265). This document, which was quoted in several of the registries, laid out the grounds by which a person could be refused issuance of a temple certificate (ibid.: 266) or stripped of their registration. The document addressed not only *Kirishitan* but other banned religions, principally the *Fuju fuse* and *Hidenshū* 悲田宗 prohibited from 1669 and 1691 respectively (ibid.: 265). An English translation and Japanese version of the text exists in the Laures Kirishitan Bunko Database (b), and an accessible Japanese reprint of the text also exists in a paper by Nangō Kōko (2010: 3–5). However, due to his extensive commentary, Tamamuro's exploration is favoured here.

Several articles of the document relate to the attendance at ancestral memorial services and religious festivals. The third article notes that failure to attend necessary festivals will result in the removal of a person's name (and those of his family) from the registry, the notification of the authorities, and investigation (Tamamuro 2001: 266–77; Laures Database b). The fourth article argues that *Kirishitan* and other religious dissidents usually do not celebrate the anniversary of their ancestors or funerals performed by the Buddhist clergy; they send only a small gift to the temple and are disrespectful and disinterested in the clergyman following his arrival (Tamamuro 2001: 267; Laures Database b). The text argues that in such circumstances, investigations should be made (Tamamuro 2001: 267). Finally, the text states that able-bodied people who do not attend such services or who are careless in religious matters will be investigated (ibid.: 267). The document, however, did not only oblige parishioners to attend festivals; it also laid out a more general code of behaviour. Requesting to hold a funeral in a different temple or criticising the abbot of a temple were grounds for investigation (Laures Database b). Expected codes of behaviour, however, also included sending monetary support to the temple, labour obligations, and perhaps most importantly a parishioner ought "in all matters [to] follow the directions of the temple and perform religious devotions" (Tamamuro 2001: 269). The document also laid out the need to investigate the religious affiliation of the parishioners noting that even if a family had belonged to a temple for generations that its members may have been drawn to heterodox beliefs (Tamamuro 2001: 268–69; Laures Database b) and that members of heterodox religious groups often belong to a temple regardless of the beliefs in their hearts (Laures Database b). The document also provided rights to the temple abbot to investigate and determine the religious affiliation of a parishioner posthumously (Tamamuro 2001: 269).

Although the date of the document's composition is forged, the document outlines the rights of the temple in relation to its parishioners and the obligations of those parishioners, which would hereto become standardised practice. In the case that a rule was broken or an obligation went unfulfilled "the temple had the prerogative of removing it [the name of the offender] from the registry of religious affiliation, in effect branding the household a member of a heterodox religion" (ibid.: 268).

The creation and evolution of the *terauke seido* system added a further level to anti-*Kirishitan* surveillance; the religious affiliation of an individual was not only the responsibility of the individual's social network as represented by the *goningumi* but the local, authorised religious system. Rigorously standardised codes of religious behaviour and obligations meant that temples were able to detect and inform the authorities of potentially deviant individuals in need of investigation. Simultaneously, individuals were made to embrace (at least outwardly) and conform to a Buddhist religious identity. The collection of registers recording religious affiliation meant that the local authorities and the *bakufu* itself were also able to monitor religious affiliation. Such a system allowed Buddhism to become the predominant religion in Japan (Williams 2005: 7). It simultaneously offered the *bakufu* further means to consolidate their power by offering the formerly militarily powerful Buddhist sects a profitable role within the Tokugawa political system and by extending means of control over the behaviour of their population.

[19] Also known as the *Shūmon Danna Ukeai no Okite* 宗門檀那請合掟 and the *Jashūmon Ginmi no Koto* 邪宗門吟味の事 (About the Examination of Heterodox Sects).

As such, the privileging of Buddhism and its deployment against other religions was the result of much wider motivations than simply monitoring the existence of Christians.

Kirishitan Ruizoku

The *shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō* were not the only registers used to keep detailed information on the population, although few other records find mention in most English language secondary sources. Discoveries of *Kirishitan* communities, such as the Bungo 豊後 *kuzure* 豊後崩れ of 1660 where 220 were discovered in the Bungo area (Kataoka 1984: 512), reaffirmed the need for both anti-*Kirishitan* persecution and surveillance. As such, following the succession of the fifth Shōgun, Tokugawa Tsunayoshi 徳川綱吉 (1646–1709), in 1680 a new anti-*Kirishitan* edict was promulgated (Shimizu 1986: 228–29). It was primarily concerned with the apostate *Kirishitan* and their descendants (*ruizoku* 類族) and demanded that records of both be made. In the case of apostates these registers were to seek to answer the following questions:

1) Where had *Kirishitan* been exposed?
2) When had he or she apostatised?
3) If they had informed on fellow *Kirishitan,* did they return to their usual abode?
4) Was the person still in custody?
5) Since apostatising, how had their occupation been? (Shimizu 1986: 229)

It furthermore noted that in the case that the *Kirishitan* had children prior to apostatising, the same questions should be asked, but if the *Kirishitan* had children after apostatising these children should be treated as descendants (ibid.: 229). The edict then made the following requests:

1) To enquire to the religious life of the apostate at his or her temple.
2) To report to higher authorities should a person of doubtful religious belief or creed be discovered.
3) To soak the corpse of a deceased former *Kirishitan* in salt.
4) To inspect the corpse of a descendant when he or she dies, and if nothing suspicious is noted to allow the temple to proceed with the funeral informing the *shūmon aratame yaku* 宗門改役 (E. Inquisitor). (ibid.: 229–230)

Following this guidance, registers of apostate *Kirishitan* and their descendants were to be made. In the case that the apostate was a man, the records would be recorded for seven or nine generations; in the case they were women, four generations (Shimizu 1986: 230; Jennes 1959: 173). The records included details on death, birth, marriage, divorce, migration, adoption, disownment, execution, name changes, changes of religion, if a person had joined the Buddhist or Shinto priesthood, if a person was missing, if a person had shaved their head, and if a person had been expelled from their temple (Shimizu 1986: 321). Such records were extensive: the *Kyōto Oboegaki* 京都覚書 compiled in 1688, collating information from the *Kirishitan ruizoku chō* キリシタン類族帳 of seventy-four domains and lists a massive 75,988 people, including 23,150 deceased (Shimizu 1986: 321; Ebisawa 1976: 15–18).

The system meant that the descendants of *Kirishitan* were constantly monitored by the authorities and under "the permanent control of the government" (Jennes 1959: 173). Contemporaneously, religion was understood to be hereditary and as such the authorities believed that the children of *Kirishitan* were in some way tainted (Laver 2011: 150). This likely formed part of the impetus and logic of this part of the *bakufu*'s anti-*Kirishitan* surveillance system: if religion were hereditary, it was more likely that the descendants of *Kirishitan* would themselves harbour heterodox beliefs. This conception was not as far-fetched as it might first appear: Endō Shūsaku (1987: 16–17) for instance notes that conversion generally occurred in familial units because changes in religious affiliation affect family members' and their ancestors' posthumous prospects.

In the village of Ōkago 大籠, located in the south of modern-day Iwate Prefecture (*Iwate ken* 岩手県) the information of both ordinary people and the decedents of *Kirishitan* was recorded in a *ruizokuchō* 類族帳 entitled the *Kirishitan shūmon ninzū aratamechō* 切支丹宗門人数改帳 (Fujisawa 2007: 16).[20] In 1789, there were some 302 descendants listed; however, because surveillance was only carried out for up to nine generations, this had dropped to 214 by 1800, three by 1835, and eventually zero by 1837 (ibid.: 16). Below are translations of entries regarding a non-*Kirishitan* family and a *goningumi* of *Kirishitan* descendants found in the 1789 copy of the document. A typical example of an entry for a non-*Kirishitan* family appears as follows:

> Estimated tax of 34 *mon*.[21] Estimated tax based on new rice fields – 36 *mon.*
> *Sōtō* Sect,[22] Daiji Temple.
> Hashiba Yashiki [Name of Abode], Zentarō, 37. His wife, 35.
> His younger brother, Zenkichi, 15. His [Zentarō's] mother, 44.
> Total 4 People. Two Males. Two Females. (Translated from Fujisawa 2007: 17)

The example of a family descended from *Kirishitan* is perhaps more interesting for the purposes of this paper. In the *Kirishitan shūmon ninzū aratamechō,* the principal difference between the entries on non-*Kirishitan* families and families descended from *Kirishitan* appears to be little more than the appendage of a note stating that the family is descended from a *Kirishitan.* Below is the record for four families that made up a *goningumi* from the same 1789 register:

> Estimated tax of 135 *mon.* Estimated tax based on new rice fields – 5 *mon*.
> *Ji* Sect,[23] Chōtoku Temple.
> Descendant of an apostate *Kirishitan*, and firearm owner. Shimonozaike Yashiki [Name of Abode], *Goningumi* Leader, Chōhachi, 57.
> His wife, 38. Boy of the same lineage, Kichijūrō, 20.
> His wife, 17.
> Total 4 People. 2 Males. 2 Females.
>
> Estimated tax of 112 *mon.* Estimated tax based on new rice fields – 6 *mon*.
> *Ji* Sect, Chōtoku Temple.
> Descendant of an apostate *Kirishitan.* Kendanhatake Yashiki, Ichizaemon, 66.
> His child, Kichizaemon, 46. His [Kichizaemon's] wife, 41.
> Boy, Momosuke, 7. Girl, Han, 4.
> Total 5 People. Males 3. Females 2.
>
> Estimated tax of 98 *mon.* Estimated tax based on new rice fields – 5 *mon*.
> *Ji* Sect, Chōtoku Temple.
> Descendant of an apostate *Kirishitan.* Shimonozaike Yashiki, Nagayoshi, 32.
> His wife, 28. Boy, Chō, 13. His [Nagayoshi's] mother, 48.
> Total 4 People. Males 2. Females 2.
>
> Estimated tax of 245 *mon.* Estimated tax based on new rice fields – 9 *mon*.
> *Ji* Sect, Chōtoku Temple.
> Descendant of an apostate *Kirishitan.* Shimonozaike Yashiki, Jizaemon, 42.
> Girl, Fumi, 12. His mother, 62.

---

[20] Matsuura Akira (2004: 4) describes the document as a *shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō* rather than a *ruizokuchō*.

[21] *Mon* 文 (a form of currency made from copper or iron).

[22] *Sōtōshū* 曹洞宗.

[23] J*ishū* 時宗.

> Total 3 People. Males 1. Females 2.
>
> The total number of persons in this one group of four families recorded to the right [in this case above] is 16.
>
> Males 8.
> Females 8. (Translated from Fujisawa 2007: 23–24)

As can be seen above, the Ōkago *Kirishitan shūmon ninzū aratamechō* records tax information, current religious affiliation, notes on whether the person is the descendant of an apostate *Kirishitan,* current abode, the roles and ages of family members in relation to the head of the family, and in the case of men and female children their names. It also records information such as firearm ownership and provides the total number of members for each household based on gender and for each *goningumi*. Nevertheless, the format and contents of *ruizokuchō* varied radically.[24] The 1769 *Esashigun Kirishitan ruizokusho jō* 江刺郡切支丹類族書上 from Esashi 江刺 province in modern-day Iwate Prefecture notes only the villages and names of *Kirishitan* descendants. An example from the text is as follows:

> Kataoka Village.
> 3 men.
> Bungorō. Kōsuke. Bunsuke. (Translated from Shitō 1984: 146)

Other documents, such as the 1720 *Kurodasuke mura kokirishitan no ruizoku niki ichiki honchō* 黒田助村古切支丹の類族弐季壱季本牒 from the same area, provide a much more detailed picture than either of the above documents with descriptive passages appearing alongside shorter notes. Here I translate a short section of one of its passages:

> Esashi Province, Kurodasuke Village, Peasant.
> Apostate *Kirishitan*.
> Sukesō.
> Sukesō's heir. Born prior to his father's apostasy so to be treated the same as the person himself [Sukesō].
> Chōjirō.
> This person was a peasant in Esashi Province, Kurodasuke Village.
>
> The descendants of those listed to the right [in this case above].
>
> Chosen by Sukesō for marriage. Chōjirō's wife. Died of illness on the fifth day of the sixth month of 1723.
> Fuka. A parishioner of the *Zen*[25] Sect's Chōshō Hermitage in Esashi Province, Kurodasuke Village, at that time [when she died] she was 77 years old.
> This woman was the daughter of the peasant Sukēmon of Esashi Province's Futakochō Village. After the death of her husband, she was with her son Sukezaemon. And following the death of Sukezaemon she was with Sukegorō. (Translated from Shitō 1984: 143)

As one can see, the document first describes the *Kirishitan* apostate who is at this point an ancestor of those that the text seeks to explore. It then explores each of the apostate's descendants providing details of their relation to the original apostate, their name, age, time of death (if no longer living), location, their temple affiliation, and details regarding their family, background, and places in which they lived. Whilst

[24] For details on the layout of *ruizokuchō,* see Kataoka (1984: 512–13).

[25] Zenshū 禅宗.

the translated section above covers only one descendant, the entry for each apostate continues through numerous descendants (in the case of Sukesō, see Shitō 1984: 142–46).

The composition of *ruizokuchō* provided another layer of surveillance and information collection. The impetus of these sorts of records appears to be the discovery of hidden *Kirishitan* (*senpuku Kirishitan* 潜伏キリシタン) communities and a conception of religious identity and behaviour as inherited. Unlike the *shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō* and *terauke seido* system, which gathered information on the whole population, *ruizokuchō* recorded often detailed information about the descendants of apostates, creating a database of potential religious criminals and a system in which descendants became the target of rigorous and life-long surveillance. Nevertheless, like the *shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō, ruizokuchō* recorded a wide array of information, constituting a form of population surveillance with only tentative links to religion.

Efumi

First developed in the late 1620s, *efumi* was a ceremony in which *Kirishitan* and apostates were made to step on Christian objects and representations known as *fumie* in order to cause or confirm their apostasy (Kataoka 1984: 504; DaCosta Kaufmann 2010: 143–44; Gonoi 1990: 236). However, from 1641 it became used as a means by which to discover *Kirishitan* (Kataoka 1984: 504; Kataoka 1989: 77). Through establishing the religious identity of those who partook in the ceremony, the rite also indicated a person's "civic loyalty or reliability" (DaCosta Kaufmann 2010: 144.). Nationwide, it was used to confirm the religious identity of foreigners who drifted ashore and people connected with them, discovered *Kirishitan,* and the servants of high ranking *Kirishitan* in prison (Kataoka 1984: 504–5). And, from around 1660 it was used in all domains to expose *Kirishitan* (Cieslik and Ōta 1999: 217–18). In Kyūshū, however, the ceremony became a yearly, bi-yearly, or tri-yearly occurrence depending on locality (Kataoka 1984: 504). In Nagasaki, the whole city was made to partake in the ceremony annually at New Year (Shimizu 1986: 190). On the third day of the first month an *efumi* ceremony was conducted at the homes of the town elders, then from the fourth to the ninth day ceremonies were conducted within each town of the city, and finally from the twelfth day in the villages under the control of the Nagasaki magistrate (Gonoi 1990: 236). Gonoi Takashi (1990: 236) and Kataoka Yakichi (1984: 505) note that because it was believed that treading on an image was an admission of apostasy from which a convert could not return, the act of treading on an image caused *Kirishitan* a great deal of torment. Indeed, the system was predicated on the notion that *Kirishitan* attachment to sacred symbols could illicit a reaction that would betray their belief (Higashibaba 2001: 145). Mia M. Mochizuki (2009: 67) describes the ceremony, noting that officials watched "as a suspected Japanese Christian simulated destruction by stepping on a devotional image. Vigilance by the judges for the slightest sign of camouflaged dissent was required for sound judgment."

Following the ceremony, *Kirishitan* who apostatised were often made to sign *korobi kakimono*, certificates verifying their apostasy (Kataoka 1984: 505). The successful occurrence of the ceremony was sometimes recorded in yet another register known as the *efumichō* 絵踏帳, which were also used to rollcall household members at the beginning of the ceremony (Shimizu 1986: 191). These documents do not appear to be particularly distinct from *shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō* (Matsuura 2004: 8, 15). For instance, Nakajima Mitsuhiro (2012: 107–8), who writes about the contents of the bi-yearly recorded *efumichō* from Nomo Village (*Nomomura* 野母村) in Nagasaki, notes that the document records names, temple affiliation, age, family relationships, births, deaths, marriages, and divorces.

The method of *efumi* does not appear to have been greatly effective for discovering *Kirishitan* following the major periods of persecution in the first half of the seventeenth century. Communities of hidden *Kirishitan* developed measures to deal with the act that they were made to perform on a yearly basis. The *Kirishitan* in Urakami 浦上 taught their children to tread on the *fumie* lightly, whilst *Kirishitan* in Amakusa 天草 attempted to tread as far as was possible only on the side of the *fumie* (Kataoka 1989: 78). The communities also developed a special prayer, the *Konchirisan no inori* コンチリサンの祈り (E. Prayer

of Penance) to be said after the ceremony (ibid.). Despite this, the *efumi* ceremony provided the authorities with a further opportunity to survey and confirm citizens' religious affiliations. Furthermore, unlike the previously described systems, *efumi* allowed surveillance to be carried out directly by the authorities rather than through the testimony of informants or the temples.

The Limitations of Anti-*Kirishitan* Surveillance

In 1644, the last missionary Konishi Mancio (*Mansho Konishi* マンショ小西, 1600–44) died (Miyazaki 2003: 4–5). However, in spite of the rigorous system of surveillance and persecution developed by the Tokugawa *bakufu*, *Kirishitan* continued to exist underground. Some of these hidden *Kirishitan* communities continued to exist into the modern period, with somewhere between 20,000 and 50,000 coming out of hiding at the beginning of the Meiji period (Cary 1976: 288). In this sense, the *bakufu* failed to eradicate Christianity. In fact, Peter Nosco (1993: 21–22) argues that the *bakufu*

> understood that despite its success in controlling what people do or say, it was ultimately unable to control what they think or believe . . . as a result one observes renewed emphasis by the state on methods for insuring no more than nominal compliance with its religious policy. These methods include the *terauke* . . . system, the *shūmon aratame* . . ., the *goningumi* . . . and—specifically against the Christians—the *efumi* . . .

In other words, for Nosco the elements of anti-*Kirishitan* surveillance explored in this paper evolved in such a way as to ensure only nominal compliance with religious policy, rather than the eradication of *Kirishitan* belief. For Nosco, the *bakufu*'s realisation that it could not control beliefs was one that developed rather early. In his *Keeping the Faith: Bakuhan Policy towards Religions in Seventeenth-Century Japan,* Nosco (1996: 143) refers to attempts to cause Jesuit priest Antonio Ishida (1569–1632) to apostatise, including an offer that allowed him to retain his beliefs as long as he outwardly abided by *bakufu* policy.

Nosco (148) notes that, due to the discovery of *Kirishitan* communities in the late 1650s and early 1660s, *shūmon aratame yaku* Inoue came to recognise that in spite of initial success, anti-*Kirishitan* policies had failed. Referring to Inoue's testimony in his record, the *Kirisuto ki* 契利斯督記, Nosco (148) writes:

> Inoue understood that performance of the *efumi* . . . and the provision of information for the religious census of the *Shūmon aratame,* had met initially with self-incriminating candour on the parts of suspects but that these same methods later encountered increasingly sophisticated strategies of dissimulation and prevarication. Evidently, obedience in matters of personal faith was proving less amenable to enforcement than obedience in other matters . . .

The change of efficacy in the systems of surveillance and persecution built by the *bakufu* seem, therefore, to have resulted from a change in approach by *Kirishitan*—they were no longer incriminating themselves. When the Jesuit Press had been operational, several works placing central importance on martyrdom had been printed. As early as 1591, the Jesuits had printed their *Sanctos no Gosagyō* (*Santosu no Gosagyō* サントスの御作業), which contained accounts of the lives of the apostles, popular saints, and martyrs and a 171-page (of a total six hundred pages) treatise on martyrdom entitled *Maruchiriyo no Kotowari* マルチリヨの理 (Anesaki 1931a: 291). In 1593, this was followed by *Bauchizumo no sazukeyō* ばうちずもの授けやう (E. On Baptism and Preparation for Death), including instructions to be given in preparation for martyrdom (ibid.: 291). Following this, three texts primarily addressing and encouraging martyrdom were printed: the pre-1615 *Maruchiriyo no kagami* マルチリヨの鑑 (E. Mirror of Martyrdom), the 1615 *Maruchiriyo no susume* マルチリヨの勧め (E. Exhortations on Martyrdom), and the 1622 *Maruchiriyo no kokoroe* マルチリヨの心得 (E. Instructions on Martyrdom) (Anesaki 1931b: 20–65; Anesaki 1926: 131–239; Anesaki 1932: 27–54).

Due to the prime importance placed on martyrdom in the above texts and by the missionaries themselves, Ikuo Higashibaba (2001: 154) argues that "for the missionaries, martyrdom was the only legitimate

behaviour when persecuted . . . after 1614, being Kirishitan, when it meant an explicit demonstration of the Kirishitan faith, was fulfilled by being martyred." Nevertheless, the Jesuit text *Maruchiriyo no kokoroe* itself betrays a change in thought that would later manifest itself in a change in response to the *bakufu*'s anti-*Kirishitan* measures. Namely, the text stated that it was not a sin for a *Kirishitan* to refuse to state that they were *Kirishitan* during an inquisition if a confession would result in torture or death (ibid.: 152). Moreover, it permitted migration or hiding to avoid arrest and the hiding of religious items (ibid.). Alongside the missionaries' own hiding, their preaching to hidden communities, and their own denials of faith under torture, a model formed in which hiding and denial rather than self-sacrifice became the means for *Kirishitan* survival and existence.

In Nosco's thesis, the change in *Kirishitan* response led Inoue and the authorities to realise that they were unable to control what was in peoples' hearts. One can add to Nosco's argument that anti-*Kirishitan* policy had never really been about controlling beliefs. Certainly it contained elements that sought to reform beliefs, but at its heart it was a policy that when understood alongside other political changes sought to consolidate and centralise Tokugawa power and control potential political threats (Kitagawa 1990: 322; Morris 2018: 120–72). It was moreover part of a wider movement that sought to control organised religion, which had begun under the Tokugawa's predecessors Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1534–82) (Elison 1981: 71–74) and Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 (1537–98) (Berry 1982: 85–87, 104). Therefore, because the *bakufu*'s systems of religious surveillance brought religious practice under its control and eliminated the potential threats that the *bakufu* associated with Christianity, it could be argued that these systems were effective in their goal. It must also be reiterated that whereas the *bakufu*'s surveillance of religion was part of a wider system of population surveillance and was primarily concerned with controlling behaviour, it was the Buddhist institutions that were responsible for providing certification of the orthodoxy of a person's beliefs. As such, the surveillance and control of religious belief fell not to the *bakufu* political institutions, but to religious institutions and those involved in *terauke seido*.

Nosco (1996: 148–49) notes a further change in policy, namely that there was a decrease in the severity of anti-*Kirishitan* persecution. He writes that

> whereas some two-thirds of Omura Christians refused in 1657 to disavow their faith and were executed, roughly a decade later, when some 30 Christians were discovered in Usuki in 1668 . . . not one was executed; they were instead arrested and imprisoned . . .. When the circumstances of their arrest, sentencing, and imprisonment were reported to the Commissioner of Inquisition (*shūmon bugyō*) in Edo, an approving reply came in the form of a letter.

This was not only a decrease in the severity of persecution, for Nosco (1993: 22) "the Bakuhan state through most of the eighteenth century was largely indifferent to the uncovering of Christians." Although it is not the case (as Nosco claims [ibid.]) that there were no instances of anti-*Kirishitan* persecution between 1698 and 1789, as evidenced by the little-known persecutions at Yonekawa 米川 (Endō 1992: 82–83), there is evidence that the authorities on the whole were not actively enforcing anti-*Kirishitan* legislation. In 1805, 5,200 *Kirishitan* were discovered in Amakusa 天草, an area that had been the location of a Jesuit college and as such was under a great deal of surveillance (Nosco 1993: 22). Nosco (ibid.) notes that it is

> quite implausible that the actual faith and religious practice of over five thousand individuals in four villages could have been unknown either to the local authorities or to the priests of those temples at which these underground Christians satisfied the requirements of the *terauke* system.

It must also be noted that Amakusa was not an unusual example, with some twenty thousand *Kirishitan* being thought to have existed in the nineteenth century in and around Nagasaki alone (ibid.: 23). Moreover, in some areas such as the island of Ikitsuki 生月, *Kirishitan* practised their faith more or less openly throughout the period of hiding (Nakazono 2015), suggesting the authorities turned a blind eye in some areas. The area of Urakami provides another interesting example to support the conclusion that the

authorities often turned a blind eye to the presence of *Kirishitan.* In 1790–91, 1840–41, 1856–60, and 1867–72, communities of *Kirishitan* were discovered there (Nosco 1993: 22), suggesting that the presence of *Kirishitan* in the area was known by the authorities who only chose to act on this information periodically and certainly not to full effect as the communities continued to exist in spite of being discovered on four occasions.

Nosco (1996: 148) offers several reasons for this tolerated existence of the hidden *Kirishitan* communities. Firstly, Christianity was no longer perceived to pose a threat; hidden *Kirishitan* were after all outwardly exemplary citizens. Secondly, "the state's dependence upon informants and self-incrimination had resulted in a corpus of legislation the enforcement of which ran counter to the economic interests and social practices of local communities" (ibid.: 151). This echoes the words of Michel Foucault (1980: 55) who in an interview with J. J. Brochier spoke about the acceptance and toleration of some forms of illegality in the modern world, noting that the cost of effective surveillance and security systems are often uneconomical. Foucault (ibid.) continued to state that relaxation and toleration of some crime can be afforded by a system when that crime poses no threat to it. Building on the reasons above provided by Nosco, it might therefore be possible to suggest that a combination of economic interests and the movement of Christianity to the margins, where it no longer posed a threat, allowed for the limited toleration of *Kirishitan* communities. Nosco (1993: 23), however, provides further reasons to be considered: thirdly, the discovery of sizeable *Kirishitan* communities would cause embarrassment to local officials illustrating that either the current official or his predecessors had failed in their responsibilities. Fourthly, there were often socio-economic reasons to not uncover *Kirishitan* communities due to both their size and their involvement in agriculture, for example. Fifthly, not exposing communities gave power to those who concealed them, in Nosco's words "power (in the form of control) inevitably accrues to those who comply in concealing knowledge of another's transgressions" (ibid.: 23–24).

Another potential reason that the existence of hidden *Kirishitan* was tolerated or overlooked is that, as noted in the section on *terauke seido,* the institutions that the *bakufu* established for the purposes of religious surveillance were built to fulfil multiple motivations and perform multiple roles. *Terauke seido* and the *shūmon aratame* helped the *bakufu* to consolidate its power, nullify the threat posed to its power by powerful or potentially powerful religious groups, control religious behaviour, and collect population data. It could be theorised that following the decline of illegal religions, the existence of now non-threatening religious deviants could be overlooked, and the institutions could divert their resources and attention to other parts of their remit.

Nosco's reasons require the acceptance of the premise that *Kirishitan* communities were detected but tolerated. Conversely, it is also possible that *Kirishitan* communities simply went undetected. Indeed, if Inoue's testimony is to be accepted at face value, it might be possible to add to these reasons by suggesting that when *Kirishitan* did not incriminate themselves the authorities found it difficult to uncover them. If a person fulfilled his legal religious duties such as becoming a temple parishioner, stepping on the *fumie*, and so on, there were no grounds by which to distinguish that person from a non-*Kirishitan*. In this sense, *bakufu* measures to monitor potential *Kirishitan* also allowed *Kirishitan* desirous to hide a way to avoid suspicion by compliance with the law. It is likely that *Kirishitan* communities continued to exist for a plethora of reasons differing based on locality. Some likely went undetected,[26] others were detected but due to a combination of the reasons outlined above were tolerated.

Legacies

Most of the systems of surveillance initiated during the Edo period including the *shūmon aratame yaku*, the composition of *shūmon ninbetsu aratamechō* and *ruizokuchō*, and the practice of *fumie* had been abandoned prior to the fall of *bakufu* in 1868. Nevertheless, the new Meiji government inherited an epistemology of suspicion regarding new religions. Due to dissatisfaction with the mild treatment of the

[26] Some hidden *Kirishitan* communities continued to exist in hiding into the modern period (Whelan 1996: 15–16).

Kirishitan by the *bakufu*, the Meiji government intensified the persecution of hidden *Kirishitan* during the early years of the Meiji period, martyring some 664 *Kirishitan* between 1867 and 1873 (Abe 1978: 421; Maxey 2015: 397–98; Miyazaki 2001: 33). Furthermore, shortly after ascending to power, the Meiji government renewed the *kōsatsu* outlining the ban on Christianity throughout the country and ordered that *Kirishitan* be made to apostatise or sent into exile (Burkman 1974: 179–81). Both the government and Buddhist institutions sent spies to monitor Christianity (Thelle 1996: 96–97); however, privileging Shinto rather than Buddhism, the Meiji government created new, although short-lived, systems of surveillance such as a shrine registration system (*Ujiko shirabe* 氏子調) to replace *terauke seido* (Maxey 2015: 403–4). Reflecting the early Edo period, Buddhists too were also subjected to persecution (Ketelaar 1990). Later periods of religious persecution and surveillance have also reflected the goals and methods of Edo-period religious persecution and surveillance. For instance, prior to the Second World War, the government, much like the *bakufu*'s privileging of Buddhism, sought to incorporate "established religions into the ruling structure" (Garon 1986: 277). It, moreover, sought to suppress new religious movements (ibid.: 288–91).

These policies reflect the primary recurring trends present in the history of religious persecution and religious surveillance in Japan, which have here been elucidated in an exploration of the surveillance of *Kirishitan*. Historical instances of persecution and religious surveillance in Japan have sought to strengthen the position of established or traditional religious groups in order to consolidate and lend to the power of the ruling political system and have simultaneously sought to weaken new religious groups that pose a threat, real or imagined, to the status quo.

Conclusions

The *bakufu* developed a complex system of surveillance that relied on three overlapping methods: the use of informants, the composition of detailed registers, and tests of faith. These strategies developed to involve everyone in society. Individuals were compelled to inform on their friends and neighbours due to both the possibility of financial reward and the fact that their wider social network was implicated by association in the crime of refusing to inform. The Buddhist religious institutions provided temple membership certificates that individual families required in order to prove that they did not belong to a heterodox religion. This membership was contingent on the fulfilment of a series of obligations expected of temple parishioners. In turn, the details of temple registration were collected in registers by local officials, and eventually records on the descendants of apostates were also compiled. Finally, officials tested the religious beliefs of their populations through ceremonies that involved trampling on religious symbols.

The perceived efficacy of the Edo-period anti-*Kirishitan* surveillance system depends on one's approach. Did the *bakufu* eradicate Christianity? No. Was it able to eliminate the perceived threat that Christianity posed? Yes. Was it able to control people's beliefs? No. Was it able to control their action? Yes. Despite the anti-*Kirishitan* persecution and anti-*Kirishitan* surveillance, *Kirishitan* communities continued to exist likely due to a combination of both change in *Kirishitan* approach and a willingness on the side of the authorities to tolerate the existence of these communities.

References

Abe Yoshiya. 1978. From Prohibition to Toleration: Japanese Government Views Regarding Christianity, 1854–73. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 5 (2): 107–38.

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

Anesaki Masaharu. 1931a. Writings on Martyrdom in Kirishitan Literature. (1). *Proceedings of the Imperial Academy* 7 (8): 291–93.

Anesaki Masaharu. 1931b. Writings on Martyrdom in Kirishitan Literature. *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 8, Second Series: 20–65.

Anesaki Masaharu 姉崎正治. 1926. *Kirishitan shūmon no hakugai to senpuku* 切支丹宗門の迫害と潜伏. Tokyo: Dōbunkan.

Anesaki Masaharu 姉崎正治. 1932. *Kirishitan shūkyō bungaku* 切支丹宗教文学. Tokyo: Dōbunkan.
Anesaki Masaharu. 1963. *History of Japanese Religion: With Special Reference to the Social and Moral Life of the Nation.* London, UK: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.
Berry, Mary Elizabeth. 1982. *Hideyoshi.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Boxer, C. R. 1951. *The Christian Century in Japan: 1549–1650.* Manchester, UK: Carcanet Press.
Burkman, Thomas W. 1974. The Urakami Incidents and the Struggle for Religious Toleration in Early Meiji Japan. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 1 (2): 143–216.
Cary, Otis. 1976. *A History of Christianity in Japan.* 2 vols. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle.
Cieslik, Hubert. 1954. The Great Martyrdom in Edo 1623: Its Causes, Course, Consequences. *Monumenta Nipponica* 10 (1): 1–44.
Cieslik, Hubert. 1974. The Case of Christovão Ferreira. *Monumenta Nipponica* 29 (1): 1–54.
Cieslik, Hubert. H. チースリク, and Ōta Yoshiko 太田淑子. 1999. *Kirishitan: Nihonshi shōhyakka* キリシタン: 日本史小百科. Tokyo: Tokyodō Shuppan.
Clammer, John. 1997. *Contemporary Urban Japan: A Sociology of Consumption.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Cooper, Barry. 2004. *New Political Religions, or An Analysis of Modern Terrorism.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
DaCosta Kaufmann, Thomas. 2010. Interpreting Cultural Transfer and the Consequences of Markets and Exchange: Reconsidering *Fumi-e*. In *Artistic and Cultural Exchanges between Europe and Asia, 1400–1900: Rethinking Markets, Workshops and Collections,* edited by Michael North, 135–61. Farnham: Ashgate.
Ebisawa Arimichi 海老沢有道. 1976. *Chihō Kirishitan no hakkutsu* 地方切支丹の発掘. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō.
Ejima Akiko. 2014. From the West to the East: Migration of Surveillance Policy. In *Surveillance, Counter-Terrorism and Comparative Constitutionalism,* edited by Fergal David, Nicola McGarrity, and George Williams, 192–209. Abingdon: Routledge.
Elison, George. 1973. *Deus Destroyed: The Image of Christianity in Early Modern Japan.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Elison, George. 1981. The Cross and the Sword: Patterns of Momoyama History. In *Warlords, Artists, and Commoners: Japan in the Sixteenth Century,* edited by George Elison and Bardwell L. Smith, 55–86. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
Elisonas, Jurgis. 1991. Christianity and the Daimyo. In *The Cambridge History of Japan,* vol. 4, *Early Modern Japan,* edited by John Whitney Hall, 301–372. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Endō Shūsaku 遠藤周作. 1987. Santa Maria shinkō to Nihonjin no shūkyō ishiki サンタマリア信仰と日本人の宗教意識. In *NHK Rekishi dokyumento 6* NHK 歴史ドキュメント 6, edited by Nihon Hōsō Shūppan Kyōkai 日本放送出版協会, 13–17. Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shūppan Kyōkai.
Endō Shūsaku 遠藤周作. 1992. *Kirishitan Jidai – Junkyō to kikyō no rekishi* 切支丹時代 – 殉教と棄教の歴史. Tokyo: Shōgakukan.
Frédéric, Louis. 2002. Renza. In *Japan Encyclopedia,* translated by Käthe Roth, 788. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977.* Edited by Colin Gordon and translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper. New York: Pantheon Books.
Fujisawa Machi Bunka Shinkō Kyōkai and Fujisawa Machi Kyōikuiinkai 藤沢町文化振興協会と藤沢町教育委員会, ed. 2007. *Ōkago no Kirishitan to Seitetsu* 大籠の切支丹と製鉄. Fujisawa Machi: Fujisawa Machi Bunka Shinkō Kyōkai.
Garon, Sheldon. 1986. State and Religion in Imperial Japan, 1912–1945. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 12 (2): 273–302.
Garon, Sheldon. 1997. *Molding Japanese Minds: The State in Everyday Life.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Gonoi Takahashi 五野井隆史. 1990. *Nihon Kirisutokyōshi.* Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
Gonoi Takahashi 五野井隆史. 2002. *Nihon Kirishitanshi no kenkyū* 日本キリシタン史の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
Habito, Ruben L. F., and Jacqueline I. Stone. 1999. Revisiting Nichiren: Editors' Introduction. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 26 (3): 223–238.
Hall, John Whitney. 1981. Japan's Sixteenth-Century Revolution. In Warlords, Artists, and Commoners: Japan in the Sixteenth Century, edited by George Elison and Bardwell L. Smith, 7–22. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
Harding, Christopher. 2015. Introduction. In *Religion and Psychotherapy in Modern Japan,* edited by Christopher Harding, Iwata Fumiaki, and Yoshinaga Shin'ichi, 1–24. Abingdon: Routledge.
Harrington, Ann M. 1980. The Kakure Kirishitan and Their Place in Japan's Religious Tradition. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 7, (4): 318–336.
Henderson, Dan Fenno. 1970. The Evolution of Tokugawa Law. In *Studies in the Institutional History of Early Modern Japan,* edited by John Whitney Hall and Marius B. Jansen, 203–30. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Hibbard, Esther Lowell. 1963. *Refutation of Deus by Fabian.* Tokyo: International Institute for the Study of Religion.
Higashibaba Ikuo. 2001. *Christianity in Early Modern Japan, Kirishitan Belief and Practice.* Leiden, NL: Brill.
Howell, David L. 2005. *Geographies of Identity in Nineteenth-Century Japan.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Hur, Nam-lin. 2007. *Death and Social Order in Tokugawa Japan: Buddhism, Anti-Christianity, and the Danka System.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Ion, Hamish. 2009. *American Missionaries, Christian Oyatoi, and Japan, 1859–73.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.
Jennes, Joseph. 1959. *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan: From Its Beginnings to the Early Meiji Period (1549–1873).* Tokyo, JP: Committee of the Apostolate.
Jinnai Hidenobu. 1995. *Tokyo: A Spatial Anthropology.* Translated by Kimiko Nishimura. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Josephson, Jason Ānada. 2012. *The Invention of Religion in Japan.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Kataoka Yakichi 片岡弥吉. 1984. *Nihon Kirishitan junkyōshi* 日本キリシタン殉教史. Tokyo: Jiji Tsūshinsha.

Kataoka Yakichi 片岡弥吉. 1989. *Nagasaki no Kirishitan* 長崎の切支丹. Tokyo: Seibo Bunko.

Ketelaar, James Edward. 1990. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and its Persecution.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kitagawa, Joseph M. 1990. *Religion in Japanese History.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Laures, Johannes. 1954. *The Catholic Church in Japan: A Short History.* Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Laures Kirishitan Bunko Database. a. Notice, dated 1682 *kōsatsu* (*Sonin hōshōrei*) 高札（訴人褒賞令）. http://digital-archives.sophia.ac.jp/laures-kirishitan-bunko/view/kirishitan_bunko/JL-KOSATSU-1682-KB1?lang=en [accessed January 15, 2018].

Laures Kirishitan Bunko Database. b. Decree of the Inquisition against Evil Religions. http://digital-archives.sophia.ac.jp/laures-kirishitan-bunko/view/kirishitan_bunko/JL-SCROLL-1613-KB1 [accessed January 15, 2018].

Laver, Michael S. 2011. *The Sakoku Edicts and the Politics of Tokugawa Hegemony.* Amherst, NY: Cambria Press.

Madinger, John. 2000. *Confidential Informant: Law Enforcement's Most Valuable Tool.* Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Matsuura Akira 松浦昭. 2004. Shihai ketai to shūmon aratamechō hyō daimei 支配形態と宗門改帳表題名. *Kokumin Keizai Zasshi* 国民経済雑誌 189 (1): 1–19.

Matsuura Akira 松浦昭. 2009. Shihai ketai to shūmon aratamechō kisai: Echizenkoku wo chūshin toshite 支配形態と宗門改帳記載：越前国を中心として. *Shōdai Ronshū* 商大論集 60 (4): 125–40.

Maxey, Trent. 2015. The Crisis of "Conversion" and Search for National Doctrine in Early Meiji Japan. In *Critical Readings on Christianity in Japan,* Vol. 2, edited by Mark R. Mullins, 387–409. Leiden, NL: Brill.

McMullin, Neil. 1984. *Buddhism and the State in Sixteenth-Century Japan*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Miyazaki Kentarō 宮崎賢太郎. 2001. *Kakure Kirishitan: Orasho – tamashi no tsūsō teion* カクレキリシタン：オラショ―魂の通奏低音. Nagasaki: Nagasaki Shinbunsha.

Miyazaki Kentarō. 2003. Roman Catholic Mission in Pre-Modern Japan. In *Handbook of Christianity in Japan,* edited by Mark R. Mullins, 1–18. Leiden: Brill.

Mochizuki, Mia M. 2009. Deciphering the Dutch in Deshima. In *Boundaries and their Meanings in the History of the Netherlands,* edited by Benjamin Kaplan, Marybeth Carlson, and Laura Cruz, 63–94. Leiden, NL: Brill.

Morris, James. 2018. Rethinking the History of Conversion to Christianity in Japan: 1549–1644. Doctoral Thesis. St Andrews, UK: University of St Andrews.

Mullins, Mark R. and Koichi Nakano. 2016. Introduction. In *Disasters and Social Crisis in Contemporary Japan: Political, Religious, and Sociocultural Responses,* edited by Mark R. Mullins and Koichi Nakano, 1–22. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Murakami Wood, David, David Lyon, and Kiyoshi Abe. 2007. Surveillance in Urban Japan: A Critical Introduction. *Urban Studies* 44 (3): 551–68.

Nakajima Mitsuhiro 中島満大. 2012. Kinsei goki Kaison ni okeru shokon・rishibetsu・saikon: - Hizenkoku Nomomura wo jirei toshite 近世後期海村における初婚・離死別・再婚:—肥前国野母村を事例として. *Hikaku Kazokushi Kenkyū* 比較家族史研究 27: 103–127.

Nakazono Shigeo, interview by James Morris, August 11, 2015.

Nangō Koko 南郷晃子. 2010. "Shūmon danna ukeai okite" o meguri shomondai「宗門檀那請合掟」をめぐる諸問題. *Kakuzan Ronsō* 鶴山論叢 10: 1–25.

Nosco, Peter. 1993. Secrecy and the Transmission of Tradition: Issues in the Study of the "Underground" Christians. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 20 (1): 3–29.

Nosco, Peter. 1996. Keeping the Faith: *Bakuhan* Policy Towards Religions in Seventeenth-Century Japan. In *Religion in Japan: Arrows to Heaven and Earth,* edited by P. F. Kornicki and I. J. McMullen, 136–55. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Nosco, Peter. 2007. The Experiences of Christians during the Underground Years and Thereafter. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 34 (1): 85–97.

Reader, Ian. 1991. *Religion in Contemporary Japan.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ross, Andrew C. 1994. *A Vision Betrayed: The Jesuits in Japan and China, 1542–1742.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Sansom, George. 1963. *A History of Japan 1615–1867.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Screech, Timon. 2012. The English and the Control of Christianity in the Early Edo Period. *Japan Review* 24: 3–40.

Shimizu Hirokazu 清水紘一. 1986. *Kirishitan kinseishi*キリシタン禁制史. Tokyo, JP: Kyōikusha Shūppan Sābisu.

Shinmura Izumi 新村出, ed. 2008. *Kōjien* 広辞苑. 6th edition. Tokyo, JP: Iwanami Shoten.

Shitō Shinyū 司東真雄. 1984. *Iwate no Kirishitan* 岩手のキリシタン. Mizuzawa, JP: Iwate Shuppan.

Stone, Jacqueline. 1994. Rebuking the Enemies of the Lotus: Nichirenist Exclusivism in Historical Perspective. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 21 (2): 231–59.

Takagi Kazuo 高木一雄. 2001. *Tōhoku no Kirishitan junkyōchi o yuku* 東北のキリシタン殉教地をゆく. Nagasaki, JP: Seibo no Kishisha.

Takase Kōichirō 高瀬弘一郎. 2001. *Kirishitan jidai no bunka to shosō* キリシタン時代の文化と諸相. Tokyo, JP: Yagi Shoten.

Takekoshi, Yosaburo. 2004. *The Economic Aspects of the History of the Civilization of Japan,* vol. 3. London: Routledge.

Tamamuro Fumio. 2001. Local Society and the Temple-Parishioner Relationship within the Bakufu's Governance Structure. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 28 (3): 261–92.

Tamamuro Fumio. 2009. The Development of the Temple-Parishioner System. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 36 (1): 11–26.

Thelle, Notto R. 1996. Christianity Encounters Buddhism in Japan: A Historical Perspective. In *Japan and Christianity: Impacts and Responses*, edited by John Breen and Mark R. Mullins, 94–107. Basingstoke, UK: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Turnbull, Stephen. 1998. *The Kakure Kirishitan of Japan: A Study of Their Development, Beliefs and Rituals of the Present Day.* Richmond, UK: Japan Library.

Üçerler, M. Antoni J. 2015. The Jesuit Enterprise in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Japan. In *Critical Readings on Christianity in Japan,* vol. 1*,* edited by Mark R. Mullins, 41–54. Leiden, NL: Brill.

Whelan, Christal. 1996. *The Beginning of Heaven and Earth: The Sacred Book of Japan's Hidden Christians.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Williams, Duncan Ryūken. 2005. *The Other Side of Zen: A Social History of Sōtō Zen Buddhism in Tokugawa Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Williams, Duncan. 2009. The Purple Robe Incident and the Formation of the Early Modern Sōtō Zen Institution. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 36 (1): 27–43.

Woodard, William P. 1972. *The Allied Occupation of Japan 1945–1952 and Japanese Religions.* Leiden, NL: Brill.