

## CHAPTER FOUR

### ORGANISING A MISSION FOR A CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY: MISSIONARY *RÉDUCTIONS* RECONSIDERED

In order to convert Amerindians who lived and hunted in lands far away from French settlements in North America, the Jesuit missionaries sought to gather these Amerindians into native Christian reserves near the French colonial settlements along the Saint Lawrence River. The missionaries encouraged the Algonquian and Iroquoian peoples to settle down in these missionary settlements to live as neophytes. Father Paul Le Jeune called such Christian settlements '*réductions*' following the example of Jesuit predecessors in South America, who labelled the Paraguayan reserves '*reducciones*'.

Two interrelated issues arise from this evangelistic approach to settling Amerindians in *réductions*. The first issue is whether the idea for the Paraguayan *reducciones* was created without precedent before it was introduced into North America. Or were the *reducciones* based on models found elsewhere? In other words, is it possible to trace the prototypes—if not the origin<sup>1</sup>—for the Canadian *réductions* beyond Paraguay? The second issue is to what extent the New France *réductions* emulated the Paraguayan models. Alternatively did the '*réduction*' scheme of New France originate only in a Paraguayan model and in no other missionary models?

To seek answers to these two issues, a reconsideration of the Jesuit *réductions* should go as far back as the pioneer Christian communities in sixteenth-century Japan, beyond the Paraguayan models that began in the early seventeenth century. This consideration should also search for the missionary achievements beyond Europe. The initial step for such analysis is to establish the interconnection between the Paraguayan and Japanese missions. Then, the native Christian communities in New France can be discussed in the light of earlier experiences

---

<sup>1</sup> This 'prototype' means the prototypical establishment of a Christian community in formerly non-Christian regions. Because a simplistic search for the 'origin' of *reducciones* may reach as far back as the ancient centuries, the search will complicate the current argument or even obscure the vital aspect of analysis.

in both Paraguay and Japan. Using this approach, features common to the two types of Amerindian missionary communities in New France and Paraguay may be seen to have their prototypes in the earlier Jesuit experiments in Japan. Other features that seem to have been unique to New France may, in fact, have been based directly on the prototypical experience in Japan.

#### A. THE PROTOTYPES FOR AMERINDIAN *RÉDUCTIONS*

##### 1. *Existing Interpretation of the Laurentian Réductions*

Father Le Jeune, the Superior of New France during the 1630s, was the first missionary to mention the Paraguayan mission. He did so in order to justify his plan for establishing a settlement for nomadic Amerindians. When the Jesuits renewed the mission in New France in 1632, the superior was already familiar with the Jesuit experience in colonial Paraguay,<sup>2</sup> an enormous region that encompassed today's Paraguay as well as eastern Bolivia, Argentina, southwest Brazil, Uruguay and Chile. In the *Relation* of 1637, for example, he referred to the Paraguayan experiment as a model for native settlements in New France. Later he used the Latin term '*reduximus*' in 1638 and the French term '*réduction*' in 1639 to refer to the first native mission of Sillery, which the Jesuits arranged for an Innu group.<sup>3</sup>

These Jesuit references to Paraguay influenced later interpretations of the Amerindian missionary settlements. In the historiography of the Jesuit missions in New France, a wide range of historians from the nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries maintain that the system of Canadian *réductions* was an emulation of the Jesuit *reducciones* in colonial Paraguay. Those who so argue include the Ursuline Mother Sainte-Croix, Gabriel Gravier and Joseph Edmond Roy, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. More recently Lucien Campeau,

<sup>2</sup> Henceforth, 'Paraguay' means 'colonial Paraguay' unless specified otherwise.

<sup>3</sup> Paul le Jeune's *Relation* of 1639, in Reuben Gold Thwaites *et al.* (eds.), *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (73 vols., Cleveland, OH: Burrows Brothers, 1896–1901), vol. 5, 31–33 [*Relations* 5: 31–33, henceforth]; *Relations* 12: 219–23; 14: 205–07; & 16: 135–141; and Le Jeune to Mutius Vitelleschi, general superior, at Rome, from Trois Rivières, 1st August 1638, in Lucien Campeau (ed.), *Monumenta Novae Franciae* (Roma: Monumenta Historica Soc. Iesu; & Montréal: Les Éditions Bellarmin; or Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1967–2003), vol. 4 (1989), 54–57 [Campeau, *Monumenta*, 4: 54–55, henceforth], esp. 55.

John W. Grant, Bruce G. Trigger, Marc Jetten, Carole Blackburn and Jean-Jacques Simard, among many others, expressed a consensus that the French Jesuits developed a *réduction* scheme based directly upon the Paraguayan system of Christian settlements from the early seventeenth century.<sup>4</sup>

There have been a few attempts at modifying this popular perspective on the native reserves on the Saint Lawrence. One alternative approach is to seek another prototype. According to Cornelius J. Jaenen, the Canadian *réductions* were modelled upon the *réduction* system developed earlier in Spanish America. As such, he includes not only Paraguay but also Nueva España, now called Mexico, as models. The problem with this argument is the lack of Christian '*reducciones*' in Nueva España, where native villages or *pueblos* already existed. What Jaenen seems to suggest is that the French Jesuits were familiar with the Spanish segregation of Amerindians in sixteenth-century Nueva España. Similarly Carole Blackburn refers to the sixteenth-century missionary communities in the Philippines where Spanish friars reorganised the indigenous population for effective cultural assimilation and religious instruction. Regrettably these two alternatives for a revised perspective lack sufficient documentation. In addition, Jaenen points to the Récollet Franciscan example of segregating the indigenous Laurentian peoples in order to provide them with Christian instruction. This was before the Jesuits joined the Franciscan mission in Quebec. Although all these examples and interpretations may demonstrate indirect influences upon the Jesuit attempts to segregate Amerindians in mission villages, they provide no theoretical

---

<sup>4</sup> A Member of the Ursuline Community [Mother Sainte-Croix, principally], *Life of Madame de la Peltrie (Magdalene de Chauvigny)* (New York: Edward Duignan & Brother, 1859), 73; A Member of the Ursuline Community [Mother Sainte-Croix], *Glimpse of the Monastery* (Quebec: C. Darveau, 1872), 14; Gabriel Gravier, *Vie de Samuel de Champlain: Fondateur de la Nouvelle-France (1567-1635)* (Paris: Librairie orientale & américaine, 1900), 93; Joseph Edmond Roy, *M. de Montmagny* (Québec: L'Événement, 1906), 41; Bruce G. Trigger, *The Children of Aataentisc* (Kingston & Montreal, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1976), 468, 577-78 & 685; John Webster Grant, *Moon of Wintertime* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 27 & 58; Carole Blackburn, *Harvest of Souls* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000), 94-95; Marc Jetten, *Enclaves amérindiennes: les « réductions » du Canada, 1637-1701* (Sillery: Septentrion, 1994), 15-33; and Jean-Jacques Simard, *La Réduction* (Sillery: Septentrion, 2003), 26-27 & note 3.

antithesis to the popular notion that French Jesuit *réductions* were directly based on the Jesuit *reducciones* in Paraguay.<sup>5</sup>

Most historians of New France have been, or wish to be, content with having found a prototype for Canadian *réductions* in Paraguay. They have not asked whether the missionaries in Paraguay created the *reducción* scheme from scratch or developed it from a prototype in some other Jesuit mission. These historians should go one step further, for they only argue that all the elements in the Jesuit operations of the *réductions* originated in the Paraguayan system.

The Paraguayan experiment, however, was merely one of several Jesuit missions in non-Christian regions from the mid-sixteenth to the early seventeenth century. Therefore, it is difficult to believe that the French Jesuits, in their plan to introduce *réductions* to New France, learnt nothing from the experiences of other regions of the world. One thus needs to consider the possible models for the New France *réductions* outside Paraguay.

## 2. *The Prototypes beyond Paraguay*

The common way to determine the prototype for the Paraguayan missionary communities has been to look for precedents in the sixteenth century, a rather narrow approach that finds precedents in the Iberian colonies, such as the Dominican experiment in the Island of Española in the Caribbean; and the Spanish-managed indigenous communities called '*pueblos reales*' in Central Mexico, Peru, and Bolivia.<sup>6</sup> Other partial precedents include the colonial Spanish policy of '*congregación*' in Central and South America, where Spanish officials amalgamated numerous villages in order to facilitate tribute collection and the organisation of labour conscripts. Also, in the Portuguese colony of Brazil, the colonial officials helped the Jesuit missionaries to create native Christian communities, or '*aldeias*', near white settlements.<sup>7</sup> All

<sup>5</sup> Jaenen, *Friend and Foe*, 177–78; and Blackburn, *loc. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> Raymond A. Bucko, 'Bartholomé de Las Casas, 1474–1566', *Early Encounters in North America: Biography* (n.p.: Alexander Street Press, L. L. C.; & the University of Chicago, 2004, online: [www.alexanderstreet2.com/EENALive/bios/A6919BIO.html](http://www.alexanderstreet2.com/EENALive/bios/A6919BIO.html)); and Robert H. Jackson, 'Jesuit Frontiers: A Comparison of the Development of the Two Missions in Baja California and Paraguay', in *San Jose de Comondu, 1708–1808* (online: [www.timsbaja.com/rjackson/0200703/loretomissionscomparison.html](http://www.timsbaja.com/rjackson/0200703/loretomissionscomparison.html)).

<sup>7</sup> Stafford Poole, 'Iberian Catholicism Comes to the Americas', in Charles H. Lippy *et al.*, *Christianity Comes to the Americas, 1492–1776* (New York: Paragon House, 1992), 1–129, esp. 98–100; Robert H. Jackson and Edward Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and*

these precedents indicate that the Paraguayan *reducciones* were at least not unique as settlements for Amerindians but were consistent with government policy in colonial Latin America.

The Jesuit system of *reducciones* in Paraguay, however, had a distinctive character that set a precedent for New France. Unlike the sixteenth-century precedents in the Spanish colonies, this missionary scheme in Paraguay either lacked the goal of incorporating indigenous people into European society or gave less priority to it.<sup>8</sup> To use a computer metaphor, the *reducción* scheme shared its hardware—the physical native settlements—with the sixteenth-century colonial and evangelistic experiments, but it did not share with them its software—the exploitation of the native population. Where then did the software for Paraguayan settlements come from? This is the type of question that historians of the Canadian and Paraguayan missions have not asked when considering the Jesuit missionary settlements.

There are two ways to search for the conceptual prototypes for the *reducciones*. One is to consider the motive of the missionaries for segregating their existing and potential converts from European settlers. By establishing isolated indigenous communities, the Jesuits tried to facilitate the process of evangelisation by ridding themselves of all the hindrances caused by the colonial 'encomienda' system, which allowed the Spanish colonists to force the Amerindian peoples to become serfs. Beyond this system, however, the native men they exploited and the indigenous women they forced into concubinage. Consequently the colonists hindered the missionaries' attempts to convert the native people to Christianity.<sup>9</sup> And yet this social conflict is still insufficient to explain why the Jesuits created the *reducciones*. Therefore, one needs

---

*Spanish Colonization* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995), 6; and Dauril Alden, *The Making of an Empire: The Society of Jesus in Portugal, Its Empire, and Beyond, 1540–1750* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), 72–73.

<sup>8</sup> Poole, *op. cit.*, 99.

<sup>9</sup> Antonio Ruiz de Montoya, *The Spiritual Conquest* (1639, St. Louis: The Institute of the Jesuit Sources, 1993), chap. 6, 39–40; A. Huonder, 'Reductions of Paraguay', in vol. 12 of *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (online); Philip Caraman, *The Lost Paradise* (London: Sedgwick & Jackson, 1975), 35. Unlike Montoya, neither Huonder nor Caraman provides concrete examples of the Spaniards' negative influence even though both of them pointed to the European immorality in the colonies. Although the Amerindians in Asunción seem to have been robbed by Spanish settlers, even Montoya avoided describing clearly who—native serfs or fellow European settlers or both—became the victims of their robbery.

to ask one further question: When and where did the missionaries think of creating isolated missionary communities?

There is one field of missionary activity that hitherto has been overlooked. In the Spanish Jesuits' accounts of Paraguay, there is evidence that the Jesuits there admired the missionaries of Japan.<sup>10</sup> One passage by an early missionary points to the Jesuit experience that inspired the Paraguayan missionaries. *La conquista espiritual* by Father Antonio Ruiz de Montoya is an early account, published in 1639, of the Paraguayan missions. Father Montoya, who, from 1612 to 1637, played a leading rôle in establishing the early *reducciones*, referred to the Japanese Christian communities as models for the Christian settlements in Paraguay. He praised Japan's 'houses and palaces', 'civilisation' and gorgeous 'silks', as well as the country's 'costume', its 'variety in food' and its 'luxuries.' He also respected its 'martyrs' who were killed for converting to Christianity. At the beginning of his description of the Paraguayan *reducciones*, a description which formed almost half of the account, Father Montoya expressed a great admiration for the Japanese Christian communities, which he held up as the model to be emulated by his companions.<sup>11</sup>

Two names given to the early seventeenth-century *reducciones* suggest this Japanese influence on Paraguay. One name was that of 'San Francisco de Xavier', which was located along the Uruguay River. Even though Father Xavier's name was widely used for European institutions, he was noted particularly for his pioneer work in Japan, as already discussed in the second and third chapters. The other name that evoked Japanese connections more strongly was 'Los Santos Mártires de Japón'. Situated between the Paraná River and the Uruguay River, this second community was dedicated to the Jesuit martyrs of Japan, including Miki Paulo, Kisai Diego and Gotô Johannes, who were crucified in Nagasaki in 1597 on the orders of Toyotomi Hideyoshi.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, it is worthwhile to consider the methodological similarities

<sup>10</sup> Emilio E. Ravignani & Carlos Leonhardt, SJ (eds.), *Iglesia: Cartas annuas de la Provincia del Paraguay, Chile y Tucumán, de la Compañía de Jesús (1609-1614)* (Buenos Aires: Casa Jacobo Peuser, 1927) [*Iglesia (1609-1614)*, henceforth], 233; Emilio E. Ravignani & Carlos Leonhardt, SJ (eds.), *Iglesia: Cartas annuas de la Provincia del Paraguay, Chile y Tucumán, de la Compañía de Jesús (1615-1637)* (Buenos Aires: Casa Jacobo Peuser, 1929) [*Iglesia (1615-1637)*, henceforth], 16.

<sup>11</sup> Montoya, *op.cit.*, chap. 45, 129-30.

<sup>12</sup> Ravignani & Leonhardt, *Iglesia (1615-1637)*, 680, 774 & note 62; and J. MacNaspy, SJ, *Lost Cities of Paraguay* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1982), 88.

between the Japanese mission and the Paraguayan mission before doing the same between the *reducciones* and the *réductions*.

## B. A COMPARISON BETWEEN JAPAN AND PARAGUAY

A comparison between Japan and Paraguay will answer the first question of whether the idea for the *reducciones* was created without precedent. This approach requires the identification of the missionary villages or towns in Japan, since Christianity was accepted only on a local scale. The possible Japanese prototypes for the Paraguayan *reducciones* are the villages of the pro-Christian *daimyô* in western Kyushu, especially those ruled by the Ômura and Arima clans in the region of Hizen, today's Nagasaki and Saga Prefectures. Ômura Sumitada was baptised in 1563, and Arima Harunobu in 1580. Once they understood that the *daimyô* were co-operating with the Jesuits, the ordinary people in Hizen welcomed the missionaries. In 1574, Ômura Sumitada even began to order all his vassals and territorial residents to seek baptism, as he had already done.<sup>13</sup>

There are similarities between the Paraguayan *reducciones* and the Hizen villages, suggesting that the Jesuit experiment in Paraguay was not the first attempt at creating an independent Christian community among non-European people. Prior to the Paraguayan experiment, the Society of Jesus succeeded in creating what became a model evangelisation programme in Japan. To achieve success, it was important that the Hizen villages did not coexist with European settler colonies. Importantly the Jesuits eschewed European-style military conquest as a necessary prerequisite to missionary work. Prior to contact with Japan it was always thought necessary to conquer a nation militarily before beginning the process of acculturation, especially in the Spanish colonies.

A further comparison is possible if based on eight main characteristics of the missionary communities in Paraguay, as stated in order below. To begin with, the Paraguayan settlements, following the example of Japan, were located far from the Spanish and Portuguese

---

<sup>13</sup> Luís Fróis, *Historia de Japam* (ed. José Wicki, SJ, Lisboa: Biblioteca nacional de Lisboa, 1976–84), part I, chap. 104 [*Historia*, 1: 104, henceforth]; and Matsuda Kiichi & Kawasaki Momota (eds.), *Nopponshi* (12 vols., Tokyo: Chûôkôron-sha, 1977–80), vol. 10, 9–24.

settlements. The Jesuit missionaries established San Ignacio Guazú, the first *reducción* of the Society, in 1609. Fathers Marcial de Lorenzana and Francisco de San Martín travelled with indigenous chiefs and their people in search of this site, which was appropriate for their first attempt at creating sedentary communities for these migratory hunters and gatherers. By segregating Amerindians in this way from Iberian colonists, including Europeans born in South America, the Jesuits set up thirteen other native towns by 1630.<sup>14</sup>

Similarly the Hizen villages were segregated, admittedly not by deliberate choice, from the Iberian settlements in East Asia, such as Macao and the Philippines. Although the means to these ends were dissimilar, the missionaries in both Paraguay and Hizen succeeded in establishing Christian communities independent of European colonies. The Japanese communities were originally non-European villages and were not subject to the Iberian colonists. The closest Iberian neighbours were the seasonal merchants and sailors at such trading ports as Nagasaki, Yokoseura and Kuchinotsu. Through the *daimyō*'s patronage and political authority, the Jesuit missionaries converted existing sedentary villages into communities for Japanese Christians.

Second, the Jesuits established a kind of political autonomy in both Hizen and Paraguay. In Paraguay the foundation and development of the *reducciones* occurred with the consent of the Spanish king, who authorised royal decrees and privileges. The native settlements were formally under the control of the colonial administration at Asunción. And yet two factors worked in favour of the mission. First of all, the colonial Europeans were denied access to the *reducciones* and were unable to acquire any land in them. The second was that, while preserving the authority of *caciques*, or native headmen, the missionaries in the settlements took on the duties of civic and religious leaders beyond the authority of the *caciques*.<sup>15</sup> Consequently the Jesuits maintained the autonomy of their missionary towns inside Paraguay as though they were located beyond the limits of Spanish colonial claims.

---

<sup>14</sup> The *reducción* of San Ignacio Guazú was free from lifetime slavery. Unlike other *reducciones* established later, however, this first settlement remained subject to seasonal labour for the *encomienda* system in the Spanish outpost of Asunción, located nearly two hundred and fifty kilometres on a straight line to the north. See Sélim Abou, *The Jesuit 'Republic' of the Guaranís (1609–1768) and Its Heritage* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997), 34–36; Huonder, *loc. cit.*; and Montoya, *op. cit.*, chaps. 1 & 5, 29–30 & 37–38.

<sup>15</sup> Caraman, *op. cit.*, 111, 120 & 157.



This attempt at political autonomy outside any European colony had already proved successful in the port town of Nagasaki in Hizen. In 1580, Ômura Sumitada granted this port and the neighbouring villages and towns to the Jesuit missionary order, just as he entrusted the administration of his other feudal holdings to his vassals.<sup>16</sup> Although Ômura retained the right to impose a tariff on international trade, the Jesuits gained control of international trade at the port as well as the privilege of local taxation. The only difference from other Hizen villages was that Nagasaki was inhabited by both Japanese residents and foreign visitors. The Jesuit administration of Nagasaki was probably the first example of political autonomy that the Society obtained outside European colonies.

Third, the missionaries attempted to create a self-sustaining agrarian society in the Paraguayan *reducciones*. As long as the indigenous people were obliged to seek their means of sustenance in the forest or on the plain outside a permanent settlement, the Jesuits were unable to provide them with Christian instruction as thorough as they might provide for a sedentary population. For example, once settled in the *reducciones*, the semi-sedentary Guaraní people, who lived all over colonial Paraguay learnt systematic agriculture and animal husbandry.<sup>17</sup> Their farms produced maize, cassava, sweet potatoes, sugar cane, yerba mate tea, fruit, cotton and different types of vegetables. Their domestic animals included oxen, cows, sheep and horses. This self-sustaining economy was also strengthened by the foundation of domestic industries, such as carpentry, metalwork, painting, shoe-making and textiles.<sup>18</sup>

In Hizen, on the other hand, the sedentary and self-supporting agrarian standard was already a *fait accompli* before the Jesuits arrived. The local Hizen communities were basically agriculturalists, although a part of the population was engaged in fishing, hunting and crafts.

---

<sup>16</sup> Lourenço Mexia's annual report of 1580 to the general superior, from Bungo, 20 October 1580, in Matsuda, *Hôkokushû* 3, 5: 217–65, esp. 238–39.

<sup>17</sup> It is difficult to label the seventeenth-century Guaranis nomadic or sedentary in black and white. They lived in small villages in the woods and engaged in horticulture. And yet they did not remain in one spot permanently and periodically wandered in the woods like nomads. See Montoya, *op. cit.*, chap. 10, 48–51; Maxime Haubert, *La vie quotidienne des Indiens et des Jésuites du Paraguay au temps des missions* (Paris: Hachette, 1967), 12–13; and R. B. Cunningham Graham, *A Vanished Arcadia* (London: William Heinemann, 1901), 26–27.

<sup>18</sup> Abou, *op. cit.*, 77–79; Caraman, *op. cit.*, 117–18; and Huonder, *loc. cit.*

The warm climate produced fruits and nuts. Farmers raised poultry, oxen, goats and horses. The fields were used for growing vegetables and different kinds of cereals, especially for rice and wheat. Thus, the missionaries did not have to introduce farming to their Japanese congregation, nor did they have to organise new settlements. Therefore, the experience in Hizen showed that the creation of Christian villages was possible when non-Europeans were settled in one place.

Fourth, the missionaries in Paraguay introduced clothing to the residents in the *reducciones*. The cotton grown in the settlements was collected and distributed to the women in charge of spinning, and it was then handed over to workers in the weaving house to be made into clothing for inhabitants. Wool was also spun and fashioned into clothing for use inside the towns.<sup>19</sup> Having previously been half-naked in the forest, the residents of the towns were turned into neatly-dressed Christians, whom Father Montoya admired as model Christians similar to Japanese proselytes.<sup>20</sup>

Once again, there was a Japanese model. As far back as the sixteenth century and before European contact, ordinary Japanese had been dressing in simple clothing made from flax and cotton. The missionaries placed a priority on tidy clothing. When Father Xavier arrived in Kyushu in 1549, he seems to have accepted Japanese clothing as a matter of course, so much so that he did not even mention clothing in his reports. He simply praised the people as good candidates for becoming Christians. In 1583, Father Alessandro Valignano referred to the cleanliness of Japanese clothing. That was his way of labelling the Japanese as an ethnic group already suited for evangelisation.<sup>21</sup>

From a European point of view, clothing implied Christian decency and moral propriety. For the priests in Paraguay, covering part of the body with clothes was more important than the manufacture of

---

<sup>19</sup> The surplus cotton fabric and wool was exported to the urban Spanish centres. See Abou, *op. cit.*, 80.

<sup>20</sup> Montoya, *op. cit.*, chap. 45, 129–30.

<sup>21</sup> Joan Rodrigues [João Rodriguez-Tçuzu], *Nippon kyōkaishi* (2 vols., Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1967), vol. I, 272–73 & 403–20; Francisco de Xavier, to his companions living in Goa, from Kagoshima, 5 November 1549, in M. Joseph Costelloe, SJ (ed.), *The Letters and Instructions of Francis Xavier* (St. Louis, Missouri: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1992), *epistola* [*ep.*, hereafter] 90, p. 297; in Kōno Yoshinori, SJ (ed.), *Sei Furanshisuko Zabieru zenshokan* (Tokyo: Heibon-sha, 1985) *ep.* 90, p. 471; and Matsuda Kiichi *et al.* (eds.), *Nippon junsatuki* (Tokyo: Heibon-sha, 1973), 11–14.

clothing. Thus, the Jesuits in Paraguay expected their Amerindian converts to follow the Japanese example of being fully clothed.

Fifth, Father Montoya in *La conquista espiritual* considered permanent buildings as an important element for beginning a Christian life. Accordingly the Jesuits required indigenous people to construct church buildings and houses in the *reducciones*, using stones and bricks. The Guaranís originally lived in large rectangular huts, and each hut could accommodate up to two hundred people. The Christian towns adopted a system of block housing units, separated from one another, one unit per nuclear family. Each unit comprised six to eight rooms.<sup>22</sup>

The Japanese buildings, or 'houses and palaces,' to use Montoya's terms, were wooden structures. In *Historia da Igreja do Japão*, a Jesuit account of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Japan, Father João Rodriguez-Tçuzu, praised the art and technique of Japanese architecture as one of the best wooden construction styles anywhere. Although there were no palaces in Hizen villages, except the Ômura and Arima castles, these first Christian communities were run independently by non-Europeans. These communities were as fully equipped with public and private architecture, all well landscaped, as any European community.<sup>23</sup>

Sixth, in Paraguay, the *reducciones* were guided by Christian missionaries and yet were administered locally by indigenous residents. Before contact and conversion, the Amerindian *cacique* was the absolute master of his subjects in each hamlet. Because there was no government system beyond the hamlet level of each cacique, the Jesuit missionaries had to create a wider administrative structure to facilitate their ecclesiastical control over the large population. For that, they adopted a Spanish, but not a Japanese, ruling system. Below the level of Jesuit control, they set up a municipal council that exercised legislative, executive and judicial powers. Based on the results of elections, overseen by the Jesuits, the council membership consisted of prefects, vice-prefects, judges, neighbourhood delegates, royal standard-bearers, policemen, notaries and so forth. Finally, under these two levels of government, there was a third level, a conventional one represented by the caciques who numbered nearly fifty within each *reducción*.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Montoya, *op. cit.*, chap. 45, 129–30; Abou, *op. cit.*, 69–70.

<sup>23</sup> Rodorigesu [Rodriguez], *op. cit.*, vol. I, 323–25; & vol. II, 49–53.

<sup>24</sup> Abou, *op. cit.*, 74–75; and Caraman, *op. cit.*, 158.

There was no need to introduce the Iberian ruling system to Japan. The Jesuit evangelists in the Hizen communities both retained the administrative system managed by non-Europeans and had the high social status attributed to foreign inhabitants, traits the later Paraguayan mission would later emulate. Although the priests in Paraguay had to establish a local administration by creating a superstructure that had been completely lacking in the tiny forest communities, their Jesuit predecessors in Japan had to create no such thing, for it already existed. As Father Valignano observed, local Japanese society had a land-based hierarchical structure controlled by a *daimyô* at its summit, who ruled local vassals directly and civilians indirectly. Being under the rule of *daimyô*, Buddhist and *Shintô* priests independently maintained their own high status. Thus, the missionaries took advantage of this existing hierarchy.

Buddhist priests were near the top of the social hierarchy. The Jesuits tried to supplant these priests with Christian priests. In 1574, for example, Father Gaspar Coelho persuaded the *daimyô* Ômura Sumitada either to eliminate temples and shrines throughout his territory or to reassign them for church use. According to Father Frois, under the rule of Ômura, over forty temples were destroyed and as many churches were built on their sites. Under orders from the *daimyô*, even Buddhist priests and apprentices were converted to Christianity and became members of the Christian community. As early as 1582, Father Frois boasted that the entire population of sixty thousand in Ômura were Christians. In this manner, the Jesuit missionaries ultimately gained administrative control of Christian villages even though their approach was not the same as that of the priests in Paraguay.<sup>25</sup>

The seventh similarity between Japan and Paraguay was that indigenous people assisted in the work of the Church in both places. The rôles performed by non-European assistants were not Jesuit inventions but were similar to those developed by the Church assistants in Europe. The priests were assisted by those of lower ranks in the

---

<sup>25</sup> Matsuda Kiichi *et al* (eds.), *Nippon junsatuki*, 7–10; Fróis, *Historia*, 1:104; Matsuda, *Furoisu Nipponshi*, vol. 10, 9–24; Francisco Cabral to the superior of Portugal, from Nagasaki, 12 September 1575, in Matsuda, *Hôkoku-shû* 3, 4: 249–56; Kudamatsu Kazunori, *Kirishitan denraichi no jinja to shinkô* (Ômura, Nagasaki: Tomimatsu jinja saikô yonhyakunen jigyô iinkai, 2002), 120–50; Luis Frois's annual report of 1587, from Arima, 20 February 1588, in Matsuda, *Hôkokushû* 3, 7: 159–242, esp. 186–89; and Luis Frois's annual report of 1582 to the Jesuit general superior, from Kuchinotu, 31 October 1582, in Matsuda, *Hôkokushû* 3, 6: 83–116, esp. 83–84.

holy orders in Europe, such as deacons, subdeacons, and acolytes in the Church or brothers in religious orders. Yet the active recruitment of non-European helpers, who had formerly been non-Christians, to Church services was not thought of when the Jesuit missions were solely within Europe.<sup>26</sup> Also, the non-European assistants were outside holy orders and normally had no chance to become priests, and thus were different from those Europeans in holy orders.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, non-European participation in the ecclesiastical work was one of the earliest successful experiments in the foreign missions by the Jesuits.

The missionaries in Paraguay ran their *reducción* church with the help of a tiny number of priests and coadjutant brothers, who were assisted by native catechists. As late as 1629, each settlement was equipped with only two missionaries: one senior priest and one younger assistant priest or brother. The elder of the two remained in residence while the younger made preaching trips into the countryside.<sup>28</sup> From the outset, the missionaries employed native catechists, or *catequistas*, who could communicate with settlers in their native language for Mass and religious instruction, a fact that is mentioned in the annual reports, *Las cartas anuas*.<sup>29</sup> As the number of converts increased, the Jesuits recruited native teachers to teach children reading, writing, dancing, singing and playing musical instruments. Most children were educated in their native language by the indigenous staff.<sup>30</sup>

The Church in Japan survived with even fewer priests. The missionaries there constantly relied on Japanese coadjutors. As late as 1585, when the mission was thirty-six years old, approximately eighty Jesuit

---

<sup>26</sup> The help of foreign assistants in the missions is reminiscent of the expansion of the Christian Church in the ancient and medieval centuries, such as the Roman Catholic missions to the ancient Germans in Western Europe and the Greek Orthodox mission to those non-Greeks in Eastern Europe.

<sup>27</sup> In this sense, *dōjuku* may have been similar to sacristans in Europe, who were lay assistants in charge of the sacred vessels and vestments. There was at least one attempt at solving this lowly treatment of non-European assistants. Father Alessandro Valignano attempted to amend the rules for the Jesuit priesthood in Japan in order to increase the number of Japanese priests in the 1580s.

<sup>28</sup> Caraman, *op. cit.*, 56–57, 138–139; and Graham, *op. cit.*, 198–99. Even in later periods, the *reducciones* had a staff of three missionaries at most. See Abou, *op. cit.*, 74.

<sup>29</sup> See, for example, the reports of 1611, 1612, 1613, 1614, 1616 and 1617, edited in Ravignani & Leonhardt, *Iglesia (1609–1614)*, esp. 118, 194, 272, 425, 443, 470, 525; and *Iglesia (1615–1637)*, 81, 86, 103 & 134.

<sup>30</sup> Only those deemed bound for bureaucratic careers learned Spanish, and even fewer gifted students learnt Latin. See W. H. Koebel, *In Jesuit Land* (London: Stanley Paul & Co., 1912), 236–38; and Abou, *op. cit.*, 86–88.

fathers and brothers were in charge of no fewer than two hundred church buildings and over one hundred and fifty thousand Christians.<sup>31</sup> In 1582, only four priests and three brothers, including two Japanese lay brothers, were in charge of sixty thousand Christians in Ômura.<sup>32</sup> In other words, Jesuit priests were often absent in many local Christian communities.

To overcome this shortage of religious staff, the missionaries created two lay positions, the *dôjuku* and *kanbô*. '*Dôjuku*', spelt '*dogicos*' or '*dojiquis*' in the Iberian correspondence, was originally a term that designated a Buddhist novitiate in Japan. Among the numerous assisting offices for the priests of the European Church, the Jesuits seem to have used the term to mean oblates or *donnés*, who dedicated themselves to a monastic life in a religious order, especially in mediaeval Europe, without taking religious vows.<sup>33</sup> Despite some similarity, *dôjuku* assistants were not equivalent to deacons or subdeacons because the Jesuits introduced these two European types of offices to the Japanese church later in the seventeenth century.<sup>34</sup> According to Father Valignano, the Jesuits borrowed a Japanese word and called their lay assistants '*dogicos*'.<sup>35</sup>

*Dôjuku* assistants were co-opted by the Jesuits to act as Japanese lay brothers serving as interpreters, preachers, couriers and secretaries in the missions. This new type of subordinate provided religious services and preached in the native language on behalf of European priests. Their duties included the maintenance of church buildings and

---

<sup>31</sup> Alessandro Valignano to Don Teotónio de Bragança, Archbishop of Evora, from Goa, 23 December 1585, in Murakami Naojirô (trans.), vol. II of *Iezusukai Nippon nenpô* (2 vols., Tokyo: Yûshô-dô, 1969), 133–37 [*Nenpô*, 2: 133–37, henceforth]; and Lourenço Mexia to Miguel de Souza at Coimbra, from Macao, 6 January 1584, in Matsuda, *Hôkokushû* 3, 6: 285–94. This figure of eighty fathers and brothers included thirty priests, twenty-five Portuguese brothers and twenty-five Japanese lay brothers.

<sup>32</sup> Luis Frois's annual report of 1582 to the general superior of the Society, from Kuchinotsu, 31 October 1582, in Matsuda, *Hôkokushû* 3, 6: 83–116, esp. 83–84.

<sup>33</sup> Josef Franz Schütte, SJ, *Valignano's Mission Principles for Japan* (2 parts, The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1980–85), part one, 340; & part two, 39–40.

<sup>34</sup> In Japan, the offices of deacons and subdeacons appeared as late as the seventeenth century. Subdeacons are mentioned probably for the first time in 1612; in Father João Rodrigues Giram's annual report of 1611, to the general superior, from Nagasaki, 10 March 1612. Deacons appeared in Father Rodrigues Giram's annual report of 1612, from Nagasaki, 12 January 1613. See Matsuda, *Hôkokushû*, 2nd series, 1: 195–384, esp. 205 & 283.

<sup>35</sup> In his *Sumario de las cosas de Japón*, Father Valignano wrote that the Jesuits called their lay assistants '*dogicos/dojiquis*' in a Buddhist fashion. See Matsuda Kiichi et al, *Nippon junsatsuki* (Tokyo: Heibon-sha, 1973), 88–91.

secretarial paperwork in Japanese. They also performed any domestic work that European missionaries were incapable of doing, such as the preparation of the tea ceremony and receiving Japanese guests. As late as the 1580s, the *dôjuku* included juvenile domestics, assistants for church services as well as more privileged or elderly preachers.<sup>36</sup>

In the early seventeenth century, the Jesuits began to use another term, *kanbô*, to differentiate a certain type of lay assistant from *dôjuku*. *Kanbô* was a term applied specifically to Japanese assistants who took care of the churches. Originally it referred to caretaking priests of a Buddhist temple. The *kanbô* were tonsured and at first informally called *bonzes* because some of them were ex-Buddhist priests. They looked after church buildings but did not accompany missionaries on their journeys. Similar to the domestic duty of *dôjuku*, their tasks included teaching basic Christian doctrine, looking after the religious activity of the community and helping the sick and the dying.<sup>37</sup>

Finally one last similarity between the missions in Japan and those in Paraguay was the treatment of the diseased. The Jesuit evangelists in both regions did little to prevent the spread of epidemic diseases. Here again, Japan served as a model. For centuries, the location of Japan at the eastern edge of Eurasia facilitated communication with the continent. Thus, the bacteria and viruses brought by the Europeans were familiar to the Japanese. According to the missionaries' occasional references to illness, the ailments and symptoms encountered by the priests were all personal afflictions and not part of a widespread epidemic. These isolated cases of disease and handicaps included unspecified fevers, hernia, tumours, tonsillitis, swelling of limbs, stomach ache and age-related diseases.<sup>38</sup> Since there were no major epidemics in Japan, the Jesuits did not have to give thought as to how to control them. The evangelists even experienced a prototypical precedent for not having

---

<sup>36</sup> Matsuda, *Nippon junsatuki*, 90–91; and Gonoï Takashi, 'Iezusukai hikaiin no konguregasan to kaisôka', *Shigaku zasshi* 103 (1994): 35–73, esp. 40–42.

<sup>37</sup> According to Gonoï Takashi, Father Luis Cerqueira, bishop of Japan, called the *bonze* assistants '*kanbô*', in his letter from Nagasaki, of 12 January 1603. A part of this letter is quoted in Gonoï Takashi, 'Kirishitan jidai no kanbô ni tsuite', in *Kirishitan kenkyû* 19 (1979), 239–62. See also Josef Franz Schütte, *op. cit.*, part one, 231–32, and part two, 172–73, 205–06 & 211–12.

<sup>38</sup> See, for example, Fróis, *Historia*, 1: 50, 70, 96; 104, 110, 112; 2: 45, 90; & 3: 2; and Matsuda, *Furoisu Nipponshi*, 9: 147–48, 243–44, 341–43; 10: 18, 60, 91–92, 277; 11: 77 & 364–65.

to prevent the potential damage of European-oriented diseases to the peoples on the formerly non-Christian side of the earth.

In Paraguay, the judgements made and solutions found by the Jesuits in dealing with illness and invalids were based on what the evangelists in Japan had observed. The missionaries endeavoured to preserve and protect the freedom of the Amerindians against the bondage of the *encomienda* system, but they spent little or no time on preventing epidemics from being spread among the indigenous people. A plausible guess, reasonable at least from a twenty-first century standpoint, is that the priests might have attempted to minimise the effect of diseases by segregating Amerindians, as supported by Philip Caraman.<sup>39</sup> Yet it is difficult to find any references that support this speculation in the missionary correspondence from Paraguay. For example, when Father Diego de Torres, the Jesuit Provincial of Paraguay, dispatched missionaries to create *reducciones* in 1609, his written instructions focussed on how to build native settlements that were independent of serfdom, and not at all on how to prevent fatal diseases among Amerindians. Also, in *La conquista espiritual*, Father Montoya ascribed the numerous deaths of native slaves solely to the hard labour and the miserable treatment by Spanish colonists in the *encomiendas*.<sup>40</sup>

Never once did Father Montoya consider epidemic diseases responsible for the decrease of native population, even though the segregation must have accidentally served to reduce the Amerindian mortality. Instead, he attributed the decline of the *reducción* populations mostly to the exhaustion and famines caused by battles, long travels and meagre harvests. These factors blinded him to the effect of alien diseases. His response to the population decrease in *La conquista espiritual* was thus narrow and limited. When slave hunters, or *bandeirantes*,<sup>41</sup> destroyed eleven out of the thirteen pioneer *reducciones* in the region of Guairá by 1631, the Jesuits evacuated the settlers in the remaining settlements of Loreto and San Ignacio Miní on the shore of the Yavevirí in the present-day province of Misiones. Out of the twelve thousand residents who departed and travelled up to three hundred kilometres,

---

<sup>39</sup> Caraman, *op. cit.*, 34. Without source evidence, Caraman asserts that the Jesuits segregated the Guaranis to protect them from epidemic diseases.

<sup>40</sup> Abou, *op. cit.*, 134; and Montoya, *op. cit.*, chap. 7, 40–43.

<sup>41</sup> The residents in Portuguese Brazil formed a militia at São Paulo to capture the indigenous people and sell them as slaves in Brazil. The members of such militias were Portuguese, half-breed, or even native Tupís, and were named *bandeirantes*, *paulistas*, and *mamelucos*. See Abou, *op. cit.*, 157.



only four thousand reached the new sites. Along the way, two thousand died of hunger or disease. Others deserted or were killed or captured by European colonists. Because another two thousand settlers succumbed to hunger and malady after settling down, less than one thousand survived in each of the two *reducciones*.<sup>42</sup>

From the outset, the *reducciones* witnessed outbreaks of diseases. The *cartas anuas*, the annual correspondence of Paraguay from 1609 to 1638, report on the repeated harm to native residents caused by pestilence, fever, dysentery, smallpox, influenza, scarlet fever, measles and typhus. The seventeenth-century terminology makes it difficult to determine whether a disease was of European origins or indigenous. Furthermore, it may also be a mistake to ascribe every single outbreak entirely to the occasional contacts with European colonisers or the frequent contacts with missionaries or to the introduction of European livestock within the settlements. Nonetheless, considering both the diseases' symptomatic similarity to existing European terms and the absence of outbreaks among the Japanese, one must conclude that they originated in Eurasia.

Considering the increasingly frequent references in the correspondence to the harmful effects of these diseases on the Amerindian population, one must conclude that the Europeans were unintentionally responsible for the spread of disease. Perhaps because they did not fully understand epidemics, the missionary response was to care for each individual case rather than looking for the root causes of the epidemics. After all, in Japan, where there were few if any epidemics caused by the introduction of European germs and viruses, that was exactly what they had done.<sup>43</sup>

Considering the above eight methodological similarities between the missionary experiment in Japan and the Paraguayan *reducción* scheme, it is difficult not to conclude that the Christian villages in Japan became an inspiration to the Jesuits who worked to establish

---

<sup>42</sup> Montoya, *op. cit.*, chaps. 35–39, 100–113; and Abou, *op. cit.*, 44.

<sup>43</sup> Ravnani & Leonhardt, *Iglesia (1609–1614)*, 18, 47, 52, 57, 65, 71–73, 76, 81, 85, 90, 98, 101, 105, 134, 162, 215, 347, 425, 452, 457, 492 & 521 (on diseases); 27, 43, 118, 168–71, 182, 185, 188, 195, 202, 205, 213–16, 289, 294, 318, 332, 375, 385, 425 & 522 (on caring for the ill); and Ravnani & Leonhardt, *Iglesia (1615–1637)*, 32, 88, 128, 140, 146, 152, 177, 183, 187, 204, 206, 210, 213, 216, 248, 251, 356, 369, 388–389, 398, 411, 426, 433, 444, 455, 461, 482, 493, 496, 511, 523, 531, 534, 539, 543, 593, 618, 640, 653, 673–74, 681, 687, 692, 701–02, 705, 708, 713 & 717 (on diseases); 22, 53–56, 103, 123, 144, 160, 213, 266, 289, 457 & 523 (on caring for the ill).

similar sedentary Christian communities in Paraguay. The Jesuit missionaries in Paraguay had already borne certain preconceptions in mind when they began to create native Christian communities. As far as they were concerned, the *reducciones*, just like Japanese Christian villages, ought to be isolated from European settlements, in order to maintain the political autonomy of the Jesuits<sup>44</sup> and to create a self-sustaining agrarian society of fully clothed inhabitants living in houses, all this administered by indigenous residents. Also, the Jesuits in the *reducciones* were as few in number as their predecessors in Japan. The Japanese experience taught them that the missionary church could only be managed with the assistance of Amerindian catechists. This initiative started in sixteenth-century Japan, where the early Jesuits recruited and trained Japanese lay brothers and *dōjuku*.

Through their experiments in Japan, the Jesuit missionaries seem to have learnt which criteria of Euro-Christian social standards to adopt and which to exclude, in order to create an independent Christian community outside the colonial European territories. Based on a few decades of experience with Japanese neophytes in the mid-sixteenth century, the Iberian Jesuits learnt to appreciate Japanese habits and traditions, such as an agrarian society, simple clothing styles and architectural techniques. The Jesuits also introduced new ideas, such as segregation of non-European converts from Europeans and political autonomy. The Jesuits in seventeenth-century Paraguay applied the same standards to the *reducciones* although they were innovations in Paraguay, whereas in Japan, the Jesuits perpetuated what was already in place. This interconnection between Japanese Christian villages and Paraguayan *reducciones* will help with an analysis of the *réductions* in New France.

---

<sup>44</sup> This claim of the isolation from European settlements as the precondition for the political autonomy of the Jesuits may need further explanation because the separation in Japan was unintentional. For the Jesuits, however, the port town of Nagasaki and the Christian villages in Hizen were the first foreign missionary communities that they established far from European settlements. They are likely to have learnt some advantages of the remoteness from European settlements in order to realise their own complete religious control over their converts' communities.

### C. THE *RÉDUCTIONS* IN NEW FRANCE IN COMPARISON WITH THE PARAGUAYAN AND JAPANESE MODELS

The indigenous Christian settlements established in mid-seventeenth-century New France can now be examined from a broader perspective with roots not only in Paraguay but also in Japan. One way to understand the *réductions* is to see them as a development that started in Japan and continued in Paraguay, then was transferred to North America. Alternatively a variation is to examine the native Christian settlements in New France as a deliberate emulation of either Paraguay or Japan. The criteria needed for analysis include the eight similarities discussed above, as well as some others. By determining what degree the *réductions* emulated the Paraguayan models, it will become evident that the Laurentian *réductions* were not simple emulations of the Paraguayan *reducciones*.

First, in terms of segregation, the *réductions* were different from the *reducciones*, and were rather closer in nature to some Hizen villages. The native Laurentian communities, which numbered three in the mid-seventeenth century, were not as segregated as the Paraguayan models. The Innu community of Sillery, the first reserve in New France, was established in 1637 near the outpost of Quebec. It was only eight kilometres away from the port of Quebec by river. The *réduction* of La Conception, the second reserve, established in 1641 for the Algonquin, the Innu and the Attikamègue, actually bordered the French settlement of Trois-Rivières. From 1651 to 1656, the third settlement, a Huron settlement, was maintained on the Île d'Orléans, downriver from Quebec. All other *réductions* created later in the century were also within a radius of twenty-five kilometres from Quebec, Trois-Rivières or Montreal.

Located adjacent to Quebec, Sillery was never a settlement exclusively for Amerindians. The Jesuits created a parish at Sillery. At the end of 1647, sixty to seventy French parishioners resided there. The Amerindian and French settlers, however, seem to have simply co-existed separately from each other inside the settlement and shared few activities. In the *Relation* of 1647–48, Father Lalemant described High Mass in Sillery as an exceptional event, where both ethnic groups met and communicated with each other through an interpreter in order to learn of the Quebec governor's ban on the private liquor trade. In 1653, Father François-Joseph le Mercier regarded Sillery as a settlement for both the French and the Amerindians. Later in 1663,

Father Lalemant distinguished the French settlement from the native *réduction* within Sillery. He regarded Sillery as the *réduction* for native Christians, and called the neighbouring French settlement 'the adjacent colony of the French'.<sup>45</sup>

The Paraguayan *reducciones*, by contrast, were located farther away from the nearest Spanish outpost of Asunción. San Ignacio Guazú, one of the nearest settlements, lay two hundred and fifty kilometres away as the crow flies, or even farther, more than four hundred kilometres away, by way of the Paraguay and Tebicuary Rivers. The communities farthest away, Nuestra Señora de los Reyes de Yapeyú, created in 1627 near modern-day Uruguay, and San Miguel, established in 1626 beyond the Uruguay River in Rio Grande do Sul in what is now Brazil, were six hundred kilometres apart.

In terms of distance, the location of the Laurentian *réductions* was similar to that of the villages surrounding the port of Nagasaki. From the year 1580 onwards, the Jesuits had their regional headquarters in this port town and made missionary excursions to Hizen villages. Most Christian villages were within a radius of thirty kilometres from the port. In the same way, the French missionaries stationed in Quebec and Trois-Rivières commuted to or stayed in the neighbouring *réductions*.

Three major factors prevented the complete segregation of the Laurentian reserves. The most important factor was that the French colonists did not enslave Amerindians in the Iberian way, as in South America. As was the case in Japan, which was not conquered by Europeans, the missionaries found no need to segregate their converts from the French population. Furthermore, sailing along the Saint Lawrence over long distances was dangerous for the missionaries and even more so for the Christian nuns who helped with missionary work in the native *réductions*. The peoples in the Eastern Woodlands located in the regions north of Lake Ontario were at war with the Iroquois, who inhabited lands to the south of the Saint Lawrence. Because of their trading alliance with the Hurons, the French settlers had been threatened by the Iroquois, especially in the 1640s and 1650s when the fur trade increased. Furthermore, Amerindian *réductions* relied

---

<sup>45</sup> Jérôme Lalemant, *Journal des Pères Jésuites en l'année 1640*, in *Relations* 30: 203; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of 1647–48, in *Relations* 33: 49–51; François-Joseph le Mercier's *Relation* of 1652–53, in *Relations* 40: 203; and J. Lalemant to Gian Paolo Oliva, the general superior at Rome, from Quebec, 18 August 1663, in *Relations* 47: 253–55.

initially on the human resources of French settlers, who cleared forests, cultivated land and built houses in order to prepare the reserves.<sup>46</sup> Thus, it was a reckless idea to set up a *réduction* in a place distant from a French outpost.

Second, the Jesuits established their political autonomy in the missionary reserves, but the case of New France was a little different from its precedents in Paraguay and Japan. Notwithstanding the rôle of the missionaries in the management of the *réductions*, the settlements were officially under the direct control of the colonial French authorities. The Company of New France, in charge of the entire Laurentian colonisation until 1663, collaborated with the Jesuits in inducing the Amerindians to settle down near the French outposts. The company announced in 1639 that it would grant the same discounted prices to native converts as it gave to French settlers at its retail shop if they should choose to settle in Sillery. In addition, the Governor of Quebec induced the Algonquins in Sillery to maintain constancy in marriage and to elect chiefs to govern them in 1640. The governor later assumed the responsibility of prohibiting Sillery's native residents from buying liquor from individual Frenchmen as well as of urging them to embrace the Christian faith to remain in the reserve. The Jesuits seem to have been behind all these negotiations with Amerindians, since they referred to these actions as part of their missionary efforts in their annual reports.<sup>47</sup>

This slight difference was caused by the partial segregation of Amerindians. The *réductions* were located too close to the French outposts for the Jesuits to achieve complete autonomy. The reserve settlers thus obeyed two authorities: the Jesuits and the nearby civil authorities.

On the other hand, the Jesuit control of the Huron villages of Ihonatiria, Ossossané and Teanaostaiaé, was closer to the Jesuit autonomy in Paraguay and at the Japanese port town of Nagasaki. These pro-Christian or pro-French villages were not called '*réductions*', since they existed before the mission was founded. However, the distance of these villages from the French settlements was similar to the distance of Paraguayan *reducciones* from the Spanish settlements. These Huron communities of Christian converts were located seven hundred and

<sup>46</sup> Paul le Jeune's *Relation* of 1640, in *Relations* 18: 95–97 & 109–111.

<sup>47</sup> Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1639, in *Relations* 16: 33; Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1640, in *Relations* 18: 99–101; and J. Lalemant's *Relation* of 1647–48, in *Relations* 33: 49–51.

fifty kilometres from Quebec. Although the French missionaries were unsuccessful in converting the entire populations of these villages, they claimed that they had secured enough converts to consolidate their evangelistic activity. In these villages, so distant from any outpost, the Jesuits achieved independent governance over their Christian converts without the civil French authorities' interference in the mission.<sup>48</sup>

Third, the Jesuit attempts at settling down indigenous people in the *réductions* were not as effective as the Paraguayan *reducciones* even though the missionaries had shared the same settlement goal ever since Father Xavier's mission. In terms of ideals, on the one hand, the attempts at creating a native settlement were the same as the predecessors' efforts in Paraguay and Japan. As early as 1635, Father Le Jeune expressed his hope for turning the Innu into a sedentary people. He acknowledged the importance of organising Amerindians into a village when he referred to the beginning of the residence of Saint Joseph in Sillery, in his *Relation* of 1638.<sup>49</sup>

In terms of lasting achievements, on the other hand, the French effort for Amerindian missionary settlements was a failure when compared with its Paraguayan and Japanese precedents even though, at first, there were some successes. As early as 1640, the Kichesipiirini, whom the French missionaries called the Algonquin of the Allumette Island, began to plant maize in Trois-Rivières, and so did the residents of Sillery. In April 1646, according to Jérôme Lalemant, native settlers prepared more than fifteen *arpents* of land in Sillery, and more than thirty indigenous families began farming in Trois-Rivières. Nevertheless, hunting won out over agriculture. In February 1643, the native settlers departed from Sillery for a moose hunt leaving only twelve or thirteen residents in one cabin, who were either invalids, old persons or children. The winter hunt for game remained so popular at the *réductions* that the missionaries referred to it repeatedly in the Journals of Jesuit Fathers and the successive *Relations* after 1642.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>48</sup> J. Lalemant's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1642, in *Relations* 23: 43 & 151; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1643–44, in *Relations* 26: 259–91.

<sup>49</sup> Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1635, in *Relations* 8: 55–57; and Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1638, in *Relations* 14: 205–07. See also Le Jeune's letter to General Superior Mutius Vitelleschi at Rome, from Trois Rivières, 1st August 1638, in Campeau, *Monumenta*, 4: 54–57, esp. 55.

<sup>50</sup> Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1640, in *Relations* 18: 109–11; J. Lalemant, *Journal des Pères Jésuites, en l'année 1640*, in *Relations* 28: 185; Barthélemy Vimont's *Relation* of 1642–43, in *Relations* 23: 315–17; Vimont's *Relation* of 1643–44, in *Relations* 25: 161; Vimont's

In other words, the Amerindians of New France remained heavily dependent on hunting wild game. It was, after all, part of their culture. Yet the Japanese residents in Hizen were already sedentary agriculturalists. The Guaraní settlers in the *reducciones* were originally semi-sedentary horticulturalists even though they lived in the woods. In the seventeenth century, the native Laurentian peoples, by contrast, did not have permanent villages. The Innu and the Algonquin were, by nature, nomads. The Huron men who wintered in the *réductions* were semi-sedentary people, but they, too, normally hunted game in winter.

Moreover, two other major factors prevented the Amerindian settlers from cultivating sufficient food, which in turn made hunting necessary.<sup>51</sup> First of all, repeated Iroquois raids during the 1640s and 1650s, as noted by the Jesuit missionaries, rendered working in fields unsafe.<sup>52</sup> In the spring of 1643, rumours of Iroquois incursions were enough to deter the community's participation in maize planting in Sillery. The male inhabitants were compelled to stop their agricultural work and depart for Fort Richelieu and Trois-Rivières to confront the Iroquois warriors. Although the native men returned to Sillery, they did not remain there. They again left for Tadoussac for hunting after failing to receive provisions from the French ships that were late in arriving. Also, in May 1656, Mohawk bands attacked the Huron settlers on the Île d'Orléans. The Hurons had set out for agricultural work in their fields after Mass. This *réduction* lost as many as seventy-one native settlers who were either killed or captured. Among them, many young women, vital participants in agriculture, were taken prisoner.<sup>53</sup>

---

*Relation* of 1644–45, in *Relations* 27: 143, 203–207; J. Lalemant, *Journal des Pères Jésuites, en l'année 1647*, in *Relations* 30: 157 & 165; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of 1647, in *Relations* 30: 231–33; J. Lalemant, *Journal des Pères Jésuites, en l'année 1648*, in *Relations* 32: 107; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of 1647–48, in *Relations* 32: 267–69; and J. Lalemant, *Journal des Pères Jésuites, en l'année 1649*, in *Relations* 34: 65.

<sup>51</sup> Other factors that caused native farmers to emigrate may have included soil exhaustion, depletion of firewood and decrease of game animals in the locality. See Gabriel Sagard, *Le grand voyage du pays des Hurons situé en l'Amérique vers la Mer douce, ès derniers confins de la nouvelle France, dite Canada* (Paris, 1632) 117–18.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Vimont's *Relation* of 1642–43, in *Relations* 24: 99–101, 157–59; Vimont's *Relation* of 1643–44, in *Relations* 25: 105–07; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of 1647, in *Relations* 30: 231; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of 1647–48, in *Relations* 32: 265–67; and Paul Ragueneau's *Relation* of 1651–52, in *Relations* 37: 181.

<sup>53</sup> Vimont's *Relation* of 1642–43, in *Relations* 23: 317–19; Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1656–57, in *Relations* 43: 115–19; and Paul Ragueneau to Goswin Nickel, general superior, from Quebec, 25 July 1656, in Campeau, *Monumenta*, 8: 801–03, esp. 802.

As the other factor, the Amerindians were prevented from actively engaging in agriculture by the outbreak of diseases of European origin. The Hospital of Sillery received approximately one hundred native patients in one year starting in mid-1642, in other words one third of entire Amerindian population of three hundred. Such a high percentage suggests an epidemic caused by imported disease. Even though the figure of one hundred included the destitute in need of philanthropy in order to survive, they formed only a minority. The majority of the one hundred patients were convalescing from illnesses. At the same hospital during the same period, there were only five or six French patients, but they were all brought there after having being stricken with an endemic disease, limited to Fort Richelieu. In other words, it was not epidemic that laid them low. As for the native residents' recovery from illness, Father Vimont stated in 1643 that God only 'sometimes' restored their health. Four years later in January 1647, the Amerindian population of the reserve had declined to one hundred and sixty. All these examples taken together suggest that many native Christians in Sillery suffered heavily from epidemic disease that normally killed few French colonists because they were resistant to them.<sup>54</sup>

Fourth, unlike the Paraguayan model, the French priests did not teach spinning and weaving for the manufacture of clothing. They left the provision of clothes to religious philanthropy and barter. The Ursulines and Hospital nuns in Sillery provided Amerindians with food, clothing and shelter at every sort of charity.<sup>55</sup> Linen, shirts, woollen caps and other clothes were given to native patients in the hospital of Quebec.<sup>56</sup> Besides iron and other metal tools, French clothing, including hats, shoes, caps, woollens, shirts, linens and cloaks, were used for barter with Amerindians.<sup>57</sup> The reason that the missionaries did not

---

<sup>54</sup> Vimont's *Relation* of 1642, in *Relations* 22: 155; Vimont's *Relation* of 1642–43, in *Relations* 24: 21–23 & 159–61; and J. Lalemant, *Journal des Pères Jésuites, en l'année 1647*, in *Relations* 30: 155.

<sup>55</sup> Vimont's *Relation* of 1642–43, in *Relations* 23: 311–13; & 24: 113; Vimont's *Relation* of 1643–44, in *Relations* 25: 243–45; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of 1647, in *Relations* 32: 213–15;

<sup>56</sup> See the invoices of supplies for the Hospital nuns, in Le Mercier's *Relation* of 1664–65, in *Relations* 49: 205–11; Le Mercier's *Relation* of 1665–66, in *Relations* 50: 161–63; and Le Mercier's *Relation* of 1667–68, in *Relations* 52: 107–09.

<sup>57</sup> The *Relations* in the 1640s and 1650s describe trade items too briefly to list each of them, but the earlier documents are more detailed about barter. See Pierre Biard's *Relation* of 1616, in *Relations* 3: 69–70 & 75–77; and Charles Lalemant to Jérôme Lalemant, from Quebec, 1st August 1626, in *Relations* 4: 207.



teach cloth production on the reserves was that their introduction of agriculture, as a first step, remained unsuccessful. The provision of clothes therefore remained the domain of the French outposts.

On the other hand, the French missionaries did not force Amerindians to dress in 'Christian' clothing. Despite the subarctic climate of New France, native clothes normally covered only minimal body parts even outdoors.<sup>58</sup> Yet the missionaries may have overlooked the native clothing custom to let their Amerindian converts continue to be providers of furs. Simple clothes made of animal skins had their advantage in life in the wilderness. Clothing made of cotton or wool would have hindered foraging and hunting in such conditions.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, because the Amerindians in New France lived in a cold subarctic climate, they had developed their own style of clothing, which was better adapted than French-style clothes, which would have been useless outside in the frozen winter of the Saint Lawrence region.

In one way, the attitude of the priests in New France was similar to the missionaries' attitudes in Japan and Paraguay. The missionaries in Japan accepted traditional Japanese fashion as clothes that would maintain Christian decency and moral propriety. In Paraguay, the Jesuits managed to clothe the naked indigenous people by introducing cotton and food farming as well as weaving to them. Nevertheless, the failure in introducing a sedentary life to indigenous Christians in New France prevented the Amerindian development of cloth manufacturing or even of sufficient agriculture. Thus, the French missionaries in the *réductions* had to clothe Amerindian converts only with as many European clothes as philanthropy and trade could afford. Most of the native settlers continued dressing in furs and skins.

The fifth area of comparison among Japan, Paraguay and New France deals with the success of the priests in creating a completely sedentary community of native Christians, who settled down in houses. In Japan, people were already sedentary and the missionaries did not have to

---

<sup>58</sup> According to Samuel de Champlain, even native women were not ashamed to expose their bodies from the waist up and from mid-thigh down. See H. P. Biggar (ed.), *The Works of Samuel de Champlain* (6 vols., Toronto: The Champlain Society, 192–36), vol. 3, 133–34.

<sup>59</sup> For example, in 1639 a canoe overturned on its way from Quebec. The canoe contained a Huron lad dressed in a French manner and an Algonquin lad dressed in an indigenous manner, in a simple pelt robe. The Huron man drowned while the Algonquin man was able to save himself by throwing off his robe and swimming to safety. See Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1639, in *Relations* 16: 177–79.

provide houses for their converts. In Paraguay, native large huts were completely replaced by block housing units to transform Amerindians to sedentary agriculturalists just like the Japanese people.

The French attempts, however, ended in failure. Because indigenous hunters and gatherers were not transformed into sedentary farmers in the Canadian *réductions*, dwellings for permanent settlements were not required. In the native Christian settlements, French-style buildings only partially replaced Algonquian bark wigwams and Iroquoian longhouses. Despite the assistance of nuns, the introduction of houses in the *réductions* was limited to the realm of Christian charity. Houses were built either to accommodate principal native settlers or to provide shelter for destitute or homeless people. In 1642, when three hundred native inhabitants lived in Sillery, the *réduction* had only four little houses and a hospital based on French plans. The two houses for the Innu were built on the Jesuits' side of the settlement while the other two for the Algonquin were on the Hospital nuns' side, separated from the Jesuits' side by an eighteen-metre-wide mound. The principal native residents were lodged in the houses, but many others lived in their own style of dwellings, which the missionaries called 'cabanes'.<sup>60</sup>

In a way, the French Jesuits' tolerance of the Amerindian dwelling custom was similar to the Iberian Jesuits' acceptance of traditional buildings in Hizen. Yet, at the same time, this similarity implies a fundamental difference because the reasons for such tolerance varied in the two regions. In Japan, the Jesuits praised Japanese houses as part of Asian civilisation, and declared them to be compatible with Christianity. In New France, because the *réductions* were far from self-sustaining and thus had to rely on religious charity, there was little extra money for the mission to accommodate all dwellers in houses. Moreover, because the missionaries did not transform the native people into French-style parishioners living in houses, the missionaries kept these Amerindians as suppliers of furs. Therefore, they were allowed to continue Amerindian hunting, while at the same time, they used temporary shelters located in the settlement. Only those activities, such as Amerindian healing rituals, polygamy, cannibalism, naked dances and indigenous charms that were in violation of Christian preaching,

---

<sup>60</sup> Vimont's *Relation* of 1642–43, in *Relations* 23: 303–07.

were expressly prohibited.<sup>61</sup> Since hunting did not offend Christian principles, it was allowed.

Sixth, as for the administration of *réductions*, the Jesuit missionaries followed the Paraguayan convention in completely controlling the entire population, in the same way as the evangelists in both Paraguay and Japan had previously shared the same administrative principle. While making use of the existing non-European government, the Jesuits in both New France and Paraguay complemented it with their own government in order to gain effective ecclesiastical control of local communities. In the *reducciones*, the priests introduced a Spanish style of administration between the level of their ecclesiastical rule and that of the caciques' existing control of people. In the Canadian *réductions*, the Jesuits maintained the chiefs' authority and seem to have created a ruling system over it.

Although the Jesuit reports speak insufficiently about the administration of the respective *réductions*, there is a reference that hints at the Jesuits' attempt at complementing Amerindian self-government in Sillery. According to Father Le Jeune in his *Relation* of 1640, the major reserve residents were urged to set up leaders apart from the civil chiefs of each tribal group. Governor Charles Huault de Montmagny advised the Amerindians to elect chiefs to govern the whole reserve. Accordingly the missionaries helped prominent residents to elect three 'magistrats' on a one-year basis through secret votes. The missionaries agreed that Etinechkawat should continue as hereditary Innu chief. Of these new three commanders, one became chief of prayers and the other two were in charge of keeping the young inhabitants focussed on their religious duties. The four 'magistrats' assumed responsibility for deciding the affairs of the *réduction*.<sup>62</sup>

At the time of this election, Sillery was developing as a multi-tribal community divided into two major parties, the Innu and the Algonquin. Within these major groups, furthermore, there were segments like the Innu near Quebec, the Innu from Tadoussac, and the Kichesipiirini, or the Algonquin, of Allumette Island.<sup>63</sup> The *réduction* administration

---

<sup>61</sup> For the Amerindian customs with which the Jesuits disagreed, see J. Lalemant's *Relations* of the Hurons of 1640 and 1643, in *Relations* 19: 201–203; 27: 39–41; Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1640–41, in *Relations* 20: 215–217; and Vimont's *Relation* of 1642, in *Relations* 22: 67–69.

<sup>62</sup> Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1640, in *Relations* 18: 101–03.

<sup>63</sup> For the Innu residents from Tadoussac, see Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1639, in *Relations* 16: 141–43. For an example of a contemporary Huron visitor, see Le Jeune's *Relation* of

was beyond the control of a single headman from one of the respective groups or segments. In order to create an efficient administration of this multi-tribal community, the missionaries had to introduce to Sillery an advanced level of self-government beyond tribal chiefdom.

In these attempts at controlling Christian communities also, there was continuity in methodology. The Amerindian *réduction* government was connected with the ecclesiastical rule of Hizen. The Paraguayan missions were similar to the earlier Japanese ones as far as the administrative arrangements for the *reducciones* were concerned. In the same way, the New France missions were comparable to the preceding Paraguayan ones in the developmental sequence of Jesuit methodology for consolidating the priests' control of non-European communities.

Seventh, on the subject of native participation in the mission's management, the Laurentian reserves seem to have been more influenced by a Japanese convention than by the Paraguayan *reducciones*. The priests initially sought help from their lay French domestics, whom they called '*donnés*' from 1639 onwards.<sup>64</sup> Only later did they introduce Amerindian assistants, whom they called '*dogiques*'. Significantly the French Jesuits used the Japanese rather than Paraguayan term. While native Paraguayan assistants were introduced as *catequistas* when the *reducciones* were established, the native Laurentian associates were called *dogiques*, a word about whose origin the French Jesuits wrote nothing in their accounts.<sup>65</sup>

Because the Jesuits in Paraguay persisted in using the term '*catequistas*' instead of any other term for referring to the equivalents for *dogiques* in their annual reports, the origin of the *dogiques* is unlikely to be in Paraguay. The French term '*dogique*' came from the Latin term '*dogicus*'. This Latin appellation was apparently translated from '*dogicos*' or '*dojiquis*', an Iberian term used by the missionaries in Japan. These last variations were how Iberian priests spelt the original Buddhist word '*dōjuku*'.<sup>66</sup> To put all these in diachronic order, the Iberian

---

1639, in *Relations* 17: 137–39. For the Kichesipiirini and main Innu groups, see Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1640, in *Relations* 18: 91–97.

<sup>64</sup> J. Lalemant, 'Mémoire touchant les Domestiques', in *Relations* 21: 293–301; and General Superior Mutius Vitelleschi to Provincial Étienne Binet at Paris, from Rome, 29 March 1639, in Campeau, *Monumenta*, 4: 203–04.

<sup>65</sup> J. Lalemant's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1643, in *Relations* 27: 67–69.

<sup>66</sup> One should not look for the similarities, of spelling and pronunciation, between '*dōjuku*' and '*dogicos*' or '*dojiquis*'. This alphabetical spelling of '*dōjuku*' did not exist

Jesuits borrowed the office of *dôjuku* and its Japanese Buddhist expression for recruiting their lay assistants. The term ‘*dogicos*’ or ‘*dojiquis*’, a name for these lay subordinates, is highly likely to have been adopted by the European Jesuits in Rome and elsewhere through missionary reports. And yet the missionaries in Paraguay did not use this term. It was instead used later by the French priests in New France.<sup>67</sup> More importantly as opposed to the popular theory of *réduction* models, the instalment of *dogiques* in the *reductions* of New France was *not* modelled on the *reducción* system in Paraguay and instead originated in the Iberian Jesuits’ emulation of Buddhist assistantship in Japan.

When the French Jesuits began to mention the office of *dogique*, it was initially not applied to indigenous Christians specifically and became so only later. The first reference to the office of *dogique* was in Superior Le Jeune’s Latin letter to Father Étienne Binet, Provincial of France, in 1638. Father Le Jeune wrote that he should like Dominique Scot, one of the former French domestics in Huronia, to return to New France on completion of his two-year novitiate so that the father might have him work as both a companion and ‘*dogicus, sive catechista*’, namely a *dogique*, or a catechist. However, this position of *dogique* had become solely the domain of native converts by the time that it was first referred to in the *Relations* in 1643. According to Father Jérôme Lalemant, the author of the *Huron Relation* of 1643, older native Christians did the evangelistic work as *dogiques* on behalf of the

---

before the twentieth century because it is a modern spelling based on the latest rules for alphabetising Japanese characters. The alphabetical ‘*dogicos*’ and ‘*dojiquis*’ remained the only spelt forms available in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

<sup>67</sup> A full discussion of the international development of the *dogique* scheme is impossible here because it involves too many aspects to explore within a few paragraphs. Lucien Campeau, SJ, was probably the first to touch upon the origin of *dogiques*. In one of his notes to *Monumenta Novae Franciae*, however, Campeau introduced the ambiguous spelling ‘*dojiku*’ as the original Japanese term to the French-language reader. And yet ‘*dojiku*’ would only indirectly lead to the original Japanese word. Although an accurate alphabetical transcription of this Japanese word may have been difficult in the sixteenth century, he should have spelt it either ‘*dogicos*’ in Portuguese or ‘*dôjuku*’ in modern alphabetical Japanese spelling, as did Josef Franz Schütte, SJ, in his *Valignanos Missionsgrundsätze für Japan* (2 parts, Roma: Edizioni de Storia E Letteratura, Via Lancellotti 18, 1951–58), pt. 1, 340; pt. 2, 39–41. See also Campeau, *Monumenta*, 4: 66, note 2. For the references in English-language articles, see Takao Abé, ‘A Japanese Perspective on the Jesuits in New France’, *Actes du vingtième colloque de la société d’histoire coloniale française, Cleveland, Ohio, May 1994* (Ontario: Mothersill Printing, 1996), 14–26; and Takao Abé, ‘What Determined the Content of Missionary Reports? The Jesuit Relations Compared with the Iberian Jesuit Accounts’, *French Colonial History* 3 (2002): 69–82.

missionaries and in their absence. In 1646, the Jesuits finally mentioned the actual name of a *dogique*: Étienne Totiri, a Huron convert in the village of Teanaostaiaé.<sup>68</sup>

The first references to *dogiques* connected with *réductions* were even later, in 1650. In the *Relation* of that year, Father Paul Ragueneau wrote about Monique, a blind woman, apparently an Algonquin, who was educated by the Hospital nuns in Quebec. According to Father Ragueneau, when she was captured by an Iroquois party and taken to their country, she served as the mission *dogique* among the Algonquin captives there. In another chapter, Father Ragueneau added that a native male *dogique* was playing a valuable evangelistic rôle on behalf of the priests at the Innu mission in Tadoussac, which he called a '*réduction*'.<sup>69</sup>

The *dogiques*' duty was similar to that of the Japanese *dôjuku* except for the maintenance of the church buildings. During the absence of priests, the Amerindian *dogiques* offered public prayers and held divine service during warfare and hunting. These *dogiques* instructed people using their native tongues and baptised any convert who seemed on the point of death. In addition, these *dogiques* sang the canticles to congregations, and preached Christian law to foreign tribes on behalf of the priests.<sup>70</sup>

The introduction of the office of *dogiques* not only had older Christian origins but it also seems to explain something about the attitude of the European missionaries concerning the acceptance of non-Europeans into the priesthood, as has been mentioned in the analysis of the Japanese *dôjuku* and the Paraguayan *catequistas*. It is highly likely that the French Jesuits emulated the offices of the junior clerics and lay assistants attached to Christian parishes in Europe when they introduced *dogiques*. Yet the difference in the name of office has an important

---

<sup>68</sup> Le Jeune, superior, to Étienne Binet, provincial at Paris, from Quebec, 31 August 1638, in Campeau, *Monumenta*, 4: 65–67; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1643, in *Relations* 27: 67–69; Ragueneau's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1645–46, in *Relations* 29: 275–77; and Ragueneau's *Relation* of 1649–50, in *Relations* 35: 247–49. As for Dominique Scot, see Jean Côté, *The Donnés in Huronia* (n.p.: William Lonc, 2001), 75–85. For Étienne Totiri, see also Charles Garnier's letter to Henry de Saint-Joseph, at Paris, from the country of the Hurons, 7 June 1645, in Campeau, *Monumenta*, 6: 260–64, esp. 262–63; and Garnier to Saint-Joseph, from [the village of] Saint-Joseph among the Hurons, 14 May 1646, in *ibid.*, 6: 472–76, esp. 475–76.

<sup>69</sup> Ragueneau's *Relation* of 1649–50, in *Relations* 35: 247–49 & 267–77.

<sup>70</sup> J. Lalemant's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1643, in *Relations* 27: 67–69; and Ragueneau's *Relation* of 1649–50, in *Relations* 35: 277

connotation. By using these names for non-European offices that were different from European ones, the non-European assistants were excluded from the holy orders of the Church and were also excluded from religious orders. This meant that they were given few opportunities to become priests, or regular members of the Society, in the seventeenth century.

Eighth, the responses of the priests to diseases and the care of the ill had not changed ever since the evangelistic decades in Japan. The French missionaries failed to learn from their predecessors in the Paraguayan mission that their native converts could be killed by imported epidemics. That was inevitable because the missionary correspondents from Paraguay failed to clarify, for their readers in Europe and North America, the connection between the epidemics among Amerindians and the arrival of Europeans. Furthermore, unlike the accidental segregations from foreign diseases in Paraguay, the French priests did not restrict contact between the Amerindians and the French settlers. The missionaries, who were ignorant of bacterial and viral infection, did nothing to prevent the spread of epidemics. They only visited and cared for their native patients. Yet this care was one of the basic acts of Christian charity, and was neither a creative idea of the French priests nor an emulation of the missionaries' care of the ill in Paraguay and Japan.

*The Jesuit Relations* suggest that the priests had enough opportunities to realise that the Amerindians were suffering from diseases imported from Europe, such as fevers and smallpox. According to Jesuit reporters like Fathers Pierre Biard, Le Jeune and Lalemant, the missionaries were aware that the native population was dwindling ever since the onset of contact with the French. In 1638, the Jesuits even had to abandon their first missionary centre in the Huron village of Ihonatiria, where diseases killed or dispersed the majority of population. In other passages, some boys and girls taken to Quebec or to France in the 1630s were reported to have died of illness. At the same time, note the *Relations*, the incidence of disease among priests and French settlers was less frequent than among of Amerindians.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> On the effect of diseases, see Pierre Biard's *Relation* of 1616, in *Relations* 3: 105; Le Jeune's *Relations* of 1637 and 1638, in *Relations* 11:193; 14: 217; Le Mercier's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1637, in *Relations* 15: 141; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1639, in *Relations* 17: 59, 115; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of 164–48, in *Relations* 33:19. On infants, see Le Jeune's *Relations* of 1635 and 1637, in *Relations* 7: 287–89; 11: 97–105;

The French Jesuit correspondents, however, neither admitted that the native people were dying of European-derived diseases nor saw any need to segregate the healthy from the sick. Only elsewhere did the missionaries seek explanations for the cause of diseases. Christian fatalism, of course, ascribed fatal diseases to the will of God, whenever the source of illness was unknown. The missionaries also developed other explanations. Early on, Father Biard blamed these maladies on intemperance, indolence and the harshness of the wilderness. As for the Innu near Quebec in the 1630s, Father Le Jeune attributed their illness and subsequent deaths to excessive consumption of liquor and poor hygiene. To solve these health problems, he attempted to curtail the liquor trade. At the root of most illnesses, however, was the priests' ignorance of the fundamental difference of vulnerability to disease between Amerindians and Europeans.<sup>72</sup>

These misinterpretations of the causes directed the priests' efforts almost solely towards not prevention of illness but care of the diseased. When Father Le Jeune encamped among the Innu in the winter of 1632–1633, he visited and treated invalid children as though he were a physician. Along similar lines, in Sillery and Trois-Rivières, the missionaries visited diseased residents and baptised especially those presumed to be dying. After the Jesuits introduced a hospital to the *reduction* of Sillery, the Hospital nuns helped them to care for native patients of different groups. Father Ragueneau even boasted that the nuns' care of sick Amerindians reduced mortality extensively though his only proof for this statement was the frequent philanthropic effort of the priests to care for diseased people in Huronia. The missionaries there visited and cared for every single person suffering from ailments that they could recognise and therefore cure.<sup>73</sup> Ironically the missionaries' round of visits to invalids disseminated new germs and viruses.

---

12: 47–51. And on symptoms, see Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1636, in *Relations* 9: 139–41; Le Mercier's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1637, in *Relations* 13: 109–11 & 163–65; and Vimont's *Relation* of 1642–43, in *Relations* 24: 159–61.

<sup>72</sup> Biard's *Relation* of 1616, in *Relations* 3: 107–09; and Le Jeune's *Relations* of 1634 and 1637, in *Relations* 6: 251–53; 11: 195–99.

<sup>73</sup> Le Jeune's *Relations* of 1633, 1639, and 1640–41, in *Relations* 5: 227–39; 16: 217–19; 20: 281–85; Vimont's *Relations* of 1642 and 1642–43, in *Relations* 22: 93–113, 155–77; 24: 159–61; Brébeuf's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1635, in *Relations* 8: 131–33; J. Lalemant's *Relation* of the Hurons of 1639, in *Relations* 16: 243–45; 17: 27–31; and Ragueneau's *Relation* of 1649–50, in *Relations* 35: 97;



Few missionaries, in fact, segregated healthy Amerindians from the sick. They failed to understand that the French settlers carried diseases, and thus they did not segregate healthy settlers from sick native people. Also, there was almost no quarantine of diseased Amerindians. One such exception occurred when four native families came to settle in Sillery in 1638 or 1639. Father Le Jeune refused them entry into the *réduction* because he did not want them to contract smallpox from the native residents. No other missionaries followed suit in similar situations.<sup>74</sup>

The priests in New France followed the example of the missionaries in Japan. They treated Amerindian patients as if they, like the Japanese, were immune to European diseases. This was partly because of the limitation of medical knowledge in the seventeenth century. The first vaccine for smallpox was invented only at the end of the eighteenth century. It was only later, in the nineteenth century, that humans understood the concept of bacteria as the cause of diseases. Research on viruses developed only from the end of the nineteenth century. And yet flawed medical information does not fully account for the missionaries' conduct as potential carriers, since they were well aware that the diseases they encountered among Amerindians after contact were contagious or infectious. One important reason why the missionaries did not think to segregate settlers and fur traders from indigenous people was the connection between trade and evangelisation. Social contact was necessary for both trade and religious conversion. Furthermore, disease did have a positive side for the missionaries, for it brought out their philanthropic spirit, which became an important component of the Christian mission.

#### D. THE INTERNATIONAL EVOLUTION OF MISSIONARY *RÉDUCTIONS*

Considered in a world-wide context, the *réductions* in New France can now be interpreted in a different light. First, the idea for Paraguayan *reducciones* was based on the Jesuit experiment in Japan. A comparison of the missionary region of Japan with Paraguay and New France raises a further hypothesis on the methodological foundation of the *réductions*. The major precedents for Laurentian *réductions* can be

---

<sup>74</sup> Le Jeune's *Relation* of 1639, in *Relations* 16: 101–03.

traced as far back as the experimental enterprises for the Christian communities in Japan even though the fundamental Christian activity and custom may have originated even earlier in the European Church. Second, although the *réductions* clearly emulated the *reducciones* in Paraguay, this emulation was not as simple as heretofore claimed. In some aspects, the Canadian models were based on Paraguayan ones, which had been formerly based on the Japanese prototypes. In other aspects, however, the Jesuit scheme in the *réductions* was based on evangelistic models, such as those for Hizen villages in Japan, rather than on those for the Paraguayan settlements.

From several perspectives, it is true that the Laurentian *réductions* emulated aspects of the Paraguayan *reducciones*. More or less as in Paraguay, the Jesuits established their political autonomy in the *réductions* while native self-government continued simultaneously in the settlements even under the priests' paternalism. Even closer to the model of Paraguay was Jesuit autonomy in the Huron villages though these villages were not actually called *réductions*. In spite of its limited success, the Jesuits' effort to settle the Innu and Algonquin peoples in the *réductions* shared the same ideals with their predecessors in Paraguay. In terms of local administration of the settlements, the priests completed missionary control of the whole residential population by following the Paraguayan convention. Also, the ignorance of the means of prevention of epidemic diseases were the same as those of the missions in the *reducciones* though the philanthropic care for invalids was a fundamental Christian duty. Nevertheless, one should recognise that all these approaches to the Amerindians were not Paraguayan creations, but emulations of the Iberian mission of the previous century in Japan.

In several ways, the methodology for the indigenous *réductions* in New France was even closer to that for the Christian communities in Japan, though there were both differences and similarities. For example, there was a fundamental difference behind one particular superficial similarity. Even though the missionaries introduced a great deal of house construction, as well as methods to produce cotton in Paraguay, the priests in New France and in Japan were willing to allow converts to continue living in indigenous dwellings and to dress in traditional non-European clothing. While the attitudes were similar in New France and Japan, the reasons for such cultural tolerance of houses and clothing differed. In this particular respect, therefore, the

French priests' tolerance in New France was not an emulation of the Iberian priests' tolerance in Japan.

Yet there were also similarities between the missions in Japan and New France. The *réductions* were not as segregated as the *reducciones* from European settlements. The Laurentian reserves were similar to the Christian villages that surrounded the international port of Nagasaki in terms of their distance from European outposts. Also, from the standpoint of native contributions to management, the French Jesuits are highly likely to have imported the office of *dogiques* indirectly from the Iberian predecessors in Japan, for the same duty as that of the Japanese *dôjuku*.

As such, it is only half true to claim that Jesuit *réductions* in New France were modelled on the *reducciones* in Paraguay. The methodological development from the Paraguayan experiments to the colonial French attempts can be traced further back to the establishment of Japanese Christian communities. Furthermore, other French missionary approaches to the *réductions* that were obviously alien to the Paraguayan methods were not creations by the French Jesuits; instead they are more likely to have been inspired in part by, or borrowed directly from, the pioneer missionary approaches in Japan. Thus, most of the fundamental characteristics of the Laurentian *réduction* scheme can be traced, directly or indirectly, to the prototypical model provided in the creation of the Japanese Christian villages.

Although there may be a counter opinion that the basic Euro-Christian elements, like the various acts of charity and the institutional arrangements of the Church, had existed as religious origins in Europe long before the mission in Japan started, such a criticism is off the point. It may even blind one to viewing the delicate aspects of the international development of the whole Jesuit mission beyond a single missionary region. Japan was one of the earliest Jesuit missions outside Europe on which the priests experimented with the introduction of European Church customs. This current study has not intended to seek, in a commonplace way, for the fundamental Christian origins in the ancient Biblical or Greco-Roman world. Instead, it has been concerned with such a prototype as the Japanese church, or one of the first realisations of a Christian community beyond the border of mediaeval Christendom.