

Title	A research on the private traders along the Chekiang Coast during the Chiaching (16th Century) Period and on the history of captain Wan Chih : also on the Portuguese settlements in Ning-Po
Sub Title	
Author	李, 献璋(Li, Hsien-Chang)
Publisher	三田史学会
Publication year	1961
Jtitle	史学 Vol.34, No.1 (1961. 7) ,p.1- 2
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	Abstract
Genre	
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00100104-19610700-0121

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

A Research on the Private Traders
along the Chekiang Coast during the Chiaching
(16th Century) period and on the History
of Captain Wang Chih
—also on the Portuguese Settlements in Ning-po

Li Hsien-chang

The first part of this article investigates the private traders along the Chekiang coast and the Portuguese settlements in Ningp'o.

1. *The private trader in Ningp'o and the arrival of the foreign merchants.* Before Teng Lao escaped from prison and went down to the coast in the 5th year of Chiaching, Lu Huang-szu was already in Shuang-yü-kang, therefore I presume that after the expulsion from Tamaô, the portuguese went to Ningpo. Since the early private traders like Chin Tzu-lao and Li Kuang-t'ou were Fukienese, those who guided the Portuguese to Ningp'o were probably also Fukienese.

2. *The private trader in Shuang-yü-kang and the Hsü brothers.* In the 19th year of Chiaching, Hsü Erh and others persuaded the Fo Lang Chi (Portuguese) to come to Chekiang coast for trade. Here we make an account about the general condition of the trade and clear up the history of Hsü brothers beginning from their stay in Shuang-yü-kang till the arise of the disturbance.

3. *The rage of the private traders and its origin.* In the 24-25th year of Chiaching Hsü brothers became bankrupt and ran away from their former place and invaded Chekiang and Fukien, then from private traders they gradually became pirates.

4. *The historical sweep of Shuang-yü-kang.* From Chu Wan's account of his military success we may trace the development and the consequence of his attack on the pirates' den in the 27th year of Chiaching.

5. *The so-called Liampoo settlements as narrated by F. Mendes Pinto.* In accord with the geographical and historical facts we review the account of Peregrinaçãô and we conclude that the settlement was Shuang-yü-kang and Liampoo city was Kuo-chü.

6. *The situation of the Portuguese settlements.* The account of Mendez Pinto concerning the housing, population, institution, organization and economic situation confirmed the account of Chu Wan.

7. *The destruction of the Portuguese settlements.* First we indicate how L. Pereyra was kidnapped by Chinese traders and how this fact coincided with Hsü brothers bankrupt; then we

study the actual conditions of the destruction and the place where the escaped ships have gone.

8. *The Portuguese trading place according to Sui-lu-chih.* From the account of V. Linschoten's *Le Grand Routier de mer* we prove the sea route of the Portuguese traders and their trading as well as their winter lodging places.

On the Condemnation of Aristotle at Oxford

Kōkichi SAKAGUCHI

In 1277, Robert Kilwardby, archbishop of Canterbury, pronounced at Oxford, the condemnation of some Aristotelian theses including Thomist theory of unity of forms. In 1284, his successor, John of Peckham ratified his enactment. The aim of this article is to show the reason why these two archbishops issued such prohibitions against St. Thomas, one of the greatest Christian thinkers

It is certain that the two archbishops thought that the theory of unity of forms threatened the traditional interpretation on dogmas on the creation and the body of Christ. But they did not ask the sanction of papal court before announcing this prohibition. So, it can be said that on the part of Roman curia, the Pope did not give any suggestion to the archbishops in issuing this condemnation. Therefore, the two archbishops are fully responsible on their action.

However, they issued the condemnation not only in accordance with their personal judgement, but they followed the atmosphere of Christian world in which there were still many Augustinians. In those days circles of prelates were totally Augustinians and anti-Thomists. These Augustinians were seriously concerned of the new pagan elements in the world of Christian thoughts.

The enactment of Kilwardby and Peckham is the reflection of this atmosphere in the Christian world. But it is to be regretted that they failed to grasp the situation of Thomism which was spreading rapidly in the world of Christian thought and which was adopted by the Dominican order, one of the most important supporters of the papacy, as their official opinions. If they had known better about this situation before issuing their condemnation, they would have been more careful.

Their condemnation caused a serious discrepancy among the Christian world which resulted in the disintegration of medieval Christendom.