the vision that her physical presence would seem almost superfluous. Like the lover entranced by a phantasm of an absent woman, Teika creates poems that conjure up images that depend not at all on the presence of their references or any connection with the quotidian world.

The Japonian Charters

The English and Dutch *Shuinjō*

By DEREK MASSARELLA & IZUMI K. TYTLER

ONE of the most interesting archival discoveries concerning the earliest relations between Japan and Britain is that of the original *shuinjō* 朱印状 (vermillion-seal document) issued by Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康, granting the English East India Company trade privileges in Japan. The document was given to John Saris, commander of the Company's Eighth Voyage, in October 1613 and is now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.¹ The discovery was made accidentally in 1985 by Professor Hayashi Nozomu 林望, Tōyoko Gakuen Joshi Tanki Daigaku, and Izumi K. Tytler while examining Japanese documents in the library's collection. It is written in a clear hand on thick creped Japanese paper, *ōtaka danshi* 大高檀紙, the kind employed for formal documents. Two such sheets are used, one full size and the other half-size, pasted together with the joint endorsed on the back with a black seal of unrecognizable pattern.

Ieyasu's vermillion seal is at the top left; five *kanji* 源家康忠恕 enclosed in double squares denote 'Minamoto Ieyasu Chūjo'. Judging from the seal face, especially the shape of the radical of the first character, 'Minamoto', the seal appears to belong to what Nakamura Kōya has called the 'B style seal', and its dimensions (8.8 × 8.4 cm) approximate to those of the *shuinjō* issued to the Dutch on 24 August 1609 (NS).² The *shuinjō* has been preserved as a handscroll in a long, narrow box made by the library; unlike the Dutch one, which

Derek Massarella, a professor in the Faculty of Economics, Chuo University, is responsible in the present article for the discussion of the historical background of the English and Dutch *shuinjō*; Izumi K. Tytler, assistant librarian in charge of the Japanese collection, Department of Oriental Books, Bodleian Library, Oxford, provides the text and translation of the English *shuinjō*.

¹ MS. JAP.b.2(R).

² Algemeen Rijksarchief, The Hague, Koloniale Archief [=KA] 11,817, unfoliated, reproduced in *Dai-Nihon Shiryō* 大日本史料, 12:6, between pp. 454–55, and in the exhibi-

tion catalogue, *In the Wake of the Liefde: Cultural Relations between the Netherlands and Japan since 1600*, De Bataafsche Leeuw, Amsterdam, 1986, pp. 16 & 52; Nakamura Kōya 中村孝也, comp., *Tokugawa Ieyasu Monjo no Kenkyū* 徳川家康文書の研究, Gakujutsu Shinkōkai, 1961, 3:2, pp. 128–29 in the indices chapter at the end of the volume.

Unless otherwise stated, all dates are given according to the Julian calendar (Old Style), which the English continued to use until 1752, when they changed to the Gregorian calendar (New Style).

was kept in a lacquered box bearing the Tokugawa family crest, no original box or wrapping was found. The document measures 46.3 × 94.2 cm and is in excellent condition. The find raises the puzzling question of how it ended up in Oxford.

At the beginning of the 1610s, the directors of the East India Company were attracted by what they imagined would be the abundant opportunities to sell England's staple product, broadcloth, in Japan, and began to entertain seriously the establishment of direct trade with that country. The commission issued to the Seventh Voyage, which left England in 1611, included an instruction to the factors, or senior merchants, to explore the possibility of opening trade with Japan and even furnished them with a letter from James I.³ In spite of misgivings about the likely benefits to arise from such a trade, Peter Floris, one of the factors on the voyage, wrote a letter from Patani (in present-day Thailand) in 1612 to the one Englishman who was already known to be in Japan, William Adams. The letter was carried by a Dutch vessel, the *Hase-wint*.⁴ It was the Eighth Voyage, however, that actually reached Japan in 1613 and established the first direct contact between the two island nations.

The three ships comprising the Eighth Voyage had left England on 18 April 1611. A mission to Japan was not the main purpose of the voyage. Its aim was to secure trade at Surat and, failing that, to procure pepper at Bantam in Java and spices from the Spice Islands in the eastern Indonesian archipelago. But if these goals proved elusive, and circumstances permitted, Saris's commission authorized him to send a ship to Japan to explore the prospects of selling 'Clothe & leade, Iron & other of yo^r Native Comodities as by yo^r obseruacion yo^u shall finde more vendible there.' If the market looked promising, he was to decide, in consultation with his senior merchants, whether or not to set up a factory, or trading post, in Japan.⁵

The voyage proceeded smoothly to the Red Sea and Mocha, where Saris learned that Surat was closed to the English. After an undignified squabble with the commander of the Sixth Voyage, Sir Henry Middleton, over the spoil from some Gujerati ships, Saris decided to make for Bantam in order to procure a lading of pepper and spices for two of his ships and proceed with his flagship, the *Clove*, via the Moluccas, to Japan.

The *Clove* reached Hirado on 11 June 1613, almost two years and two months after leaving England. The English were well received by the daimyo of Hirado, Matsuura Takanobu 松浦隆信, and his grandfather, Matsuura Shigenobu 松浦鎮信. The Matsuura were glad of the arrival of another set of *nambanjin* 南蛮人 seeking trade in their domain (the Dutch had already set up a

³ George Birdwood & William Foster, ed., *The First Letter Book of the East India Company*, Bernard Quaritch, London, 1893, pp. 387 & 426-27.

⁴ William Foster, ed., *Letters Received by the East India Company from its Servants*

in the East, Sampson, Low, Marston & Co., London, 1896-1902, 1, pp. 208-09; W. H. Moreland, ed., *The Voyage of Peter Floris*, Hakluyt Society, London, 1934, pp. 33 & 35-36.

⁵ Birdwood & Foster, p. 412.

factory there in 1609) and did everything possible to insure that the English were made welcome.

After a delay of seven weeks to await the arrival from Edo of Adams, with whom Saris had been instructed by his employers to confer about a possible trade with Japan, Saris left for Ieyasu's court at Sumpu on 7 August to pay his respects and make a formal request for the English to be allowed to trade in Japan. He was accompanied by a party of ten, including the *jurebasso*, or interpreter, John Japan, a Japanese who had been taken in the Company's service at Bantam. Adams and two of his servants also went along.

The party reached Sumpu on 6 September. Two days later the audience with Ieyasu took place. The *ōgosho* 大御所, or retired shogun, was presented with gifts and a letter from James I, and Saris was instructed to prepare a petition outlining his requests. A draft was produced, but was revised and abridged on the advice of bakufu officials. The revised petition was presented to Ieyasu on 10 September and on the 12th the party proceeded to Edo to pay their respects to the nominal shogun, Tokugawa Hidetada 徳川秀忠. On their way back to Hirado, Saris again stopped in Sumpu on 8 October, and received the *shuinjō* granting the English permission to trade in Japan, and a letter from Ieyasu to James I.⁶

UNTIL almost the end of the nineteenth century, it was assumed that the Japanese document published in 1625 by Samuel Purchas, styled 'The Japonian Charter', was a facsimile of the trade privileges given by Ieyasu, while the text titled the 'Priviledges granted by Ogoshosama, Emperour of Japan, unto the Right Worshipfull Sir Thomas Smith, Knight, Governour, and others the Honorable and Worshipfull Adventurers to the East-Indies', was an authentic translation.⁷ But in 1898 Ludwig Riess showed that the Japanese document published by Purchas was not in fact the privileges and that the English document was merely a paraphrase of Saris's original petition, which had been judged too long, and, one imagines, inappropriately worded. Riess noted that the original petition was located among the Cotton Charters in the (then) British Museum.

To set the record straight, Riess printed the original petition, juxtaposed with the paraphrase that Purchas had taken to be the privileges themselves,

⁶ See Ernest Satow, ed., *The Voyage of Captain John Saris to Japan, 1613*, Hakluyt Society, London, 1900, pp. 129-32 & 137.

For the history of the East India Company, see Derek Massarella, *A World Elsewhere: Europe's Encounter with Japan in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Yale U.P., 1990.

⁷ Samuel Purchas, comp., *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes, containyng*

ing a History of the World in Sea Voyages and Lande Travells by Englishmen and others, MacLehose, Glasgow, 1905-1907, 3, pp. 466-68.

The reproduction of the 'Japonian Charter' in the above edition compresses and does not do justice to that in the original edition, *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, Henry Featherston, London, 1625, first part, p. 375.

and, for the first time in an English publication, gave the Japanese version of the actual privileges together with an English translation. Unfortunately, Riess's reference to his source is vague and inaccurate, and he gave the date of the *shuinjō*, Keichō 18.8.28, incorrectly as 13 October (NS) instead of 12 October, or 2 October (OS).⁸

In the introduction to his edition of Saris's journal of the Eighth Voyage for the Hakluyt Society, Sir Ernest Satow explored the matter further and showed that the Japanese document published by Purchas was nothing other than a copy of Saris's abridged petition presented to bakufu officials on 10 September.⁹ Satow acknowledged his debt, although not very clearly, to Suganuma Teifū's work, which had also been Riess's source. Suganuma had printed a version of the *shuinjō* together with the Japanese translations of James I's letter to Ieyasu and Saris's abridged petition.¹⁰ In turn Suganuma's source was *Ikoku Nikki* 異国日記, compiled by Suden 崇伝, the Zen priest who, among other duties, acted as the bakufu's advisor on foreign affairs.¹¹

Ikoku Nikki mentions that two copies of the *shuinjō* were given to Saris. One was intended to be put aboard the ship and brought by the next English vessel to call at Japan if no factory were established on that occasion; the other was to be taken to *Ikara koku*, or *Ikarateira*, one of the Japanese renditions of the Portuguese word for England.¹² Yet another copy was retained by the bakufu, and this is the one recorded in *Ikoku Nikki* and utilized by Kondō Morishige 近藤守重 in *Gaiban Tsūsho* 外蕃通書, a collection of documents covering the bakufu's overseas relations and compiled by Kondō during his period of office as *shomotsu bugyō* 書物奉行 (commissioner of documents) in the early nineteenth century.¹³

Saris did not, however, take the two *shuinjō* with him. He left one with Richard Cocks, the chief factor, in Hirado after it was decided to set up the factory there rather than in Edo. Edo is the location mentioned in the *shuinjō* itself and the place where Ieyasu hoped, and Adams recommended, a factory

⁸ Ludwig Riess, 'History of the English Factory at Hirado', in TASJ, First Series, 1898, 26, pp. 211-15. The call number of the petition in the Cotton Charters is British Library, Cotton Cart. xxvi. 28.

⁹ Satow, pp. lxxxi-ii.

¹⁰ Suganuma Teifū 菅沼貞風, *Dai-Nihon Shōgyō-shi: Hirado Bōeki-shi zuki* 大日本商業史: 附平戸貿易史, Tōhō Kyōkai, 1892, pp. 514-15, 516 & 518-19.

¹¹ The relevant documents from *Ikoku Nikki* (the Japanese translation of the letter from James I 'to the highe and mightie Prince the Emperour of Japan', originally translated into a *kana* version by William Adams, Ieyasu's reply, Saris's abridged petition, and the privileges themselves) are printed in

Hayashi Akira 林 穉, comp., *Tsūkō Ichiran* 通航一覽, Kokusho Kankōkai, 1913, 6, pp. 343-46.

See also Murakami Naojirō 村上直次郎, ed., *Ikoku Ōfuku Shokan-shū: Zōtei Ikoku Nikkishō* 異国往復書翰集: 増訂異国日記抄, Yūshōdō, 1966, pp. 184-87. The English translation on pp. 185-87 is not of the *shuinjō*, but of Purchas's 'Japonian Charter'.

¹² Hayashi, 6, p. 346.

¹³ Kondō Morishige wrote under the name of Seisai 正齋 and his works were published in *Kondō Seisai Zenshū* 近藤正齋全集, Kokusho Kankōkai, 3 vols., 1906. The relevant material concerning the English and Japanese is contained in *Gaiban Tsūsho* 外蕃通書, pp. 187-91, in *Kondō Seisai Zenshū*, 1.

should be established (Saris had an open mind about the matter until the question was finally settled in Hirado's favor after his return from Sumpu and Edo on 6 November.) The second copy Saris took to England along with the copy of the abridged petition, also in Japanese.

On 26 October 1614 the directors of the East India Company received a number of documents from Saris, sent up from Plymouth, where the *Clove* had reached on 27 September. These included 'a coppie . . . of such priuiledges as are granted by the Emperor of Japon vnto the English for free trade there, beeinge as ample as can be required in that kinde.' This was in English and was the same as the document that found its way into Purchas's *Haklyutus Posthumus* as the translation of the 'Japonian Charter'.¹⁴ The document is in Saris's writing, and some noticeable differences in tone, style, and content become apparent when the text is compared with the actual privileges. Saris's version is more precise and legalistic than the vague wording of the Japanese and reflects what he assumed had been granted at Sumpu rather than what actually had been the case.

For example, in accordance with contemporary European business assumptions, the English version emphasizes the binding nature of contractual agreements between merchants and wrongly states that the cargoes of future English ships calling at Japan could be sold without the necessity of a visit to the shogunal court. It also mentions that the English had liberty to explore lands in and around Japan, in particular 'Yeadzo', or Hokkaido (this had been dropped from the abridged petition and did not find its way into the privileges themselves, although, in conversation with Adams, Ieyasu made it clear that the English were free to undertake such a voyage should they so wish).¹⁵

These differences are not surprising. Not only had Saris an obvious personal interest in portraying the results of his mission in the most favorable light (for example, the reference to Ezo fitted in nicely with the Company's policy of seeking possible new markets for English cloth), but he had to make his success credible to his employers, in concepts and terminology that were both familiar and understandable to them. There is no mention in the records of Saris forwarding any document in Japanese to the directors. What, then, happened to the Japanese documents that Saris had brought back and why were they not handed over to the Company?

It is important to understand that the East India Company did not treat its records with any great respect at this time. Documents were perused, their contents noted, and the originals stored away and largely forgotten.¹⁶ Voyage commanders were not obliged to hand over their journals unless explicitly

¹⁴ Court Minutes, reproduced in Satow, p. lxiii; *Letters Received*, 1, pp. 297-98, printed in facsimile in Thomas Rundall, *Memorials of the Empire of Japon*, Hakluyt Society, 1850, following p. 66.

¹⁵ *Letters Received*, 1, p. 322.

¹⁶ Derek Massarella, 'The Loudest Lies: Knowledge of Japan in Seventeenth Century England', in *Itinerario*, 11:2 (1987), pp. 52-71.

requested, and they retained in their possession other documents relating to their voyages if they so wished. For instance, Saris handed over only a fair copy of his journal in 1615, at the directors' request, to enable William Keeling to study it before his departure for the Indies. As Keeling intended to visit Japan as well, he 'desired to haue such enstruccion from Cap^{ine} Saris as he hath obserued concerninge Iapan, as well of the manners and disposicions of those people as the Marchandizinge or any other obseruacions that hee hath made concerninge those parts.'¹⁷ There was nothing unusual, then, about Saris holding on to the Japanese documents, believing that for the Company's purposes the most important one was in the Hirado factory's possession and that, as no one in England could read them, the documents he had brought back were of no importance.¹⁸

But documents in strange foreign writing were of interest to one man in England, Samuel Purchas, who was busily gathering materials for his *magnum opus*, *Haklyutus Posthumus*. In response to the latter's request, Saris provided Purchas with various documents concerning the Eighth Voyage. Among them was a version of his journal, which he had compiled at the bidding of Richard Hakluyt after his return from Japan. This was almost certainly revised by Hakluyt for an edition that was prepared for publication but never found its way into print, although the project had advanced far enough for Saris to write a dedication to Sir Francis Bacon, dated 1617. The manuscript, parts of which Purchas incorporated into his work, is now preserved in the Tōyō Bunko, Tokyo, which bought it in 1925, and differs in a number of key respects from the fair copy preserved among the India Office Records in London.¹⁹ Saris also gave Purchas the document in Japanese that the latter took to be the 'Japonian Charter', but was, of course, the abridged petition.

Purchas acknowledged the donation in a marginal note beside Saris's description of the audience with Ieyasu. Saris comments that the requests he made in the abridged petition 'were passed under his [Ieyasu's] great Seale, which is not of Waxe (as ours) but stamped like a print and coloured red.' Purchas adds, 'The Copie of which he brought home and gave mee which after followeth.' This 'Copie' was the 'Japonian Charter' and was reproduced 'with the Seale in blacke' because 'the Originall was left with Master Cocks' in Hirado. Saris's description of the seal on the original, 'stamped like a print and coloured red', is an accurate description of a *shuin*, and one strongly suspects that Saris was not describing from memory when he wrote these

¹⁷ Satow, p. lxi.

¹⁸ The fifteen Japanese employed as sailors on the *Clove's* homeward journey would not have been of much help. Even if moderately literate, which is unlikely, they would not have been able to grasp the complexity of the official language used in the *shuinjō*, much less render it into English.

¹⁹ Tōyō Bunko, D Ser 3. This is published in transcript and facsimile in Takanobu Ōtsuka, *The First Voyage of the English to Japan by John Saris, 1613*, Tōyō Bunko, 1940–1941. Ōtsuka unconvincingly attempts to disprove that the 'Bacon' manuscript was not the one used by Purchas. The draft of Saris's original journal is now lost.

words but from the *shuinjō* itself, which he had kept in his possession as an attractive, exotic souvenir.²⁰

Purchas, an intensely curious man and avid collector of original documents, had managed to secure the 'Originall' of the 'Grand Signiors Seale with part of his Passe' (that is, the Ottoman emperor's seal from the safe-conduct pass that the Eighth Voyage had carried). This he reproduced. He had also acquired some seals from documents given to Saris in the Red Sea by Gujerati merchants who had had the misfortune to find themselves caught up in the dispute between Saris and Middleton.²¹ The *shuinjō*, however, eluded Purchas's grasp.

How Purchas acquired the English version of the alleged privileges is unclear; either he received a copy from Saris himself or, more likely, it was among the papers he was permitted to consult by the Company, which was not adverse to having its successes trumpeted to the world.²²

There was nothing improper about Saris retaining what to modern eyes are official documents; he was simply taking his cue from the Company's own lax attitude to its own records. This laxity, and the fact that the directors made no effort to check the authenticity of the so-called trade privileges through their servants in Japan, contrasts strikingly with the care taken over other state papers and with the bakufu's concern to preserve a full record of its communications with foreign countries, where necessary translating documents into Japanese.

If the *shuinjō* itself was never in the possession of the East India Company, how did it end up in the Bodleian? Intriguingly, Suganuma mentions that according to information provided by James Ward of the India Office Library, the original of the *shuinjō* was located there.²³ This was mistaken. Ward almost certainly had in mind one of the other documents in Japanese in the India Office's custody, although none of these has an official seal.

The earliest Bodleian references to the *shuinjō* occur in handlists compiled about 1680. The first two handlists describe the document inaccurately as 'Manuscriptum Chinense'.²⁴ This misconception persisted until 1697 and the publication of the great catalogue of the Bodleian's manuscript holdings. This

²⁰ Purchas, 3, pp. 461–62 & 465. The Tōyō Bunko version of the journal describes the *shuin* twice, on the second occasion stating that 'these Privilidges [that is, the abridged petition] were written in the China character and language, and were sealed with a broad seale which is not of wax but a stampe or print vpon paper' (Ōtsuka, 1941, p. 194).

Purchas dropped this comment and added his own: 'The Characters have by some been thought to be those of China, but I compared them with China bookes, and they seemed to me quite different, yet not letters to compound

words by spelling, as ours; but words expressed in their severall characters, as the Chinois use, and the brevitie manifesteth. I take them characters peculiar to Japan. Take them thou Reader, and judge better, if thou canst.' Purchas, 3, p. 465.

²¹ Purchas, 3, pp. 380 & 381–82.

²² India Office Records, B/5, pp. 348–49.

²³ Suganuma, p. 518.

²⁴ Bodleian Library Records, c.334, f. 4v (exact date unknown) & c.337, f. 102v (about 1680).

established the identification with Japan but the description of the *shuinjō*'s contents was quite misleading: *Magna quaedam charta manuscripta Sinensis, MS. Est edictum Japonicum prohibens mercium venditiones antequam vectigalia fuerint soluta*. ('A large Chinese manuscript. It is a Japanese edict forbidding the sale of goods before dues are paid').²⁵ The reason for the confusion can be attributed to the likelihood that the catalogue entry was drawn up with the assistance of someone who knew Chinese and could decipher some of the *kanji* in the complex script of the *shuinjō*.

The obvious candidate is Shen Fu-tung 沈伝宗, who was brought to Europe in 1683 by the Jesuit Philip Couplet. According to the Bodleian's accounts for 1686–1687, Shen was paid £6 'for his making catalogues to the China Bookes, for his expences and Lodging.'²⁶ Shen's efforts would account for the inscriptions added on the back of the *shuinjō*, comprising two Chinese characters, their romanizations and Latin translation, and an erroneous Latin summary of the contents:

告 Cao Edictum
示 gi Monstrandum

... Regis Japoniae edictu[m] omnibus monstrandu[m] et loco publico appensum et ipsius sigillo rubro innactum, prohibens ne quis inferat merces antequa[m] ab officiis qui vectigalibus praesunt inspiciantur et examinentur.²⁷

[An edict of the King of Japan, to be shown to all and displayed in a public place and enacted by his red seal, prohibiting anyone from bringing in goods before they are inspected and examined by the officials in charge of dues.]

None of this answers the question of how the *shuinjō* came to the Bodleian. William Adams's log-book was donated in 1620 as part of the benefaction of Sir Henry Savil.²⁸ The *shuinjō* was clearly not a part of that donation. The most plausible explanation is that the document remained in Saris's possession. Either he disposed of it at some stage during his life, by sale or gift, or his cousin, George Saris, to whom he bequeathed 'all my written and printed books of what kind soeuer',²⁹ took such action after his death in 1643. At any rate, by 1680 the document was in the Bodleian. Fortunately it had been well looked after in its long travels from Sumpu to Oxford.

The fate of the copy of the *shuinjō* left in Hirado presents no problem. It was returned to bakufu officials in 1616 when the trading privileges of the English and Dutch were curtailed. At that time a new *shuinjō* was issued,

²⁵ Bodleian Library Records, e.340, f. 154 & e.342, p. 13; *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae*, Oxford, 1697.

²⁶ A. F. L. Beeston, 'The Earliest Donations of Chinese Books to the Bodleian', in *The Bodleian Library Record*, 4 (1953), p. 307.

²⁷ The other inscriptions on the back are shelfmarks dating to the seventeenth and nine-

teenth centuries.

²⁸ Bodleian, MS Savil 48. Other East India Company archival material in the Bodleian, including a copy of the journal kept by the factors of the Company's voyage to Japan in 1673 (Rawlinson MS A.191, ff. 69–76), was donated to the library in 1756.

²⁹ Public Record Office, London, PROB 11/197, f. 353v.

limiting the Company's trade to Hirado (in practice, Hirado and Nagasaki).³⁰ This was the *shuinjō* that was given up when the English left Japan in December 1623, and which they sought in vain to retain on the assumption that their departure was only temporary.³¹

In fact the next East India Company ship to reach Japan was the *Return*, in June 1673. She had left England in September 1671 along with the *Experiment* and *Zant* in an ambitious mission to restore direct trade with Japan. In their instructions for the voyage, the directors noted, 'Wee haue caused to be transcribed the Articles, made wth the Emperour of Iapon at our first entrance . . . for y^t y^e Articles doe graunt vs a free trade for ever in the Empire of Iapon.'³² This transcript was carried aboard the *Return* on her voyage from Bantam to Nagasaki, and was handed over to the *daikan* 代官 when the request to reopen the trade was made. No matter what the directors imagined, the document was not the original *shuinjō*, but a transcription of the abridged petition for trade, which Saris had drawn up in September 1613, in other words, Purchas's 'Japonian Charter'. The directors had ordered a copy to be traced from Purchas's *Hakluytus Posthumus* in pen and ink on English paper.

The unintended deception was obvious to the Japanese authorities. Yet even had the English brought the original *shuinjō* with them—and it is ironic that the original was extant in England, although not in the Company's possession—they would still not have been readmitted to trade in Japan. Alarmed at the prospect of English competition, the Dutch had informed the Japanese that the English king, Charles II, was married to the Portuguese princess, Catherine of Braganza, which immediately disqualified the English request from any serious consideration.³³

THE following translation of the *shuinjō* issued to the English is more literal than Riess's (republished by Satow with slight amendments),³⁴ retaining the vague character and expressions of the original Japanese text.

Item The ships that have now come to Japan from England for the first time will be allowed to trade in all goods without hindrance; they will be exempted from customs and other duties.

Item As for the goods aboard, they should be listed separately according to their use and the list should be submitted.

Item Their ships shall be allowed to arrive in any port of Japan; if they lose

³⁰ For the 1616 privileges, see Murakami, *Ikoku*, pp. 197–98, and *Gaiban Tsūsho*, p. 191, in *Kondō Seisai Zenshū*, 1.

³¹ N. Murakami, ed., *Diary of Richard Cocks*, Sankōsha, 1899, 2, p. 367.

³² India Office Records, E/3/87, f. 238.

³³ *Gaiban Tsūsho*, pp. 190–91, in *Kondō*

Seisai Zenshū, 1; Satow, *Saris*, pp. lxxxvi–vii.

On the voyage of the *Return* to Japan, see Massarella, *A World Elsewhere*, Chapter 8, section 3.

³⁴ Riess, pp. 214–15; Satow, *Saris*, p. lxxxiii.

their sails and helms owing to storms, there will be no objection to their coming into any inlet.

Item In due course a residence shall be granted to the Englishmen anywhere they like in Edo; meanwhile they may build a house and reside and trade there; as for their return to their own country, it is up to them. [At their departure] they should dispose of the house built by them.

Item If an Englishman dies of illness, or any other cause, in Japan, his possessions shall be sent forth [to England] without fail.

Item Forced sales by violent means shall not be allowed.

Item If any of the Englishmen commits an offense, he shall be sentenced according to the gravity of the offense; the sentences shall be at the discretion of the English commander.

Wherefore as above.

Keichō 18, Eighth Month, 28th day.

MINAMOTO IEYASU
Fidelity and forbearance

Bodleian Library

The *shuinjō* granted by Tokugawa Ieyasu to the English in 1613.

The differences in the text between the present *shuinjō* and those quoted by Suganuma, Riess, and *Zōtei Ikoku Nikkishō* are as follows.

	<i>shuinjō</i>	Suganuma	Riess	ZIN
a	儀	義	義	儀
b	諸役	諸般	諸般	諸役
c	儀	義	義	義
d	着岸	著岸	著岸	着岸
e	在	有	有	有
f	儀	儀	儀	義
g	付	missing	missing	付
h	押買	おしかい	おしかひ	おかしい
i	いきりす人	イギリス人	イギリス人	いきりす人
j	在	有	有	有
k	いきりすの大將	イギリス人の大將	イギリス人の大將	いきりすの大將
l	右如件	右如件	右如件	右如件

Some of the discrepancies, such as おかしい (ZIN), イギリス人 (Riess), and 右如件 (Riess) may be no more than typographical errors. A point of interest is 諸役, which was written as 諸般 by Suganuma and Riess, and translated by Riess as 'all watters' (=all matters?).

For a discussion of the different ways of reading the character for 'Minamoto' within the seal, see Nakamura, pp. 128-29.

源家康
忠恕

慶長拾八年八月廿八日

右如件。

いきりすの大將次第申付事

荷物押買、狼籍仕間敷事

日本之内、いきりす人病死など仕候者其

致居住商賣可仕候歸國之儀、者何時、而

いきりす人可任心中

付立置候家者いきりす人可為儘事

日本之内、いきりす人病死など仕候者其

致居住商賣可仕候歸國之儀、者何時、而

いきりす人可任心中

付立置候家者いきりす人可為儘事

日本之内、いきりす人病死など仕候者其

致居住商賣可仕候歸國之儀、者何時、而

いきりす人可任心中

付立置候家者いきりす人可為儘事

日本之内、いきりす人病死など仕候者其

致居住商賣可仕候歸國之儀、者何時、而

By way of contrast it is interesting to compare the *shuinjō* issued by the bakufu to the Dutch. Unlike those granted to the English, and contrary to what the Dutch themselves came to imagine, none of the Dutch *shuinjō* contained specific trade privileges; they were merely safe-conduct passes guaranteeing, at the shogun's command, that Dutch ships would not be molested in Japan no matter where they made their landfall. As mentioned above, the first was issued in August 1609, a second in 1611. The extent of Dutch trade privileges in Japan was spelled out in a letter from Ieyasu to the Dutch 'king', that is, Prince Maurice of Nassau, the Dutch *Stadholder*, dated Keichō 14.7.25, or 24 August 1609 (NS). It was short but friendly in spite of its formal tone. In essence it gave the Dutch company the same privileges as those granted to the English, including the right to construct buildings for a factory.³⁵

The Dutch, however, were worried by the fact that the original *shuinjō* was too brief and too vaguely worded to protect them from the possible actions of capricious officials, and they made their reservations clear to the bakufu in 1611 on their second visit to Sumpu. They were told not to worry as the shogun guaranteed their safety from all manner of molestation, and the *shuinjō* they received on this occasion was virtually identical to the 1609 one.³⁶

It is possible that these reservations prompted the English, after consulting with William Adams, who had been active in lobbying bakufu officials on behalf of the Dutch in 1611 and was, therefore, aware of Dutch anxiety, to demand more specific privileges on their visit to Sumpu in 1613. This would account for the difference in style and content between the English and Dutch *shuinjō*. Keen to promote foreign trade, the bakufu obliged the English, although the fact that Saris had to abridge his original petition shows that flexibility was not unlimited. After all, an ill-assorted set of *nambanjin*, who bore no resemblance to an official embassy, were in no position to dictate their demands to the bakufu. The English imagined that they had secured a fully binding contract, but their *shuinjō* was not seen in such legalistic terms by the bakufu. Circumstances could, and did, change. It was not for foreigners to set the agenda in the bakufu's foreign relations.

In 1616 the Dutch were subjected to the same restrictions as the English. The *shuinjō* granted on 15 September 1617, in the name of Hidetada, a copy of which is in the Algemeen Rijksarchief, merely reconfirmed the earlier safe-conducts. But the Hollanders also received a copy of a letter sent to the daimyo of Hirado by four *rōjū* 老中—Doi Toshikatsu 土井利勝, Andō Shigenobu 安藤重信,

³⁵ Ieyasu's letter to Maurice of Nassau is printed in *Tsūkō Ichiran*, 6, p. 185, and *Gaiban Tsūsho*, pp. 40–41, in *Kondō Seisai Zenshū*, 1.

The translation of the latter, like that to James I, was free and much lengthier than the original. See Oscar Nachod, *Die Beziehungen*

der Niederländischen Ostindischen Compagnie zu Japan im siebzehnten Jahrhundert, Rob. Friese Sep., Leipzig, 1897, pp. xv–xvii.

³⁶ *Dai-Nihon Shiryō*, 12:8, pp. 592 & 636–38; *Tsūkō Ichiran*, 6, p. 179; *Gaiban Tsūsho*, p. 46, in *Kondō Seisai Zenshū*, 1.

Itakura Katsushige 板倉勝重, and Honda Masazumi 本多正純—dated 23 September 1617 (also in the Algemeen Rijksarchief). This instructed Matsuura Takanobu to remind the *opperhoofd*, or chief factor, that the Dutch could conduct trade from their factory in Hirado as long as they strictly observed the laws proscribing Christianity in Japan. A similar letter was addressed to Takanobu and the Nagasaki *daikan* in 1618 saying much the same thing but with reference to the English.³⁷

In the spring of 1640 the Dutch faced a renewed threat from the silk guild, or *ito-wappu nakama* 糸割符仲間 merchants, whom the Dutch called 'the merchants of the five cities' (Edo, Osaka, Kyoto, Sakai, and Nagasaki). These merchants demanded that the Hollanders' factory be removed to Nagasaki, where the Dutch would be subjected to the *ito-wappu* price for Chinese raw silk, as had the recently expelled Portuguese. These demands were unwelcome to both the Matsuura, whose domain derived considerable economic benefits from the presence of the factory at Hirado, and also to the Dutch, who despite their longstanding grievances about their treatment at the hands of the Matsuura, were scarcely less apprehensive about the restrictions they would face in Nagasaki and the resulting cut in profits. Fortunately, or so it seemed for a while, both parties could count on friends in high places. The Dutch were requested by Makino Nobushige 牧野信重, a *rōjū* and patron of the Matsuura, to proceed to Edo and bring with them the original *shuinjō*, granted by Ieyasu, in the expectation that this would provide powerful evidence to counter the 39 demands of the *ito-wappu* merchants.³⁸

A search was made of the factory, then in the process of reconstruction, but the original could not be found. Instead, François Caron, the *opperhoofd*, took along the *shuinjō* granted by Hidetada in 1617, alleging that the original was no longer in the factory's possession as it had been returned to the bakufu by his predecessor at Hidetada's accession, an excuse Makino found plausible. (The answer had been carefully rehearsed; in fact, the *shuinjō* had been taken back to the Netherlands by Jacques Specx, the factory's first *opperhoofd*.) Unperturbed, Makino argued the Dutch case (in reality, the Matsuura case) before his fellow-councilors, stating that as the Dutch had done nothing to break the laws of Japan they should be permitted to remain in Hirado.

³⁷ KA 11,817 & 11,819, unfoliated; *Dai-Nihon Shiryō*, 12:27, pp. 607–08; Murakami, *Diary*, 2, p. 348.

The 1617 letter is wrongly dated in M. P. H. Rossingh's edition of *Het Archief van de Nederlandse Factorij in Japan/The Archive of the Netherlands Factory in Japan 1609–1860*, Algemeen Rijksarchief, The Hague, 1964, p. xxxv, which gives 1620 instead of 1617.

The letter had previously been misdated by a Dutch factor in Deshima in 1713 who gave its date of issue (Genna 3.8.23) as 24 August

1617 (NS) instead of 22 September (NS).

Historical Documents Relating to Japan in Foreign Countries: An Inventory of Microfilm Acquisitions in the Library of the Historical Institute [Shiryō Hensanjo], The University of Tokyo, 2:2, *The Netherlands*, 1964, p. 3.

³⁸ Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo, ed., *Nihon Kankai Kaigai Shiryō: Diaries Kept by the Heads of the Dutch Factory in Japan*, 1981, 4, pp. 185–89.

Caron, who was unable to obtain an audience with the shogun, presented Iemitsu and various *rōjū* with gifts, and before returning to Hirado in July addressed a letter to the councilors detailing his requests. This was done on the recommendation of Makino and the daimyo of Hirado. He mentioned Hidetada's *shuinjō* and the 1617 letter from the *rōjū*, a copy of which he appended, arguing that these documents guaranteed that the Dutch could maintain an unrestricted trade in Hirado.

But neither Makino's pleading nor Dutch protests ultimately saved the Dutch from being removed to Nagasaki. Their building program in Hirado raised bakufu suspicions at a time of acute sensitivity following the disastrously unsuccessful Portuguese mission from Macao in the summer of 1640 requesting that the Lusitanians be allowed to reopen their trade with Japan. The emissaries were executed, except for a few who were permitted to return to Macao to bear witness to the appalling finality of the shogun's earlier decree of expulsion. The discovery of the inscription 'AD 1640' on the gable of one of the factory's new buildings further fanned the bakufu's long-standing unease about the exact nature of Dutch allegiance to Christian doctrines. The overriding concern to expunge Christianity from Japan outweighed all other considerations in the bakufu's calculations, including the fate of the local economy in Hirado, and the Dutch were forced to choose between residence on Deshima or departure from Japan.³⁹

This was not quite the end of the story. Alarmed by the souring of relations with the Japanese in the late 1630s and the threats to restrict their trade, the directors had sent the 1609 *shuinjō* back to Batavia with instructions that it should be returned to Japan and shown to the *rōjū* as proof irrefutable that the Hollanders had been granted free trade in Japan. The document, carefully wrapped in a presentation box, duly arrived in Nagasaki on 6 November 1641 (NS) and was taken to the *daikan* by one of the interpreters, who treated it as if it were a sacred text. (By this time the cult of the deified former shogun was well established.) After studying it, the *daikan* returned the document with great ceremony to the *opperhoofd*, commending the Dutch for bringing it back to Japan.

Acting in accordance with instructions from Batavia, the *opperhoofd*, Jan van Elserack, took the newly arrived *shuinjō*, together with the 1617 one, on his visit to Edo in December. The Dutch hoped that a document bearing the revered Ieyasu's seal would command the same respect and obedience as if it were his voice speaking from beyond the grave; in this way it would compel the *rōjū* if not actually to restore the free trade that the Dutch believed (wrongly) to be theirs by right, then at least force the councilors to relax the tough restric-

³⁹ *Nihon Kankei Kaigai Shiryō*, 4, pp. 195–96, 198, 199, 201, 215 & 219–21, esp. p. 220. Nagazumi Yoko's account of these events is inaccurate concerning the documents Caron

took to Edo. See 'Japan's Isolationist Policy as Seen Through Dutch Source Materials', in *Acta Asiatica*, 22 (1972), p. 32.

Dai-Nihon Shiryō, 12:6

The *shuinjō* granted by Tokugawa Ieyasu to the Dutch in 1609.

tions in force on Deshima and make some form of restitution for the losses incurred in the compulsory move from Hirado in June 1641.

The *rōjū*, notably Inoue Masashige 井上政重, were genuinely impressed by the care that the Dutch had shown in preserving such a hallowed document and ordered a copy to be prepared, but, while listening politely, they turned a deaf ear to the Dutch demands. Policy was not dictated by sentiment. The Dutch had no option but to swallow their pride, write off the expenses of demolishing the factory buildings at Hirado, and accept their confinement on Deshima in order to pursue what was still a profitable trade in Japan.⁴⁰

The inscription on the back of the *shuinjō* is of considerable interest. In a precise seventeenth-century hand, it states that the document was issued by 'Ongosiosamma', Ieyasu, to Jacques Specx in 1611. This is mistaken, for not only was it issued in 1609 but it was not issued to Specx. The inscription was written either in Batavia or, more probably, in Amsterdam when Specx showed it to his employers as evidence of his diligent service on their behalf. As the 1611 *shuinjō* was issued while Specx was *opperhoofd*, it is possible that he believed the document he had taken to the Netherlands was indeed the second *shuinjō*. Interestingly, the inscription suggests a degree of uncertainty on the

⁴⁰ *Nihon Kankei Kaigai Shiryō*, 6, 1986, pp. 7–8, 9–10, 13, 16, 42, 44, 50, 54, 57, 60–61, 65–66, & 198–99; Nachod, pp. 301–02.

part of the Dutch company concerning the year in which the factory in Japan was established. This is borne out by references in the *dahregister* for 1641 and in a letter from the Governor General of the Council of the Indies in Batavia to the *rōjū* in 1642 implying that the Dutch had traded in Japan from 1607 or 1608. A similar vagueness about their Hirado factory existed in the English company.⁴¹

The case of mistaken identity neatly parallels that of Purchas's Japonian Charter and led to confusion in later accounts about the Dutch and Japan. This can be attributed to J. G. Scheuchzer's translation of Engelbert Kaempfer's *The History of Japan*.

Among the papers in the British Library relating to Kaempfer's visit to Japan, 1690–1692, are a number of documents in Japanese, including a first-rate copy of the 1609 *shuinjō* made by a Japanese amanuensis. A *katakana* version was drawn up at the same time and Kaempfer annotated this in Roman letters, giving the date as 'Keitsioo dsiu ionen [1609] sitsi Guatzu Nidsiu Gonitzu.' A covering note in Dutch repeats the inscription on the reverse of the document stating that it was a pass from 'Ongosiosamma' given to Jacques Specx, but adds a date: 'stylo Japoniae 25^{to} dagh der 7^{em} Mane, synde 30 Augusti 1611.' This note is not in Kaempfer's hand, and while it is correct about the Japanese day and month (coincidentally the same as that of the 1611 *shuinjō*), it is wrong about their Western equivalent (the 1609 *shuinjō* is dated 24 August and the 1611 one 6 September). Unfamiliar with the Japanese *nengō*, Scheuchzer repeated the misidentification, a mistake for which Kaempfer, who died in 1716, was in no way responsible. The date was accepted by Oscar Nachod in his history of the Dutch factory and Japan in the seventeenth century.⁴² It has remained unchallenged until now.

According to Nachod, the identification of the 1609 *shuinjō*'s correct year of issue was first made in response to an inquiry to the Dutch colonial minister by the historian G. Lauts in the 1840s. The minister ordered the document to be examined in Deshima and the year 1609, rather than 1611, was found to be correct. (This did not stop Lauts and Nachod from giving the Western date inaccurately as 25 August instead of the 24th.)

What Lauts, Nachod, and the compilers of the Shiryō Hensanjo's guide to its microfilm holdings fail to do is to give credit to the individuals who actually made the discovery. They are two: an anonymous Japanese interpreter employed by the Dutch factory in the early nineteenth century, and Hendrik Doeff, the *opperhoofd* from 1804 to 1817, the man responsible for insuring

⁴¹ KA 11,817; *Nihon Kankei Kaigai Shiryō*, 6, pp. 10 & 198.

⁴² British Library, Sloane MS 3,060, ff. 470–72; Engelbert Kaempfer, *The History of Japan together with a Description of the Kingdom of Siam, 1690–92*, London, 1727, 1, pp. 382–83; *Historical Documents Relating*

to Japan in Foreign Countries, 2:2, *The Netherlands*, p. 1; Nachod, p. xix.

I am grateful to Dr Beatrice Bodart-Bailey for lending me a photocopy of Kaempfer's manuscript. My comments of Kaempfer have benefited from a discussion with her. D.M.

that Deshima was the one place on the globe where the Dutch flag still flew during the Napoleonic wars.

On the advice of his informant, Doeff noted on the back of the *shuinjō* that the year of issue was Keichō 14, or 1609, and that it had not been issued to Jacques Specx but to Jacques Groenewegen. He made this conjecture on the basis of a romanization of the *hiragana* (*jiyakusu-kuruun-heike*), and the identification has stuck even although the Groenewegen in question never went to Japan and was already dead by 1609. (The '*kekusu-kuumu-heike*' written on the back of the 1611 *shuinjō*, seems to refer to him as well.) Moreover, while Doeff noted that the Japanese month and day of issue was 7.25, he mistook this for September in the Western calendar.

The 1609 and 1617 *shuinjō* remained in the Deshima factory until 1860 when, along with other documents, including the 1617 letter from the *rōjū* to the Matsura, they were transferred to the Rijksarchief, where they arrived in 1862.⁴³

⁴³ KA 11,817; Nachod, pp. xvii–xviii; *Tsūkō Ichiran*, 6, pp. 179 & 189; *Historical Documents Relating to Japan in Foreign Countries*, 2:2, *The Netherlands*, p. 1.

The fate of the copies of the 1611 *shuinjō*

given to the Dutch is not known. Four were issued, of which at least two were sent to Patani and Bantam. *Dai-Nihon Shiryō*, 12:8, p. 637.