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Preface

A symposium was held in the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines on 5 May 2000 with the object of commemorating the 400th anniversary of the landing in Japan in April 1600 of William Adams. Adams from Gillingham, Kent, was the navigator of the Dutch vessel, *De Liefde*, which was wrecked off the coast of Kyushu and spent the rest of his life in Japan. The meeting heard papers about the relationship between Adams and the Tokugawa shogunate and the associated activities of the English factory set up in western Japan by the East India Company between 1613 and 1623.

This symposium was held in association with the Japan Society, Asia House (London) and Miura Anjinkai whose honorary president, Nicholas MacLean, took the chair at one of the sessions.

The speakers were Professor Derek Massarella, Chuo University, Tokyo and currently a visitor at STICERD, and Anthony Farrington, Consultant, Oriental and India Office Collection at the British Library. The Centres are grateful to them for agreeing to the publications of their papers.
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Abstracts

(Massarella paper): The William Adams story has been told many times, but not completely. This paper corrects matters of fact and revises matters of interpretation. It adds new information about Adams the man and examines the fabrication of the myth of William Adams or Miura Anjin that has developed since the late nineteenth century.

(Farrington paper): The English factory at Hirado, Japan, which lasted from 1613 to 1623 was established in the hope of increasing East India Company trade with China and Ayuthaya, Thailand. Out of 7 voyages, only 4 reached destination; and the factory was wound up as a commercial failure.
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Why talk about William Adams? It is, of course, the four-hundredth anniversary of the arrival of the Kentishman, the first recorded Englishman to reach Japan, aboard the Dutch ship *De Liefde*, and anniversaries provide useful chronological perspectives from which to take measure of people and events. But in 2008 will we be celebrating the four-hundredth anniversary of the arrival of William Hawkins in India, aboard the first ship flying English colours to arrive on the coast of India? Or, in 2009, will we be holding a four-hundredth anniversary symposium to commemorate Richard Welden, another Englishman who, like William Adams, stayed on in the Indies after arriving there on the English East India Company's Fifth Voyage, becoming, it was said, ‘a perfect linguist in the Mallaia and Ternatan tongues and well acquainted with the country people and coast’ of the eastern Indonesian archipelago, eventually becoming a servant of the ruler of Buton?

It is highly unlikely. Hawkins did well personally in India, happy to pass himself off as an official ambassador from James I and VI. He received honours and allowances from the Mughal emperor, Jahāngīr, and in his home preferred to use ‘the customes of the Moores or Mahometans, both in his meate and drinke and other customes, and would seeme to be discontent if all men did not the like’. But his self-proclaimed embassy ended in tears. No matter, for, as we all know, in the ensuing relationship India became the jewel in the crown of the British empire. There were plenty of grander historical figures in the pantheon of Anglo-Indian heroes and villains to ensure Hawkins’s exclusion therefrom. Besides, the modern relationship between Britain and India is mature enough to have no need of historical figures to provide a focus.

As for Buton, Britain’s relations with that small territory, now part of an unstable Indonesia, are of quite a different nature from those with Japan. Japan has become a major provider of inward investment and, therefore, as the pundits remind us, of vital importance to the contemporary British economy, especially its diminished manufacturing sector. It is for this reason, together with the fact that the
contemporary Anglo-Japanese relationship is less mature, less (dare one say it?) a matter of family, unlike that with India, and, therefore, more dependent on artificial constructs to breathe life into it, that William Adams casts a longer historical shadow than his career would otherwise justify, and why we are talking about him in the year 2000. But this in turn raises a further question about William Adams: which Adams are we talking about? The historical person, born Gillingham, Kent, sometime before 24 September 1564, the date of his baptism, died in Hirado, Japan, 16 May 1620, and whose purchase on our historical consciousness would be slight without the economic importance of Japan in present-day Britain? Or William Adams, the myth, the Adams who since the late nineteenth century has been an icon in Anglo-Japanese relations and, as Anjin or Miura Anjin, something of a talismanic figure in modern Japan? The answer, as far as this paper is concerned, is both: William Adams, the man, and, Adams/Anjin the myth.

But first I would like to make some broader observations about the European encounter with Japan in which the arrival of the *Liefde* in mid-April 1600 (NS), off the coast of Bungo in present-day Oita Prefecture, is an important event, not least because it aroused the interest of the English and Dutch East India companies in establishing direct trading relations with Japan, and, therefore, added a new and eventually important dimension to Japan's relations with Europe. I wish to do this because the bigger context, in which Adams the man led his life and, it has to be admitted, gained a certain measure of historical status, is itself also the object of mythologising, especially from scholars who take their cue from Edward Said's 'Orientalism' thesis, and from those who view the encounter from an anthropological perspective, preferring to interpret history as metaphor rather than as experience, something that people actually live and make.

One of the most influential tropes characterising the encounter between Europe and the non-European world is Professor Greg Dening's metaphor of a beach. According to Dening

‘[b]eaches are beginnings and endings. They are frontiers and boundaries. For some life forms the division between land and sea is not abrupt, but for human beings beaches divide the world between here and there, us and them, good and bad, familiar and strange...Crossing beaches is always
dramatic. From land to sea and from sea to land is a long journey and either way the voyager is left a foreigner and an outsider’.  

This vivid imagery works well as a literary device but as a characterisation of the historical reality of the early modern encounter in Asia it is inappropriate, although, to be fair, Dening’s book, *Islands and Beaches*, shows a far greater sensitivity to the disciplinary distinctions (chasms?) separating history from anthropology, and the different approaches to the study of the past arising therefrom, than his most recent, and more popular, book, *Mr Bligh’s Bad Language*, where the authorial ‘I’ is a bit too ever-present, nannyishly holding our hand while walking us through the story, a sort of social sciences version of a *shishōsetsu*, or ‘I’ novel. But then Professor Dening is a lapsed historian.

In the East Indies all the major encounters between Europeans and non-Europeans took place in ports, that is, in bustling, cosmopolitan, commercial space, in which the actors had a common interest - profit - and where they shared a universal language - the language of commerce, of buying and selling goods and services in a market, all services including the pleasures of the flesh or the solace of the bottle. It was a space where Europeans and Asians sought to gain profit and prevent loss; win an advantage and avoid being deceived. Their activities were mediated by a rule of law, customary law rather than the law of nations, the precursor of international law, which Europeans were only just beginning to refashion from natural law principles to correspond with the realities of an emerging global economy, a rule of law that varied from place to place in administration, transparency and fairness, but one that all strangers had to negotiate and try by every means to turn to their advantage. They could complain about perceived injustice, and frequently did, and, when the occasion demanded, and if the consequences were likely to prove inconsequential or minimal, ignore or even break the law to try and get their way. It was a fluid space in which ethnicity, nationality, and even religion, perhaps the most important badge of identity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, were not set rigid, a space to which Europeans brought quite different assumptions about the differences between human societies than they were to do in the nineteenth century during the age of empire.  

During Adams's life, Japan was no exception to this pattern, even if Hirado and Nagasaki, where the Europeans in Japan were largely based, did not enjoy the same cosmopolitan character as the southeast Asian entrepôts of, for example, Ayuthia (Thailand) or Bantam (Bantem in Java), or even the European-controlled entrepôts of Malacca (Melaka) or Batavia (Jakarta). In Japan, the terms of trade were set by the Japanese. The Europeans had to abide by them even when they felt they were unfair. If, however, in their business ventures, the Europeans were bound by the laws of Japan, in some areas of their activities they were unbound by the laws and moral conventions of their native countries. In the case of the English, for example, there were no ecclesiastical courts around, as at home, increasingly eager to interfere in and attempt to regulate sexual behaviour. Sexual, more precisely heterosexual, relations between Europeans and Japanese were common. Some were commercial and purely market transactions: a service was paid for and provided. Others corresponded more obviously with what today we would call 'a relationship', with all that that implies about the gamut of human emotions, commitment, and reciprocity. The exact nature of these relationships was a matter for the couples themselves to define and determine and is largely beyond historical reconstruction. Nevertheless, the warm sentiments expressed in a few surviving letters written by Japanese to members of the English factory mainly around the time of their final departure from Hirado, and the fact that the offspring of one of these Anglo-Japanese couples, William Eaton, who was taken back to England, becoming the first Japanese to attend Cambridge University, together with the subsequent careers and lives of Dutch-Japanese individuals such as Pieter Hartsinck, whose career has been thoroughly researched by Professor Iwao Seiichi, or Cornelia van Nijenroode, whose life in Batavia and the Netherlands has been vividly reconstructed by Professor Leonard Blussé, show that a number of these relationships were taken seriously by the individuals involved.

There is no evidence to show that for the English resident in Hirado liaisons with Japanese women were intended to be legally binding marriages rather than liaisons of convenience. So far as we know, none followed the example of Richard Hawkins who acquired an Armenian Christian as his wife in India and married her in a
ceremony in which his servant acted as a Christian witness. This was a form of spousals (verbal promises made before witnesses, *per verba de praesenti*) which Hawkins considered to be legally binding. And he was right, although, as Professor Stone has pointed out, there remained considerable confusion in England throughout the seventeenth century about how far the spousals were in fact binding. But even if the liaisons between the English residents in Hirado and their Japanese consorts were relationships of convenience, devoid of the permanence implied by marriage, we should certainly not presume that they were essentially exploitative, sexually or otherwise, lacking any commitment whatsoever, or that the Japanese women involved were victims of predatory European males. The evidence of the surviving letters from the Japanese side, tantalisingly brief as, unfortunately, it is, suggests that this was not the case. This is not to deny that many of the other liaisons that abounded in Hirado, especially when the companies’ ships were in port, had no other purpose than to provide instant gratification for the men. Even so, as with all market transactions these were not one-sidedly favourable to the Europeans, as many sailors who refused to pay for their trysts in Hirado’s *okabasho* (unlicensed pleasure quarters) with *shishō* (unlicensed prostitutes) found out to their detriment. Nor does it deny that the English residents in Hirado involved in more long-term relationships were incapable of what might be regarded as exploitative behaviour. What it does suggest is that the relationships between the English and their Japanese consorts were not essentially exploitative and that the Japanese women were not victims. The Madame Butterfly trope, no matter how appealing to later generations, both European and Japanese, is anachronistic as far as the early modern encounter is concerned. These ladies were neither Butterflies nor proto-ianfu or comfort women, doing their duty for the greater good or profit of their superiors, in this case the Matsuura family, the daimyo of Hirado.

The East Indies, including Japan, were no beach, then, neither literally nor figuratively, where native and newcomer performed strange, exotic rituals in front of each other, the 'ceremonies of possession' that Professor Patricia Seed has written about, before one side, the Europeans, proceeded, with what is often presented as an act of inevitability, to subjugate the other. This was no empty divide nor dramatic frontier across which 'self' and 'other' stared with mutual, unbridgeable
incomprehension, a place where, to quote Professor Dening again, the European ‘does not see the islander’s colors or trees or mountains. He sees his’.

Nor was it particularly exotic. Just as today when it is no longer necessary to travel to distant places to find people with multiple body piercings and elaborate tattoos, so too in earlier times the foreign and exotic could be found on the doorstep. Joseph Addison commented on the cosmopolitan space that was the Royal Exchange in London: ‘I am infinitely delighted in mixing with these several Ministers of Commerce, as they are distinguished by their different walks and different Languages: Sometimes I am justled among a Body of Armenians: Sometimes I am lost in a Crowd of Jews; and sometimes make one in a Groupe of Dutch-men’.

The encounter between Europeans and Asians evolved in what were geographically distant or remote places for the Europeans but not according to a logic of inevitable conflict between irreconcilable opposites. There were other ways in which the encounter could, and did, unfold. In relation to all these issues William Adams, man and myth, is indeed instructive.

Information about Adams’s background and early years is limited. What we know comes mainly from letters he wrote from Japan. He was born in Gillingham, Kent, in 1564, and, following a common trajectory for the non-landed, middling sort, served an apprenticeship under Nicholas Diggens, a major shipbuilder who later secured a profitable ship-repair contract from the East India Company. After completing his apprenticeship, Adams saw naval service against the Spanish Armada in 1588 as master of the Richarde Dyffylde. Subsequently, he took up employment with the Barbary Company, as pilot and master, before joining, as pilot, one of the Dutch voorcompagnie (pre-Dutch East India Company) voyages to the East Indies which left Rotterdam on 27 June 1598 (NS), under the command of Jacques Mahu. Contrary to later Jesuit assertions from Japan, there is no evidence that he participated in any Dutch voyages in quest of the Northwest Passage before then.

The voyage’s mission was to reach the East Indies, sailing by way of Cape Horn, to obtain spices and other Asian commodities, imitating Francis Drake’s exploits en
route by attacking Spanish possessions in South America. Things did not proceed according to plan. After a series of disasters in the South Atlantic, only three of the voyage's five ships made it through the Magellan Straits. Of these only two, the *Liefde*, to which Adams had transferred, and the *Hoop* were able to rendezvous in early November 1599. These ships set course across the Pacific for Japan, but only one made it, the *Liefde*, which arrived, as has been mentioned, off the coast of Bungo (precisely where is unknown although this has not prevented a number of towns from claiming the distinction of first landfall), around 19 April 1600 (NS).

The two dozen or so survivors were all sick and exhausted after the perilous voyage. However, the first non-Portuguese European vessel had reached Japan along with the first recorded Englishman, a few months before what was to become a major turning point in Japanese history, the battle of Sekigahara, in October, an event which paved the way for the establishment of the Tokugawa shogunate by Tokugawa Ieyasu. The arrival of the 'luteranos', or Lutherans (i.e. Protestants), as the Jesuits called the *Liefde*’s survivors, was highly unwelcome to the Catholic missionaries, who had been active in Japan since 1549, the year of St Francis Xavier's arrival in Kyushu. Their presence immediately ended the powerful and jealously-held position the Jesuits had created for themselves as information brokers, the conduit through which information about Japan flowed to Europe, and vice versa, a monopoly which, it is true, had recently been breached by the arrival of the mendicant orders, but at least they were fellow-Catholics.

The Jesuits, who were among the first to see the wretched newcomers, wasted little time in denouncing them as ‘theeves and robbers of all nations’ to the Japanese authorities. It must have been with trepidation, therefore, that Adams, the healthiest of the survivors, appeared before Ieyasu in Osaka in May 1600. Fortunately, a rapport was established as Adams informed the future shogun about a somewhat different kind of Europe from the one portrayed by the Jesuits, a continent bitterly divided by politics and confession. He convinced his interlocutor that the *Liefde* had come to Japan to trade, an agenda highly agreeable to Ieyasu who favoured building upon the policy of his predecessor as hegemon, Toyotomi
Hideyoshi, of expanding Japan's overseas trade. After this interview, the lot of the *Liefde*'s survivors improved greatly.

In subsequent letters, Adams claimed that he had intended to return to England to his wife Mary and two children but that he and the other survivors, whose maritime skills were useful to the Japanese, were prohibited from leaving Japan. This may or may not have been an *ex post facto* justification for not returning, but as the years passed and he prospered in Japan, Adams, like Richard Welden, had less and less motivation to consider going home. He became an informal counsellor to leyasu, a privilege he shared most famously with another European, the Jesuit João Rodrigues, nicknamed 'the interpreter', about whom Dr Michael Cooper has written. Adams participated in leyasu's recreational pursuits of mathematics, geography, and other subjects, and his favour with the shogun was rewarded by the granting of *hatamoto*, or bannerman, status, and an estate with approximately 100 households, providing an income of between 150 and 250 *koku* (1 *koku*=180.4 litres). This was located at Hemi, on the Miura peninsula, not far from the expanding Tokugawa stronghold of Edo.

In present-day Japan Adams is often called Miura Anjin (Miura Pilot). One near-contemporary Japanese document (the *Ikoku tokai goshuinjō*, drawn up in 1624) names him as such in hiragana script; others refer to him as Anji or Anshi also in kana, although he styled himself Anjin, the name by which he can be found on Japanese internet search engines. The characters in use today for Anjin (Adams), however, are not those used at the time, a fact that has not been appreciated until now. A Japanese document from 1606 (in the *Ikoku goshuinjō*), a *shuinjō* (vermillion seal letter) issued to Ferdinand Michielszoon and Jacob Jansz. Quaeckernaeck, gives quite different and more intriguing characters for Anjin. They are not the characters ('hold needle') employed today, but those for 'peace' or 'respose' and 'charity', an interesting, and one imagines quite conscious wordplay given that the ship on which Adams had arrived in Japan after a tempestuous voyage was called the *Liefde*, or 'Charity'. These are also the characters used for him in Japanese documents relating to the East India Company during the 1610s. In fact, the term *anjin* or *anshin*, meaning pilot, was in use in Japan long before Adams arrived. It is
derived from the functions performed by the officer in charge of the needle or compass (rashinban) on board Chinese ships visiting Japan in the medieval period. After the Portuguese arrived in 1543 the word anjin was associated with the functions performed by the Portuguese officer on the carracks called the piloto, and later with the identical functions performed by the stuurman on Dutch ships. These were largely the same as those performed by the anjin or pilot on Japanese ships. These individuals were in charge of deep-sea navigation, the forbears of master mariners. There was no consistency in the characters used for anjin or anshin either in the medieval or early modern periods. In the first English-Japanese dictionary, published in Edo in 1862, the characters for anjin as the translation for pilot are those which have subsequently stuck to Adams in Japanese and it is highly likely that they did so as a result of the influence of this highly authoritative publication. By the Meiji period the Japanese for ‘pilot’ had become mizusakiannai and the older word anjin dropped out of usage.

Another reason for Adams’s waning interest in going home was the fact that he had taken a Japanese wife. The date of this marriage is unknown. There is no proof for the frequently made assertion, including in the latest English-language biography of Adams by William Corr, that she was called Yuki or O-Yuki, the daughter of one Magome Kageyu, an official allegedly in charge of the tenmasho (pack- or post-horse office) in Edo. Whoever she was, she was not without business acumen and ambition, as the diary of Richard Cocks, the head of the English company’s factory in Japan during its ten-years’ existence from 1613-1623, makes clear. The couple had two children, Joseph and Susanna. In addition Adams had a consort in Hirado from whom he had another child, born after his death. In England, at this time, bigamy and the desertion of the original wife and family were not uncommon. According to the Common Law it was a felony for a married person to take a second wife if the original partner was still alive. This at least was the legal position after 1603 when bigamy was made a civil offence. Even then, though, exceptions were made. One such specified by the 1603 statute occurred when ‘either party hath been continually abroad for seven years, whether the party in England hath notice of the other’s being living or no’. This applied in Adams’s case, certainly by the time that he had succeeded in reestablishing contact with his wife in 1612, meaning that
legally both he and Mary Adams were free to remarry, which they both did, although it is highly improbable that Adams knew about the 1603 act when he married his Japanese wife. To his credit, however, and unlike many of his countrymen at home, Adams took his responsibilities to his first family seriously. He did not abandon them. Mary Adams received regular support payments from her husband, sent via the English and Dutch companies, although under English law Adams was not obliged to do so. Given the fact that, as his letter to his unknown friends and countrymen makes clear, he valued his reputation and his contacts in England highly, his action is not surprising. He would not have wanted to have been perceived by friends or colleagues as negligent. Moreover, Adams had a sense of honour and a conscience; he did not want his family in England to sink into destitution. His behaviour stands apart from that of many other men to whom Professor Stone has drawn attention.

As for Adams’s marriage to his Japanese wife this was clearly something distinct from prevailing marriage practices in Japan. Adams was a foreigner, although unlike Portuguese residing in Japan before him, one who enjoyed a shogun’s patronage. The marriage was not intended to cement an alliance between families (Adams had none in Japan); nor was Adams adopted into his wife’s family (he did not change his name). It accorded with Japanese practice to the extent that it set up a new ie or household. In so far as marriage was intended to secure or advance the interests of families, and could, therefore, override the wishes of individuals, and that church weddings were not a prerequisite to make marriages both legal and binding in England (they were, of course, almost entirely unknown in Japan), the social and institutional aspects of marriage and people’s attitudes towards it in both England and Japan were not so very different at this time. Even within Catholic Europe marriage had only become a sacrament in 1439 and it was only after 1563 that the Catholic church insisted that the attendance of a priest was a prerequisite for a marriage to be both valid and binding.

There is no doubt that news of the presence in Japan of the *Liefde*’s survivors encouraged both the English and Dutch companies to attempt a direct trade with Japan. Adams played a part in this. In 1605, for example, he secured a letter from
Ieyasu inviting the Dutch to trade with Japan. His efforts were influential, but
certainly not decisive, in helping them make this decision for they were intent on
coming regardless of Adams who was not the only survivor of the Liefde who stayed
on in Japan.31

In 1609 the Dutch finally arrived, the English four years later, in 1613. Both
companies received shuinjō from the shogun, permitting them to trade in Japan, the
Dutch in 1611, the English in 1613. On both occasions Adams played a part in
securing the trade privileges but he exaggerated his role. This is especially evident
in a letter he sent to the English company's agent at Bantam, Augustine Spalding,
alleging that ‘[t]he Hollandes be now settled [in Japan] and I hav got them that
privilledg as the Spaynard and Portingalles could never geett in this 50 or 60 yeers
in Jappan’.32 Japanese sources make it explicit that Adams acted as interpreter. He
did not perform any negotiation. He was in no position to secure for the companies
anything other than what the shogunate, intent on expanding trade for its own
reasons, was prepared to offer. Moreover, contrary to Adams’s assertion, between
December 1609 and February 1610 Rodrigo de Vivero, the interim governor of the
Philippines and an influential Spanish official, negotiated an important treaty (which
was never ratified) with the shogunate which included trade privileges similar to what
the Dutch received, without Adams’s intercession.33 Adams’s limitations as a broker
were clearly displayed in 1616 when, acting on behalf of both companies' chief
merchants in Japan, he was unable to persuade the shogunate to revoke its deeply-
resented orders curtailing the companies' privileges, restricting their trade to Hirado
and Nagasaki.

In 1613 Adams turned down the chance to return to England on the Clove, the
English company's first ship to arrive in Japan. He entered the company's service,
however, and some of his salary was paid to his spouse in England. He made
several voyages to southeast Asia, some for the East India Company, some on his
own account. Adams died on 16 May 1620 in Hirado and was buried there. His
movable estate was valued at about £493, divided almost equally between his wife
and surviving child in England and the two children from his Japanese wife. Nothing
was left to his Japanese wife nor to his consort and child in Hirado.34 As far as his
Japanese wife is concerned this can easily be accounted for, although none of Adams's biographers have done so. Before his death Adams and his wife had become estranged. After his death his wife tried to get even by attempting to take over Adams's *shuinjō* for her own and her relations benefit. Adams himself had entrusted Richard Cocks with the job of ensuring that they were employed for the benefit of his children, Joseph and Susanna, a task he performed conscientiously. After the departure of the English in 1623, the Dutch assumed this responsibility. Thus was Mrs Adams's ambition thwarted. She could not get hold of the *shuinjō* nor the Hemi estate as this had been granted by the shogun, remained in his gift, and passed to Adams's son, as Cocks noted. It is unclear why Adams's Hirado consort and their child, who, as has been mentioned, was born after Adams's death, were excluded from the will. Cocks offered to see to the child's education if the mother gave it over to 'the english nations protection'. This does not appear to have happened.

Richard Cocks was generous and effusive in his obituary. Disregarding the unpleasant memories of an often fraught relationship, he declared that Adams had been 'in such favour w'th two Emperours [shoguns] of Japon as never was any Christian in these p'tes...& might freely have entred & had speech w'th th'Emperours when many Japon kings [daimyo] stood w'thout & could not be p'mitted'. This was a considerable overestimate of Adams's standing and achievement in Japan. Adams certainly enjoyed the patronage of the first two shoguns. For example, he could still trade freely in Japan after 1616 when the commerce of the English and Dutch companies was curbed. The services he performed for both companies, something which profoundly irked the English, were useful, but they were not vital. Cocks was an able and adept negotiator with the shogunate and both companies could use the services of another survivor from the *Liefde*, Jan Joosten Lodensteyn, who was also made a *hatamoto* and enjoyed shogunal patronage until his choleric temperament and drunken behaviour no longer made him welcome at court.

The Jesuits too exaggerated Adams's influence in official circles. They blamed him for turning Ieyasu decisively against the missionaries and their creed and for the decree of 1614 outlawing Christianity and expelling the missionaries. Adams, who
was not at all coy about self-promotion, would have been flattered. But his role in one of the defining events of the Tokugawa period was inconsequential. His views on Roman Catholicism played no part whatsoever in the outlawing of Christianity in Japan, the causes of which are long-term and too complex to be attributable to an individual, especially one who was very much peripheral to the decision-making processes of the early Tokugawa regime.

Both Cocks's and the Jesuits' evaluation of Adams anticipate the mythology that has taken hold since the mid-nineteenth century. After his death, however, Adams was largely forgotten. Letters and accounts of him, together with other material relating to the English and Japan, were printed by Samuel Purchas in *Purchas His Pilgrimes* (1625) and he was mentioned by Samuel Fuller in the *Worthies of England* (1662).

The creation of the modern Adams myth can be dated precisely to 1872. In that year an expatriate Englishman, James Walters, 'discovered' tumuli, two stele, and two lanterns on a hill near Hemi. Walters claimed that these were the tombs of Adams and his Japanese wife. They have since become known as the *anjin-tsuka*, or pilot tumuli. Walters made his discovery with the help of priests from Jōdoji temple in Hemi under circumstances in which auto-suggestion and wish fulfilment rather than dispassionate scientific investigation guided the participants. The priests informed Walters of local lore that after Adams's death the residents of Anjin-chō near Nihonbashi in Edo, where Adams stayed while in Edo, had made a donation to the temple for prayers for the repose of his soul. Adams's will drawn up in Hirado on the day of his death makes it explicit that he died, nominally at least, a Christian, and for good reason: this made it possible for him to leave his estate in England to his beneficiaries there for until 1857 all wills and probates in England and Wales were under the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts which jealously guarded their authority over the settling of estates.

The stone lanterns near the tumuli were supposedly paid for by the Anjin-chō residents in 1798 and Walters claimed a date, allegedly on one of the stele, corresponded to 1634 which has since been taken as the year Adams's unknown Japanese wife died. Walters developed the idea of a link between Anjin-chō and
Jōdoji, whose priests were happy with the publicity the supposed Adams connection generated for their temple, with the potential to put it on the foreign residents’ list of ‘must see’ things Japanese. On a visit to the temple in 1999 I was informed that documentary evidence allegedly confirming the link with Anjin-chō was no longer extant, and had not been for many years. The temple itself is proud of its reputed connection with Adams and possesses artefacts of southeast Asian provenance which are said to be Adams's. There is no proof of this. A photograph of one of them has been issued as a telephone card. In 1905 the tomb purported to be Adams's was excavated but no human remains were found. It is possible that the anjin-tsuka monuments are connected with Joseph, Adams's son. Joseph inherited his father’s Japanese name Anjin or Anshin, and it may be that it is he rather than his father who was known as Miura Anjin. The Dutch referred to him as ‘Mioura Ains’ and, as has been mentioned, the Ikoku tokai goshuinjō, in which there is a reference to Miura Anjin receiving a shuinjō in 1614, was drawn up in 1624, four years after William Adams’s death by which time Joseph had been confirmed in his father’s estate perhaps using the name Miura Anjin to distinguish him from his father. Joseph was a successful overseas trader in his own right until overseas voyages by Japanese were prohibited in 1635, the year in which he disappears from the historical record. The date of his death, that of his sister, and whether or not he died with or without issue are unkown so it cannot be asserted, as it sometimes is, that they enjoyed a rare exemption from the 1639 decree ordering the surviving families of Euro-Japanese marriages to leave Japan. It is more probable that there is no Adams connection whatsoever with the anjin-tsuka structures and that there was none between Jōdoji and Anjin-chō in Nihonbashi.

After Walters' 'discovery' the myth of William Adams took wing. It chimed well with the spirit of the times. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries Adams's renown was greater in Britain than in Japan. His story was custom-made for a generation which sought to locate the origins of British imperial greatness in the Elizabethan Age, with its supposed doughty, independent-minded seafarers and adventurers, heroes all, underdogs who against the odds, challenged the over mighty, overbearing Spaniard to do their country proud. The Adams story had its appeal as well for British expatriates in Japan. They too saw themselves as
pioneers, like Will Adams, the name by which he became popular but which neither he nor his contemporaries used, forging new relationships between the island empires, many among them teachers, as Adams was portrayed, instructing the Japanese in Western scientific knowledge, although they would not have been amused had they known what the Japanese called them, yatoi or hired hands, a somewhat condescending expression which certainly did not imply the high prestige many of them assumed they enjoyed.

In Britain his renown fluctuated with the prevailing state of Anglo-Japanese relations. In 1885 he was included in the original *Dictionary of National Biography* (and will be included in the *New Dictionary of National Biography*) and after 1902, and the signing of the Anglo-Japanese naval alliance a string of publications about him followed. It was of course the alliance that gave the Adams myth a lease of life far beyond expatriate circles in Japan. What better way to help cement the alliance in the popular mind than by recounting the heroic adventures of Will Adams? The booklet by C. W. Hilary, *England’s Earliest Intercourse with Japan*, published in 1905, captures this mood perfectly. It is not without a familiar ring. ‘Japan’, Hilary wrote, ‘has now entered into the comity of nations as a first-class military and naval power: and as a competitor in the world’s markets...It is her ambition to become in the Far East the antitype of her ally in the West. Long may the happy relations now subsisting between the two island countries continue!’

In 1905, supposedly shocked by the state of disrepair of the anjin-tsuka, the governor of Kanagawa, took the initiative along with the British Minister, Sir Claude M. MacDonald, Admiral Baron Inouye and, the self-appointed keeper of the Adams flame in Japan, James Walters, to promote a subscription for the restoration of the 'tombs'. Prince Arisugawa Takehito and Prince Arthur of Connaught became patrons of the project and 20,000 yen was raised from Japanese and British benefactors. The 'tombs' were placed on a plinth and the surrounding area turned into a park and called Tsukayama Kōen, the name by which it is still known. The Japanese inscription beside the 'tombs' maintains that they are precisely that, tombs, and that on his deathbed among his last wishes Adams had specified that, thanks to the grace and favour of the Tokugawa shogun, he had prospered in Japan and
therefore wanted to be buried at Hemi facing east, gazing towards Edo so that his soul while in the underworld would have the protection of the city. His posthumous Buddhist name is said to be Juryo Manin Genzui Koji. His wife is identified as Magome and their two children are quite erroneously said to have died young. The connection with Jōdoji is also stated and it is mentioned that the remains of Adams's house were still to be found in Hemi. The site was officially dedicated by the British ambassador on 30 May 1918 and became an official historical site in 1923. The inscription is, of course, almost entirely invention.

Some in England were embarrassed that no similar monument to Adams existed in his native land and after years of lobbying a memorial clock was erected in Gillingham in honour of a native son who, according to the booklet produced for the dedication ceremony in 1934, a time of Anglo-Japanese alienation, had 'discovered' Japan. Like the inscription at the *anjin-tsuka*, the booklet is a product of fantasy and hyperbole, only much more so. Alderman J. Bate, the former Mayor of Gillingham describes Adams as ‘a valuable adviser to the Shogun Ieyasu in the peaceful governing of the Japanese people, and for the commercial prosperity of Japan’, ‘one of the Fathers of the British Navy’, and a Kentishman whose ‘first, and last, thoughts were always for "HOME AND ENGLAND"’. A 'character sketch' by Richard Blacker, author of *The Needle Watcher*, a novelisation of Adams's life, still in print, rounded out the booklet, adding to the mythology. The booklet also contains a drawing of Adams, pure invention as no contemporary image of him exists, depicting him standing on a ship's deck, chart in right hand, left hand resting on sword, gazing resolutely towards the unknown horizon. This image has proved enduring, at least in Japan. The face has acquired Japanese characteristics and is used on the official website of Yokosuka City in Kanagawa Prefecture where the *anjin-tsuka* is now located. It is also the featured display in the Anjin izukaiya or pub in Huis Ten Bosch, the Disneyesque Dutch theme park in Nagasaki Prefecture.

After the war, during which one book about Adams was published in Japan, his fame remained high in Japan but declined further in Britain. After the traumatic wartime events it seemed opportune at the diplomatic level to remind the Japanese public of better times in Anglo-Japanese relations, and, in view of the unexpected
Americanisation of the occupation, of the long history of those relations. In August 1947 a new memorial to Adams was dedicated at Itō on the Izu peninsula where on leyasu’s orders Adams is supposed to have supervised the construction of two ships, one of which was used to transport the interim governor of the Philippines to New Mexico in 1610 after his own vessel was shipwrecked off the Japanese coast. However, there is no evidence that Adams had any part in constructing ships at Itō. Moreover, he was not the only European involved in shipbuilding or other maritime activities in Japan. The Portuguese were as well. For example, a Portuguese supervised the construction of the ship which carried Sebastian Vizcaino, Philip III’s ambassador to the shogun, back to Acapulco along with Hasekura Rokuemon, the envoy of Date Masamune to Philip III and Pope Paul V, at the end of 1613. Besides, those who exaggerate Adams’s role in the development of Japanese nautical skills ignore the fact that in the early seventeenth century the Japanese were far from deficient in those skills anyway. The Itō memorial was unveiled by the commander-in-chief of the British Commonwealth Forces of occupation in Japan and some capricious verse by Edmund Blunden, by then himself something of a minor celebrity in Japan, was added the following year. An annual Itō Anjin Matsuri or festival is held over three days in August. A yearly Anjin celebration had also been held in Tsukayama Kōen before the war but was suspended around 1935. In 1948 a more solemn official event was inaugurated, a memorial ceremony at the putative ‘tomb’ during the cherry blossom season, an event that continues to be observed annually, at which the British are represented by their military attaché, and which takes pride of place among Yokosuka city’s four ‘Major International Ceremonies’.

Today it is Adams the myth rather than Adams the historical figure that people are familiar with in Japan, or, more correctly, Anjin the myth. In Britain, outside the circles which have a specific interest in promoting Anglo-Japanese relations he is largely unknown. Adams/Anjin has become a ‘fact’ in Japanese high school history texts which the proverbial schoolboy is supposed to recall. But it would be unwise to break off here, as all the Adams’ biographers do, for to the extent that he has a number of monuments in Japan and has become the focus of a number of festivals, Adams has been nativised. This brings us back to the starting point of this paper: the nature of cross-cultural encounter. There should be nothing surprising about the
nativisation of Adams. The 'other' can be accommodated quite comfortably within the bosom of the 'self'. The Jesuits in China are one example. The British in India as managers and supporters of Hindu temples are another. In 1802 the Baptist William Ward noted with distaste that '[l]ast week a deputation from the Government went in procession to Kallee Ghat & made a thank offering to this goddess...of the Hindoos, in the name of the Company, for the victories & successes which the English have lately obtained in this country' (i.e. the victories of the Marquis of Wellesley over Tipu Sultan in southern India). Many company paintings in which the British are represented as full participants in Hindu festivals survive. Indeed when the company's support for Hindu temples and involvement in Hindu festivals ceased a number of Hindu commentators were aghast, fearing that the poor management which followed would lead to the atrophy of Hinduism and pave the way for Christianity to triumph.

In his dual role as William Adams, historical person, and Miura Anjin or Anjin, the stuff of myth, and source of invented traditions in Japan, the Kentishman calls into doubt the conclusions of those who anchor their discussion of the encounter between Europeans and non-Europeans on cultural anthropological foundations, on images of beaches and islands, suggesting an intrinsic and immutable gap between 'self' and 'other'. In this regard I disagree with Professor Ronald Toby who argues that in the early modern period in Japan '[t]he representation of Other was essential to the perpetuation of community, to the inscription of boundaries, and to the reconstitution of categories of Self and Other, in the aftermath of the Nanban interlude [i.e. what used to called (inaccurately) the 'Christian Century'].

In his life-time William Adams lived comfortably in Japan and was accepted into Japanese society. In his mythological incarnation Adams/Anjin has become Japanese, right down to the site in Hirado which claims to mark his grave. The inscription there is marked with a cross, which, I would suggest, is not simply a courtesy extended to an exiled foreigner but can be interpreted as part of a larger agenda. Hirado, and the adjoining island, Ikitsuki, were, and are, today an area where Roman Catholicism took root. Indeed Ikitsuki was an important centre for kakure kirishitan, or hidden Christians, who, after the proscription of Christianity in
1614, took their faith underground from where it emerged in 1864 in syncretic form, blending Christian, Buddhist and Shinto belief and ritual. Although very much in decline, and riddled with factionalism, it survives to this day. Anjin, if not in fact, then symbolically, and, of course, ironically, is very much ‘one of us’ for the Catholic minority in this area. This is not quite, I suspect, what John Saris, the commander of the **Clove**, meant when he observed, rather tartly, in much-(mis)quoted words, in 1613 that Adams was very much a ‘naturalised Japanner’.

In one of the former royal palaces on Bali, a terrain well-trodden by cultural anthropologists, in Karangasem, if I am not mistaken, one of the Balinese kingdoms which the Dutch ruled indirectly, permitting it to retain the fiction of independence, much like the princely states of the Raj, I recall seeing a few years ago a number of Dutch figures strategically placed along one of the perimeter walls. The meaning of this is highly intriguing. I would suggest that it demonstrates how, just as in India, the ritual practices and symbolic values of the ‘other’ could be used in the service of the ‘self’ - in the case of India, the British appeasing the Hindu gods to ensure local support for further successes against their enemies; in Bali, the transformation of the former enemy, the Dutch, into protectors of the royal palace and thus of the princely power.

If so, at the very least the distinction between ‘self’ and ‘other’ in such crossovers becomes blurred. It may even be erased.

Does not Adams/Anjin perform a similar function in blurring and erasing difference? In posing this question I hope that I too am not contributing to the perpetuation of the Adams/Anjin myth.

---
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APPENDIX

按針
[Miura] Anjin
characters in use today for William Adams.

安仁
Anjin
characters used in 1606 shuinjō and in East India Company documents from the 1610s.¹

安針
Anjin [-chō]
characters used in eighteenth-century map of Edo.²

¹ Nakamura (ed.), Tokugawa leyasu monjo, 3:1, p.499; Nihon kankei kaigai shiryō: Igirisu shōkancho nikki, 3, pp.129, 141, 144, 150.

² Nihon kokugo daijiten, 1, p.557; Kokushi daijiten, 1, p.381.
The Japan base: English East India Company attempts at inter-Asiatic trade from Japan, 1613-1623

Anthony Farrington

The English factory at Hirado in Japan was a minor episode in the history of the East India Company's struggle to penetrate the East Asian market. It survived for just over ten years, from June 1613 until December 1623, and yet it has left an archive of more than 400 items which is unrivalled in depth and coverage at this date. The documents range from single or multi-page letters written by the factors to bills of lading and declarations of affection in Japanese, and include along the way ships' logs, accounts and the 450 folio diary of Richard Cocks, the head of the factory, which 'strayed' from the Company's archives during the nineteenth century. This massive survival can perhaps be characterised as less businesslike (and for that reason more interesting) than the contemporary Dutch factory archive, although Jacques Specx, the Dutch Chief at Hirado, did not begin to keep a formal ledger and journal until August 1620. Unlike the Dutch, who retained their toehold in Japan for two and half centuries, the English Company soon returned a verdict of failure on their Japan experiment. Their poor manager Cocks received the blame for the Company's total inability to match the flow of goods to their inflated expectations of the market.

Two quotations might encapsulate the decade of English hopes and frustrations in their Japan factory. Martin Pring, one of the Company's sea captains, informed the Directors in October 1621, 'if the trade of the Chinesses could be drawne to Japan it would prove the best factorie in the world', while Richard Cocks had written home in January 1617, 'and were it not for hope of trade into China, or procuring som benefit from Syam, Pattania and Cochin China, it were noe staying in Japon, yet it is certen here is silver enough & may be carid out at pleasure, but then we must bring them comodeties to ther lyking'.
The whole episode, indeed, can be seen as the first stage in a long effort to establish direct contact with China, a goal which was not fully realised until the early eighteenth century. Information obtained through the Chinese junk trade at Bantam in Java, where the English had established their first Asian trading post early in 1603, had given the Company a clear picture of the Macao-Nagasaki voyages of the Portuguese. But it then put the cart before the horse by establishing a factory in Japan before it had the means to supply that factory with saleable commodities. Encouraged by the inaccurate reports of John Saris, who commanded the first voyage, the Company hoped to tap the ‘silver riches’ of Japan with a combination of goods brought from England and goods obtained elsewhere in Asia. Apart from the first ship, the Clove in 1613, only three other English ships brought cargoes direct from London to Japan, and they can best be described as ranging from ‘difficult to sell’ to absolute rubbish.

The opening balance of the new factory when the Clove left in December 1613 consisted of 11,302 taels (£2825 10s) in cash and plate and 11,812 taels (£2953) in merchandise. The latter comprised 50 pieces and remnants of broadcloth, 6057 pieces of Indian textiles, 124 elephant tusks, 315 peculs (18.7 tons) of pepper, 46 barrels of gunpowder, 238 cwt of lead, 6 cannon with shot, 20 taels weight of gold, 2 pipes of olive oil and 1188 lbs of tin - hardly a promising foundation for a return of silver which would obviate the need to carry bullion out of England.

The second ship, the Hosiander in 1615, brought no cash and its cargo included nearly 9000 pieces of Indian textiles, wax, lead, quicksilver, pepper, 91 fowling pieces, 408 knives and 30 pairs of scissors. The Thomas and Advice in 1616 repeated the pattern: no money, increasing quantities of broadcloth and Indian fabrics, and bric-a-brac which included 100 Russia hides, 192 skins of gilt leather, 900 furs (mainly rabbit), 2455 gallipots, plus assorted glass bottles, knives, looking glasses, spectacles and prints and pictures. Aside from their general unsuitability items arrived in poor condition and deteriorated further in storage. Cocks complained frequently about cloth
which was either rot or rat-eaten, both equally applicable, Indian piece goods were stained by mildew or spoiled by insects, guns were rusty and sacks of pepper contained sticks and stones. Richard Wickham, an assistant factor, neatly summarised the dilemma: ‘Yf we were lerned alchimists we could not so soone turne mettles into silver as the Honourable Company, being deluded, are bouldly confident that we can turne these idle comodytys into money’.9

Insofar as the European and Asian goods brought on the Company's inter-continental shipping had any appeal in Japan, it was essentially a highly limited luxury or novelty appeal, subject to rapidly changing vagaries of fashion and taste. England's principal export, heavy woollen broadcloth, was marked up to a high figure in Japan; individual sales were small and the uses for the cloth - saddle coverings, linings for weapons or armour boxes, and occasionally military surcoats (jinbaori) - could never have provided an outlet large enough to satisfy the Company's hopes. It was soon noted that the Japanese preferred ‘sad’ colours, sombre shades of blue, cinnamon, ochre and violet, while greens, pinks and reds were difficult to move. Similarly, when first embarking upon sales at Edo in May 1614 Richard Wickham reported enquiries after Indian piece goods ‘fantastically paynted or striped’ but in the following year the only Indian fabrics which would sell were those with white spots on black or blue grounds. According to Ralph Coppendale, captain of the Hosiander, ‘the people are so mutable that that which is a good comoditie this yeare will prove a drugge another year’. Such a sophisticated market was hardly likely to succumb to English gallipots, knives and spectacles.

The Company's factors came to rely instead upon the long-expected opening of trade to China and, pending that break-through, trade from Japan to Southeast Asia, in whose ports they might expect to obtain Chinese commodities. Despite the official Ming ban on relations with Japan the English had found a flourishing Chinese mercantile community at Hirado and Nagasaki. Its leader Li Tan (alias Andrea Dittis or ‘Captain China’) kept
alive Richard Cocks’s hopes for penetration of the mainland while pocketing the proceeds of presents intended to smooth non-existent negotiations. There were also Japanese entrepreneurs and shipowners who increasingly, after the Catholic missionaries were banished in 1614, took over the intermediary dealings in the silk trade from Macao.

Overseas commerce by Japanese or by foreigners resident in Japan was subject to a licensing system dating from at least 1592. Each ship had to carry the Bakufu’s red-seal passport, the *shuinjo* or *goshuin*, issued for one or several voyages to a stated destination, and any ship without such a document might be treated as a pirate or smuggler. Conversely, although the early Tokugawa practice was to ignore hostilities outside Japan so long as the belligerents behaved themselves within Japanese jurisdiction, it was soon accepted that these *shuin-sen* ships were a kind of maritime extension of Japan. If any Europeans interfered with them they would be answerable at their trading posts in Japan. An interesting case arose in 1620 when the English ship *Elizabeth* captured a Portuguese-owned frigate heading for Nagasaki. The captain was Japanese and she carried four Spaniards, some Portuguese and a number of Japanese merchants as passengers. On the surface it was a clear case of violation of a *goshuin*. The English and Dutch, then allies, were only able to wriggle out of the ensuing lawsuit before the *daimyo* of Hirado and the *bugyo* of Nagasaki when it was eventually proved that two of the Spanish ‘merchants’ were Franciscan friars being smuggled into Japan. In August 1622 the friars and the captain were burnt, twelve of the Japanese passengers were beheaded, the Tokugawa kept the cargo and the Europeans were awarded the frigate, by then a useless hulk.

Given the infrequency and unsuitability of cargoes from London, the English factory soon began to participate in the *shuinjo* system, obtaining its licences mainly through William Adams. Seven junk voyages made, or attempted, to mainland Southeast Asia proved a mixture of success, failure and disaster.
The first was mounted in March 1614, when the factory was only a few months old. A Japanese junk was chartered at Hirado and carried two of the English merchants, Tempest Peacock and Walter Carwarden, for the port of Faifo in ‘Cochin China’ (Quang Nam, central Vietnam). The junk carried a cargo of ivory, broadcloth, Indian piece goods and silver valued at 2983 tael (€746). The vessel was never heard of again, although it was later established that Peacock had been murdered in Vietnam and Carwarden may have escaped only to be shipwrecked. This opening venture lost 13% of the initial stock of the Japan factory.

Meanwhile in August 1614 the English bought their own 200 ton junk at Nagasaki for 200 tael (£50) and spent a further 312 tael (£78) on a refit. Re-named the Sea Adventure, she sailed for Ayutthaya in Thailand in December 1614 with William Adams as captain, Richard Wickham and Edmund Sayers of the factory’s staff as merchants, a local crew of 58, and a number of Japanese and Chinese merchant passengers. Wickham’s instructions were to purchase raw silk, Chinese piece goods, sappan wood, deer skins and ray skins, the latter used for the handles and scabbards of Japanese swords. To obtain these commodities he was given 5000 tael (£1250) in silver and only 700 tael (£175) worth of merchandise, divided between Indian fabrics, special purchases of Japanese weapons, lacquerware and oddments, and five barrels of gunpowder. The special purchases included 15 suits of Japanese armour at 4 tael 5 mas each, 36 katana at an average price of 1 tael 7 mas, 18 wakizashi at 5 mas and 28 at 2 mas, Japanese muskets and bows and arrows. Unfortunately a combination of foul weather and an insufficient refit prevented the junk from going any further than Okinawa. It stayed there for repairs from 27 December 1614 until May 1615 and reached Hirado again in June. Wickham managed to sell 94 tael worth of Indian piece goods for 233 tael, or roughly 150% profit, and he purchased two catties of ambergris for 128 tael. The voyage was otherwise a failure.
The third *shuinjo* voyage was an unqualified success. After a further refit and provisioning costing 1696 *taels* (£424) the *Sea Adventure* sailed again for Ayutthaya in December 1615 with William Adams as captain and Edmund Sayers as merchant. The cargo consisted of 2400 *taels* (£600) in silver, 459 pieces of Indian textiles valued at 186 *taels* and most of the Japanese goods which had been returned from Okinawa. The latter were mainly given as presents when the junk reached Ayutthaya on 18 January 1616. Most of the textiles were left with the stock of the Siam factory, and with the money Sayers bought large quantities of sappan wood and deer skins. Adams took the *Sea Adventure* back to Japan with 2400 peculs (143 tons) of sappan wood and 3700 deer skins, making the voyage to Hirado in 47 days, 5 June-22 July 1616. Sayers returned in a chartered Chinese junk with 875 peculs (44 tons) of wood. He was forced into Satsuma by storms and only reached Hirado in October 1616. A further 4560 deer skins were freighted on a Japanese junk which missed the monsoon and did not make Nagasaki until June 1617.

The *Sea Adventure* sailed on the factory’s fourth voyage in December 1616. This time she was captained by a Japanese, Skidayen Dono, William Eaton went as merchant, and James and Robert Burgess, who had arrived in Japan on the ships *Thomas* and *Advice*, as pilots. The junk carried 2240 *taels* (£560) in silver plus a few Indian piece goods and some English bric-a-brac such as notebooks and looking glasses. She reached Thailand on 19 January 1617, remained until 28 May, and was back at Hirado again on 7 September. For the first time the return cargo included raw silk - 10 peculs (1333 lbs) - along with 2531 peculs (150 tons) of sappan and 9000 deer skins, the whole yielding a gross profit in Japan of at least 4400 *taels* (£1100).

The fifth voyage, to Quang Nam, was performed in the junk which Edmund Sayers had chartered for his return from Thailand in 1616. It was bought in Japan by William Adams, who named it *Gift of God*. Adams as captain and Sayers as merchant sailed from Hirado on 23 March 1617, reached Faifo 20 April, left again on 21 June and were back at Hirado 8 August. Enquiries
about the fate of Peacock, Carwarden and the stock of the factory’s first voyage proved inconclusive. The cargo of broadcloth, Indian piece goods and ivory sold moderately well, bringing in 1406 taels (£351 10s). Sayers managed to buy 3.7 peculs (490 lbs) of raw silk for 493 taels (£123 5s) and 135 catties (180 lbs) of eaglewood at 180 taels (£45) for the return to Japan; but balanced against these successes, he was cheated out of 656 taels (£164) by a Chinese confidence trickster while attempting another raw silk deal.

The sixth voyage used the Sea Adventure again, with William Eaton as merchant and James Burgess as pilot. The cargo comprised 276 taels (£69) worth of Indian piece goods, 128 taels (£32) in Japanese armour and weapons and 3100 taels (£775) in silver. The junk left Hirado on 2 January 1618, was forced into Okinawa for repairs, and did not reach Thailand until the end of the year. The worn-out Sea Adventure was then abandoned and the English bought another junk for the homeward voyage, arriving back at Hirado with a full lading of sappan and deer skins on 8 August 1619.

The final shuinjo voyage, piloted by William Adams with Edmund Sayers as merchant, set out for Quang Nam in a chartered Chinese junk on 11 March 1618. As on earlier occasions, bad weather hindered progress south, it was forced into Oshina in the northern Ryukyus, and returned to Hirado in May.

Thus out of seven voyages attempted only four reached their destinations - it would be interesting to know how this success rate compared with similar voyages by Chinese and Japanese merchants. However, these efforts to mainland Southeast Asia did give the English an opportunity to unload some of their Indian piece goods and the return cargoes generally yielded high gross profits, for example 200-230% on sappan wood. The factory’s basic problem lay in its even higher recurring expenses. For instance between December 1613 and January 1617 the factory disposed of almost 10,000 pieces of Indian textiles at a profit of 2568 taels (£642) or 38% over cost, and sold broadcloth for 6256 taels (£1564). But over the same period the establishment of the factory, wages and ship refits totalled more than 26,000 taels (£6500), without counting presents, journeys up and down Japan, and
the hopeless investment in the China dream. Even allowing for the returns from the junk voyages to Southeast Asia the downward spiral of sales against expenditure was clear, and the junk voyages themselves failed to achieve their primary aim of obtaining significant quantities of raw silk or woven silk fabrics.

Unlike the English, the Dutch, while obviously striving for profit in Japan, made their factory at Hirado play a part in a wider strategy for trade monopoly in Indonesia. William Adams informed the Company\textsuperscript{23} that victuals, timber, planks, iron, hemp and carpenters were cheap in Japan and ‘the people of this land are very stout seamen’. But apart from necessary refits for the \textit{Hosiander}, Thomas and \textit{Advice} little advantage was taken of Japanese skills and materials. In December 1614\textsuperscript{24} Richard Cocks described Japan as the Dutch storehouse for their ambitions in the Moluccas, to where they carried rice, barley, beans, meat, dried fish, locally-cast ordnance and shot, and \textit{samurai} mercenaries. Next year Ralph Coppendale\textsuperscript{25} reckoned that Japan’s rôle as a ‘ommodious storehowse to furnishe them with men, munition & victualls at much cheaper rates then elsewhere’ had become the main reason for the Dutch presence in the country. Cocks attempted in vain to persuade his masters in London\textsuperscript{26} that the English could do the same, despite promising them a flow of ‘desperate warlike people ... ready to adventure for good pay’. The Anglo-Dutch Fleet of Defence voyages of 1621 and 1622 did finally involve the English in this ‘Japan base’ concept, although the English still lacked the ruthlessness of the Dutch vision. In any case they had come to it too late. In 1621 Hidetada forbade the export of ordnance, gunpowder or munitions, or the employment of Japanese as ships’ crews and soldiers.

The East Asia operations of the short-lived Anglo-Dutch alliance against Portugal and Spain, carried out by a fleet of ten ships based at Hirado, were limited to a blockade of Manila and the plundering of Chinese junk traffic for two seasons. A separate Dutch attempt to capture Macao, which was beaten off with Chinese assistance, incidentally led to the Dutch occupation of the Pescadores and later Taiwan. The Japanese authorities tolerated the alliance’s activities on condition that no \textit{shuinjo} ships were molested, and no
doubt they shared in the rich pickings from the plunder brought to Hirado. In 1622 Richard Cocks saw a temporary fulfilment of his Chinese dreams, handling such goods as 213.5 peculs (12.7 tons) of raw silk and 2210 pieces of silk fabrics. The two English ships *Elizabeth* and *Bull* which left Japan at the end of the year carried money and goods valued at 156,000 reals of eight or £31,200, while the English Company's half-share of the total plunder was reckoned at nearly £40,000. It is ironical that the figure is ten times the amount which Richard Cocks was alleged to have wasted during the factory's life.

The Japan episode, viewed as an attempt on China from its peripheries, was undoubtedly a failure. But apart from the richness of the factory’s archive for historians of early Tokugawa Japan, it is interesting as an early example of a European encounter with and attempt to imitate a flourishing and sophisticated pattern of inter-Asiatic trade.
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