Seigaku tōzen to Chūgoku jijō: 'zassho' sakki
西学東漸と中国事情:「雑書」札記
[The Eastern Spread of Western Learning and Conditions in China: Notes on "Various Books"] (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1979), pp. 178-203.

Masuda Wataru
増田渉

PART 8

Translated by Joshua A. Fogel
University of California, Santa Barbara

22. Dunbi suiwen lu and Various Others Writings about the Taiping Rebellion

In "Yuekou jilüe" 粤寇紀略 [Brief Record of the Rebels of Guangdong and Guangxi], in juan 1 of the Dunbi suiwen lu 盾鼻随聞錄 [Random Notes of a Defended Nose], we read as follows:

> Hong Xiuquan was a man of Huaxian, Guangdong. When he was forty or more years of age, he had long hair, wasp-like eyes [sic.], a broad visage, and a fat body, and he was somewhat literate. His surname is unknown, though some say it was Zheng 鄭 . In Daoguang 25 [1855] he went to Guangxi and joined a religious association. It so happened that when Hong Deyuan 洪徳元[mentioned earlier in the text as the leader of an association known as the Tiandinghui 添丁会] passed away as a result of illness, he came to assume the surname Hong and replaced [Deyuan] as leader of the group... In addition, he added Christianity and called himself the younger brother of Jesus and the younger, second son of the Heavenly Father Jehovah.

Comparing this account from the Dunbi suiwen lu with those of two texts cited earlier, the Shinshi ran'yō 清史攬要 [A Overview of the History of the Qing] and the Gen Min Shin shiryaku 元明清史略 [Brief History of the Yuan, Ming, and Qing], one can see that they are virtually identical. Inasmuch as both the Shinshi ran'yō and the Gen Min Shin shiryaku were written in Kanbun, they effectively lifted the sentences directly from the Dunbi suiwen lu as is. This parallels precisely the case of the Yuefei jilüe [Brief Record of the Rebels of Guangdong and Guangxi] as compared to

both the Shinchō shiryaku 清朝史略 [Brief History of the Qing Dynasty] and the Saikin Shina shi 最近支那史 [Recent Chinese History].[a]

The Dunbi suiwen lu was printed with punctuation for Japanese readers and, it seems, enjoyed a rather wide readership. As noted earlier [see SJS, V.2, pp. 55-56--JAF], apparently this work was originally brought to Japan by Takasugi Shinsaku 高杉晋作 (1839-67), Nakamuda Kuranosuke 中牟田倉之助 (1837-1916), Hibino Teruhiro 日比野輝寛 (1838-1912), and the others who had traveled to Shanghai aboard the Senzaimaru 千歳丸 , the shogunate's trading vessel, between the fourth and seventh lunar months of Bunkyū 文久 2 (1862).

In his Yū-Shin goroku 遊清五録 [Five Records of a Trip to China] (in Tōkō sensei ibun 東行先生遺文 [Posthumous Writings of Takasugi Shinsaki] Tokyo: Min'yūsha, 1916),[b] Takasugi Shinsaku lists the "books copied by Nakamuda," and among them we find the Dunbi suiwen lu. There is a note in the text at this point which reads: "Relied on a copyist in Nagasaki." Because this was a "book [that had been] copied," we know that it was copied out in Shanghai and brought home to Japan, but we do not know if the original from which it was copied was a printed text or if it was a manuscript itself (the latter is more likely the case). However, in his Nakamuda Kuranosuke den 中牟田倉之助伝 [Biography of Nakamuda Kuranosuke] (Tokyo: Nakamuda Takanobu, 1919), Nakamura Kōya 中村孝也 (1885-1970) mentions the maps and book titles of the volumes purchased by Nakamuda in Shanghai; we find there "thirteen stringbound volumes of books and manuscripts concerning the Long-Haired Bandits." Probably, the Dunbi suiwen lu was counted among these.

In his Zeiyūroku 贅肬録 [A Record of Warts and Lumps] (in Bunkyū ninen Shanhai nikki 文久二年上海日記 [Shanghai Diaries from 1862] Osaka: Zenkoku shobō, 1946) as well, Hibino Teruhiro first describes the Taiping Rebellion which he witnessed with his own eyes in Shanghai at the time and the population dislocations it caused. He then notes: "I have written down over the past few days all matters concerning the bandits, having ascertained them particularly through the Dunbi suiwen lu which I myself copied out." Thus, just like Nakamuda, Hibino too made a copy of this work and returned with it to Japan.

These men were the first [Japanese] to travel to Shanghai and see on the spot the "Long-Haired Bandits" about whom firm knowledge was so difficult to come by in Japan till then. To that end, they appear to have made copies of such works describing circumstances at the time in considerable detail, before returning home with these materials. In addition to the Dunbi suiwen lu, we find among the

list of "books copied by Nakamuda" such texts concerning the Taiping Rebellion as: Tianli yaolun 天理要論 [Important Observations Regarding Heavenly Principles], Taiping zhaoshu 太平詔書 [The Taiping Imperial Declaration], Taiping lizhi 太平礼制 [Taiping Ceremonial Regulations], Tianming zhaozhi shu 天命詔旨書 [The Book of Heavenly Decrees and Proclamations], Zizheng xinpian 資政新篇 [A New Treatise of Aids to Administration].[c]

For the entry corresponding to the seventh day of the fifth lunar month [1862] in his "Shanhai en'ryū nichiroku" [Daily Record of a Stay in Shanghai] (in his Yū-Shin goroku), Takasugi Shinsaku notes: "The reverberations of gunfire were heard by all on land at dawn, and this had to have been fighting between the Long-Haired Bandits and the Chinese. I thought that if only I could go verify this [report] and the see the fighting firsthand, I would be so happy." In his entry for the tenth day of that same month, we find: "At dusk a Dutchman came and told us that the Long-Haired Bandits were three li [about one mile] outside Shanghai. The next morning we would certainly be able to hear artillery fire. The [Edo shogunal] officials expressed great surprise, but I on the contrary was ecstatic." And, several days later on the sixteenth: "We again heard artillery fire all morning long."

Under his entry for the seventh day of the sixth lunar month, we learn that the shogunal officials in the Japanese party made an inspection of the suburbs of Shanghai, and Takasugi accompanied them. "Many small [Buddhist] temples were destroyed, the work of the hands of the bandits." When they went to examine a Confucian temple, "the English have lived here since the bandit rebellion began, and it has been changed into a barracks for troops. Inside the temple the troops sleep on their guns. What I saw was inexplicably deplorable."

Although the foreign concession area was secure during the period when these Japanese visited Shanghai, in the outskirts of the city Taiping forces were just waiting for an opportunity. Just at that time, Loyal King Li Xiucheng 李秀成 had made his camp at Suzhou and was contemplating an attack on Shanghai. Thus, the men who traveled to Shanghai aboard the Senzaimaru wrote reports of this sort and brought back to Japan a variety of source materials on the Taipings.

No date is recorded for when the Japanese edition of the Dunbi suiwen lu was printed. At the end of the main text, we find: "Prepared by Itō Yukimiki 伊藤之幹 , Naniwa [i.e., Osaka]." This would clearly indicate who had punctuated the text, but the publisher remains unclear. A work in two stringbound volumes, entitled Jinling guijia zhitan 金陵癸甲摭談 [Account of the Plunder in Nanjing in

1853-1854 (publ. 1856)], by Xie Jiehe 謝介鶴, which appears on the list of books brought back to Japan at the same time (as well as in Takasugi Shinsaku's account), was also printed with Japanese punctuation. On the inside of its front cover, it reads: "Printed by the Nishodō 二書堂, Naniwa, winter late in Meiji 2 [1868]." It also bears an inscription: "Prepared by Takami Inosuke 高見猪之介 of Iga."[d] This might mean that at about the same time the Dunbi suiwen lu was also printed in Japan.

I have in my possession two Japanese editions of the Dunbi suiwen lu. Both have the title on the inside front cover, and both carry the "introductory remarks...personally recounted by Chuyuan Tuisou 樗園退叟" at the beginning of the text. They then carry a preface by Yao Jiyun 姚際雲, dated the eighth lunar month of Xianfeng jiayin or 1854, followed by the titles of each of the eight juan of the work. As cited above, we find in the first juan, "Yuekou jilüe," a brief biography of Hong Xiuquan who succeeds to the leadership of the Tiandinghui after the death of Hong Deyuan. The last page of the text (inside the back cover) where an inscription might be written is blank in one of my texts and carries just the following note in another: "Japanese, Chinese, and Western Bookstore, Ogawa Gihei 小川儀平 of Masuya-chō 升屋町, Ōtsu, Ōmi domain." Judging from the two facts that the Japanese punctuator given at the end of the text proper was "Itō Yukimiki of Naniwa" and that the bookseller was "Ogawa Gihei of Ōtsu," it would seem that this work was published in the Kansai area. Furthermore, because dates of the "application" and "permission" [for printing] of the aforementioned Jinling guijia zhitan are recorded in the Kyōhō igo Ōsaka shuppan shoseki mokuroku 享保以後大阪出版書籍目録 [List of Books Published in Osaka from the Kyōhō Reign Forward] (Osaka: Ōsaka tosho shuppangyō kumiai, 1936), while such information for the Dunbi suiwen lu cannot be found in such book lists, perhaps the initial Japanese punctuator of the text printed the work himself without permission.

Bibliographically speaking, it seems that the first printed edition of the Dunbi suiwen lu has not been passed down to the present, for it was apparently banned both by the Qing government and by the Taipings. In the opening statement of Xie Xingyao's 謝興堯 "Dunbi suiwen lu ba" 盾鼻隨聞錄跋 [Postface to the Dunbi suiwen lu] (in his Taiping tianguo congshu shisan zhong 太平天国叢書十三種 [Thirteen Works in a Collection on the Taipings]),[e] he notes: "This book is a work of the Xianfeng period, though its circulation was highly limited. Woodblock printed editions of it are exceedingly hard to come by now. Printed editions of it are extremely rare. Editions one may see today are either manuscripts or those printed in

Japan."

The Taiping tianguo ziliao mulu 太平天国資料目録 [Bibliography of Source Materials on the Taiping Rebellion] (appended to Taiping tianguo 太平天国 [The Taiping Rebellion], Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1957) mentions the Dunbi suiwen lu in eight juan and gives both a manuscript edition of Xianfeng 9 (1859) in one stringbound volume held in the Beijing Library as well as a privately printed edition by Wang Kun 汪堃 in two stringbound volumes, dated Guangxu 1 (1875), "held by Xie Xingyao."[f] Perhaps Xie obtained this latter private reprinting by Wang Kun after having written that "editions one may see today are either manuscripts or those printed in Japan." This 1875 edition of the Dunbi suiwen lu was the one used in volume four of Taiping tianguo, the documentary collection compiled by the Zhongguo shixuehui 中国史学会 (China Historical Association] and published in 1952. (A comparison with the Xianfeng edition in the Beijing Library reveals a small number of discrepancies).

The manuscript editions of this text brought to Japan, as noted above, were from Bunkyū 2 or 1862, and the manuscript held in the Iwase Bunko dates to early in Bunkyū 4 or 1864 (in the second lunar month of that year, the reign title was changed to Genji). Both are thus manuscripts dating prior to the reprinting of Guangxu 1 (1875, which corresponds to Meiji 8). Hence, the text obtained in Shanghai by Takasugi and the others was either the Xianfeng edition or a copy made from it and brought back to Japan. As for the reprinting of Guangxu 1, I have seen three copies of it in the collection of Fujita Toyohachi 藤田豊八 ([1869-1929], now in the Tōyō Bunko). They are all identical. However, the Tōyō Bunko's Fujita bunko mokuroku 藤田文庫目録 [List of Books in the Fujita Collection] (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1930) errs in giving the author of this work as Yu Qinsheng 俞秦生, apparently the result of some sort of misunderstanding.

In the "introductory remarks" to the Dunbi suiwen lu, we read as follows: "I was an expectant official in Guilin. Obeying my charge, I went to the encampment and wrote down correspondence. We covered five provinces. Along the way, I compiled a volume of recorded personal observations. After the bandits fled to the eastern provinces, I left my post on a plea of illness. I copied down reports and regularly recorded the discrepancies in the stories reported." To elaborate a bit, he was at his bureaucratic post in Guilin, and then entered the military camp as assigned. There he became a scribe and rode about on campaigns with the Qing armed forces in their battles with the Taiping Army in five provinces: Hunan, Hubei, Jiangxi, Anhui, and Jiangsu. After the Taipings entered Shandong, he used the pretext of illness to quit his appointment. He then compiled a vol-

ume of reports, and unsubstantiated rumors were not, as a rule, included in it.

When Wang Kun was serving as the circuit intendant of Yongning in Sichuan, he was censured by Instructor (xuezheng 学政) He Shaoji 何紹基 and was dismissed from office by Governor-General Huang Zonghan 黄宗漢 (He's relative by marriage), both of which angered him greatly. A man of perverse nature, Wang Kun included in his work that it was impossible that all of the women in He's family had been the objects of Taiping obscenities. He went on to add extraordinary contempt with countless words of calumny for the high official for whom he bore such hatred. When He Guiqing 何桂清 became governor-general of the Liang-Jiang provinces, he ordered the woodblocks for this book burned, according to Xue Fucheng 薛福成 (in his Yongan biji 庸庵筆記 [Notes from an Ordinary Hut], juan 3, "Dunbi suiwen lu danghui" 盾鼻隨聞錄當燬 [Destruction by Fire of the Dunbi suiwen lu], 1902).[9] Yet, argues Xie Xingyao, while the personal attacks are immoral, there are places in the text worthy of consultation in which Wang directly describes invaluable historical materials that he saw firsthand.

Luo Ergang 羅爾綱 , however, has written an article entitled "Yibu Taiping tianguo de jinshu" 一部太平天国的禁書 [One Work Banned by the Taipings] (in Taiping tianguo shiliao bianwei ji 太平天国史料辨偽集 [Essays Distinguishing Forgeries of Historical Documents of the Taiping Rebellion], Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 1955). In it he quotes from a manuscript entitled the Jieyu hui lu 劫余灰錄 [Account of Burning to Ashes], which was banned as a Taiping work. He then discuss the "introductory remarks" of the work in which the author claims to have recorded things he personally witnessed. Through a detailed analysis of the content of this work, Luo concludes that it was a forgery, and thus one cannot consider it a Taiping work. His textual research is extremely detailed and cannot be gone into here. However, inasmuch as the Dunbi suiwen lu was banned both by the Qing government and by the Taipings, one probably did not see it much in general circulation. (It is said that an edition was printed in Tongzhi 2 [1863] under the changed title Chaobao suiwen lu 鈔報隨聞錄 [Random Notes from Documents] and is held in the Nanjing Library). The fact that this book was reprinted in Japan roughly at the time of the Meiji Restoration under such circumstances is worthy of particular note from the perspective of Taiping bibliography.

If I may be permitted a bibliographic digression, let us return to the subject of the relationship between Ōshio Heihachirō 大塩平

and the Taipings [see SJS 5.2, pp. 33-44]. One thing about which we raised serious doubts was the question of how it was that Ōshio, in the words of Ishizaki Tōgoku 石崎東国, was "a man thoroughly conversant in...Christianity." How are the Wang Yangming School [of which Ōshio was a professed adherent--JAF] and Christianity linked? Ishizaki argues that "Ōshio's thorough knowledge of Christianity (Kirishitan 切支丹) was well known from studies done already at the time of the incident involving Mizuno Isanori 水野軍記 and Toyota Mitsugi 豊田貢." Then, Ishizaki cites a work of unclear authorship, entitled Ōshio den 大塩伝 [Biography of Ōshio (Heihachirō)], as follows:

> After the incident involving Mizuno Isanori [an incident following Mizuno's own death--Masuda] settled down, I was looking into mysterious texts that had been confiscated and learned that they were entirely records in a secret language. Thus, not one person from the shogunal administrators on down could understand a word of it. It seemed as though only Heihachirō had completely mastered it so that he could comprehend its meaning in great depth after just one reading. People of the time all sighed in respect and declared him divine.

After the uprising, all traces of Ōshio and his son soon disappeared. "Many stories tell that Mitsugi studied the magical methods of Christianity from his books which she received from him directly, then hid herself in a ravine deep in the mountains, and attempted all manner of magical tricks." Ishizaki then comes to a far-fetched conjecture: "Thus, the fact that Mr. Ōshio was thoroughly conversant with Christianity and, of course, that he acquired this tradition from Hong Xiuquan 洪秀全 and Feng Yunshan 馮雲山 further demonstrate this," presumably referring to the theory of Ōshio's Christianity.

The "incident of the Christian heretic," which arose in the Kyoto-Osaka area during the Bunsei years [1818-30] and in which Toyota Mitsugi (a woman), who allegedly received her training in Christian witchcraft from Mizuno Isanori, was the "principal offender," was judged to be one of Ōshio's three achievements while in office (according to Kōda Shigetomo 幸田成友) [see SJS, V.2, pp. 33-34]. Ōshio was said to have rushed to use it to enhance his reputation. Kōda, however, raises doubts about whether Toyota Mitsugi, Ōshio's follower, was really a Christian. While one can see in the records (depositions and affidavits) the facts that they uttered incantations to "Zensumaruharaiso" ゼンスマルハライソ (Jesus, Mary, and Paradise), prepared for the baptism, and secretly kept pictures

of "Tentei Nyorai" 天帝如来, still from their depositions we see a kind of dualist or heterogeneous nature in which they had stolen money entrusted to them to perform incantations and prayers, such as offerings to the fox god.

That Ōshio acquired much knowledge of Christianity or training in it as a result of this scrutiny is extremely doubtful, if not altogether laughable. Under the circumstances at the time, his was an investigation and an effective judgment of what was deemed a thoroughly "heterodox religion." Thus, it is unimaginable that he would have found any need to study the fundamental religious principles or doctrines of Christianity at all. It was a judgment based solely on an investigation into their conduct and behavior from the biased perspective against this "heterodoxy."

Ōshio's written judgment on this case seems to have circulated rather widely and was included in "Shiryō sōsho (6)" 史料叢書 六 [Series of Historical Materials], in Shiseki shūran 史籍集覧 [Collection of Historical Documents] (1882-83).[h] It appears as well in an appendix to the aforementioned three-stringbound-volume manuscript in my collection, and I also have a thin manuscript of the written judgment itself, entitled Kirishitan kyō jahōsha keizaisei sho 切支丹行邪法者刑罪制書 [Report on the Adjudication of the Guilt for Heterodox Practices of the Christians]. After examining these materials, we find not so much as a particle of evidence to substantiate the idea that the investigation covered the religious principles or doctrines of Christianity. Thus, from our present perspective, reasoning to the contrary borders on nonsense. At least, as seen in the judgment in the case involving his follower Toyota Mitsugi, Ōshio was not "a man extremely learned in the Christian religion," and frgaments such as Ishizaki's assertion that he studied "mysterious [Christian] texts that had been confiscated" cannot be accepted.

Westerners refer to the Christianity practiced by the Taiping rebels as "Taiping Chirstianity," thus stressing its distinctiveness. The American missionary, Issachar J. Roberts, with whom Hong Xiuquan studied Christianity in Guangzhou early on, later visited the Taipings' Heavenly Capital (Nanjing) and spent some time there, observing conditions under the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom. When he left Nanjing, though, he reported on the Christianity of the Taipings: "They are carrying out their political objectives with their ridiculous religious pretensions."[1] However, Luo Ergang argues that the Society of God Worshippers "used a certain kind of training in Christianity as the foundation and forged it into an intellectual weapon

in the Chinese peasant revolution of that time. It also used certain Christian religious ceremonies and made them a means of organizing the revolutionary multitudes." He goes on to say that:

> The Society of God Worshippers first and foremost synthesized a simple anti-feudal egalitarianism--peace for all peasants throughout the realm, equality of all people, equal land distribution, and the like--with a certain egalitarian idea within Christian doctrine, and they created a "revolutionary God." This meant that all people throughout the realm, regardless of who they were, were the sons and daughters of the Lord, and before God commoners were the equal of the emperor. By using their God in Heaven, they attacked the emperor on earth, the highest ruler in feudal society. It was thus an attack on the spirit of heirarchy of the feudal system that had been in China for several thousand years. The religion of the Society of God Worshippers also made use of the God of Christianity to attack all of the feudal superstitions and the authority--from Confucius to King of Hell--that the landlord class used to oppress the peasants, and it liberated the Chinese peasantry from the shackles of ancient myths... The religion of the God Worshippers advanced yet another step and merged both with a certain egalitarianism in Christianity and with ancient Chinese ideas of Great Harmony (Datong 大同). In so doing, they hauled down to earth a visionary Heavenly Kingdom (Tianguo 天国) and created the Taiping "Heavenly Kingdom" of freedom and equality, in which "the entire realm was a single family, all enjoying great peace," without exploitation or oppression.[2]

Luo Ergang also argues that although the religion of the Society of God Worshippers included two sides, religious superstitions and revolutionary thought, in their early years the superstitious element played an extremely important organizational role. In subsequent years when the "Heavenly Capital" was erected at Nanjing, though, it occasioned the opposite effect on the internal structure of the Taiping movement. Yang Xiuqing 楊秀清, using the pretext of the "Heavenly Father's Descent to Earth" (whereby the Heavenly Father or God descended to earth and took possession of Yang's body), sought to usurp Hong Xiuquan's position of authority, and Hong Xiuquan had Yang killed, for his "treason was divulged by Heaven." "As a result of the conflict between Hong and Yang," claims Luo, "the superstitious disguises of the Heavenly Father and Heavenly Elder Brother were completely stripped off, and this made the masses indifferent to

religion." So saying, Luo sees the religious aspect of the Taiping movement as a disguise--a means of forging political cohesion--basically for the purposes of revolution.

In the third volume of Jian Yuwen's 簡又文 three-volume work, Taiping Tianguo dianzhi tongkao 太平天国典制通考 [Comprehensive Analysis of the Institutions of the Taipings] (Hong Kong: Jianshi mengjin shuwu, 1958), there is a section entitled "Zongjiao kao" 宗教考 [Analysis of Religion] which is subdivided into three parts: "The Personal Religion of Hong Xiuquan," "Taiping Christianity," and "Foreigners' Views of Taiping Christianity." The analysis runs to 488 pages and goes into great depth and detail. Jian shows that, seen historically, Christianity went threw many different changes depending on time and circumstances. "We cannot deny the capacity of Christianity to undergo change and to develop naturally, nor can we deny the providential power of Chinese believers to transform it themselves. No one would deny that that was a genuine time of great tumult, and we all must recognize accordingly that [the Taipings] had a distinctive form of Christianity." On the basis of these premises, Jian concludes that "'Taiping Christianity' was one strain in the history of Christianity which evolved and took shape in China."

In exposing the superstitious nature of their religious beliefs, Luo touches on how Eastern King Yang Xiuqing--originally a peasant from a mountain village who worked in the local hills and made charcoal, he was a ruthless creature with a natural gift for strategic leadership--tried to unseat and replace Heavenly King Hong Xiuquan and how he was killed by Hong in retaliation. When Hong discovered Yang's plan for a coup d'état, he immediately sent secret messengers to his kings, who were in the midst of battle at various sites in the country, calling them to return to the "Heavenly Capital." Northern King Wei Changhui 韋昌輝 was the first to return to Nanjing, and he attacked and killed Yang Xiuqing without delay. Not only was Yang himself cut down, but allegedly his entire family and all the officers and troops under his command as well, some 20,000 in all meeting their deaths. This occurred in late August and early September of Xianfeng 6 (1856), though historical records give differing exact dates.

Wei then replaced Yang, took effective control over the Heavenly Capital, and brought his own pressure to bear on the Heavenly King. Returning to Nanjing after Wei was Assistant King Shi Dakai 石達開, who like Wei had reason to despise Yang's tyranny, and he reprimanded Wei for carrying out the massive slaughter of Yang's whole family and all his military forces. When Wei Changhui then tried to kill Shi

Dakai, Shi escaped alone by clinging to a rope furtively let down the ramparts of the city and fled to Anhui. Wei proceeded to murder all of Shi's family members remaining within the city (roughly occurring on September 20, 1856). Having left the Heavenly Capital, Shi assembled an army in the Anhui region and attempted to break into the Heavenly Capital to punish Wei Changhui. When he learned that Shi's huge army was approaching, Hong Xiuquan in response rallied an anti-Wei group within the city and had them attack and execute Wei. The latter's decapitated head was then sent to Shi Dakai in Ningguo (Anhui) for inspection (in November).

Eventually, Shi Dakai reentered the Heavenly Capital at the head of his large armed force and was given power over state affairs for the "Heavenly Kingdom." In just over eight months' time, he departed the Heavenly Capital with an armed force under his command, attacking on the Anhui front, and he never returned to Nanjing. Hong Xiuquan's two elder brothers (by a different mother) and confidantes--the Tranquillity King Hong Renfa 洪仁発 and the Blessing King Hong Renda 洪仁達 --fell out with Shi, and even Hong Xiuquan was said to have feared that Shi, like Yang Xiuqing and Wei Changhui before him, would come to outshine the Heavenly King and assume his position. When he learned of the atmosphere in the capital, he severed all personal contacts himself.

In this manner, internal dissension continued unabated with the power struggles among the various kings, the power-holders among the Taipings, and one by one from the very beginning of the uprising they lost their leading generals (the Southern King Feng Yunshan and the Western King Xiao Chaogui 蕭朝貴 had already died in battle). Gradually, the signs of a thorough internal breakdown became more and more apparent. After Shi Dakai's departure, the principal military powers supporting the Taiping movement were the young Chen Yucheng 陳玉成 and Li Xiucheng 李秀成 , fellow provincials from poor peasant families in Guangxi who had both worked as hired laborers. Both had also received Taiping kingships. Li Xiucheng was captured after the fall of the Heavenly Capital, and in the deposition he was compelled to write (whether it is entirely the work of Li Xiucheng or not remains in doubt), he noted: "The dispute between the Assistant King [Shi Dakai] and the Tranquillity King and the Blessing King having caused the Assistant King to march far away from the capital, the morale of the soldiers and the people was broken and troubled... No one was seeing to affairs at the [Taiping] court, and there was not a single capable general in the field."[i] These statements also indicate that the Taipings were clearly on the verge of collapse.

Ishizaki explains this internal dissension in extremely simple terms, by stating that it was due to the fact that Hong Xiuquan was a Japanese. "The Eastern King Yang [Xiu]qing intended to usurp the throne for himself, and [Hong Xiuquan] ultimately had Wei Changhui murder him. Wei Changhui too was later killed [by Hong]. In short, these events occurred at the time of the founding (?), although in fact <u>they rebelled when they ultimately learned that Hong was a Japanese</u>."[3]

Furthermore, Ishizaki says nothing about the fact that these gruesome power struggles among the leaders of the Taipings weakened the Taiping movement, but on the contrary notes the following:

> The elimination of these rebel officers was by no means a cause for the weakening of the Taiping Rebellion. The Taipings retained their strategic position at Jinling [Nanjing], drew back to Jing-Chu 荊楚 in the West,[j] joined it with Qing-Qi 青斉 in the north, terrain covering several thousand <u>li</u>, with armed forces numbering a million, and many strong leaders and valiant officers scattered about like the stars in the sky. They continued to defeat the armies of Zeng Guofan 曽国藩, Zuo Zongtang 左宗棠, and Liu Mingchuan 劉銘伝 at various sites, and the government's forces showed not the least fight in them.

Even after the dissension among the central Taiping power-holders, fighting with the Qing armies continued, but Ishizaki does not recognize the gradual movement toward destruction--"no one was seeing to affairs at the [Taiping] court, and there was not a single valiant officer in the field"--but writes with this empty optimism.

23. The <u>Kan'ei shōsetsu</u> and the <u>Riben qishi ji</u>

The Taiping movement was, of course, an anti-Qing revolution which arose toward the end of the dynasty, a struggle which rocked the foundations of Manchu rule and nearly succeeded in toppling it. If we return 210 years prior to the rebellion, we find, in the very last years of the Ming dynasty, a war of resistance fought by Han Chinese against the Manchu armies which had invaded Chinese soil from Manchuria to the northeast. The Ming state was on the verge of collapse, and the war sent shock waves as far away as Japan. News of the great tumult of this dynastic transition in China and the ethnic clash it engendered were conveyed to Japan at the time. I would like now to examine how the news was received and what response was made in Japan at the time.

Earlier in this work [see SJS V.1, pp. 60-70], we noted that the descendents of the anti-Manchu heroes of the late Ming, Zheng Chenggong 鄭成功 and his General Gan Hui 甘輝, appear as extraordinary, fictional heroes in popular Japanese novelistic treatments of the Taipings, such as Shinsetsu Min Shin kassen ki 新説明清合戦記 [New Account of the War between the Ming and the Qing]. The complex events that transpired on the mainland during the collapse of the Ming dynasty were not only treated as popular topics, for they also created all manner of sensations among the authorities of the Edo shogunate.

Zheng Zhilong 鄭芝龍, although originally the head of a band of pirates, was the leader in the Fujian region of the anti-Manchu popular movement of the time. He and his son, Zheng Chenggong [or Koxinga (Coxinga), as he later became known], both had ties to Japan. In particular, Zheng Chenggong (Prince of Yanping 延平) was the son of Zhilong and a Japanese woman, and the fact that he was "half-Japanese" makes it effectively impossible to deny that [some] Japanese have felt an emotional intimacy with him.

Because of the close ties the two Zhengs had with Japan, they sent a number of emissaries to the Edo shogunate, seeking weapons and requesting military assistance. The shogunate deliberated about many policy responses, investigated the matter keenly, and was deeply pained about whether or not to plunge in and dispatch troops overseas. This is the subject matter of the oft-cited work, Kan'ei shōsetsu 寛永小説 [Account of the Kan'ei Era] (in Zoku shiseki shūran 続史籍集覧 [Collection of Historical Documents, Continued], Tokyo: Kondō shuppanbu, 1893).[k] The word "shōsetsu" 小説 in the title does not carry its current meaning of "novel" or "fiction," but was a chronicle of the affairs of the Kan'ei period [1624-30] under the third Tokugawa Shogun Iemitsu 家光, written shortly after the events themselves in a conversational, historical style. Other works of this sort exist as well, such as the Keichō shōsetsu 慶長小説 [Account of the Keichō Era (1596-1611)] and the Genna shōsetsu 元和小説 [Account of the Genna Era (1615-24)].

In one section of the Kan'ei shōsetsu, we find the following:

> Koxinga massed his men and set off to besiege a place known as Takasago [Taiwan]. At that time, he respectfully sought [military] assistance from Japan and humbly offered all manner of rare gifts. The Nagasaki Administrator sent word [of these gifts to higher-ups]. If assistance was not forthcoming, worriedly [Iemitsu], what would be his reputation. The "Three Houses" [major collateral lines of Kii, Owari, and Mito], the Senior Councillor [Ii Naotaka], and

others were summoned for consultation. At this time, the Three Houses (shinpan 親藩 daimyos) proposed to Iemitsu that he name them each Commanders-in-Chief and send them on a military expedition, but Ii Naotaka rejected the idea, saying: "As for the sending of military assistance, I humbly believe that there is no merit in it whatsoever and that it will be utterly useless." Although Iemitsu "was much concerned thereafter, the Senior Councillor's objection was a plausible conclusion, and there were no instructions for assistance [to be sent]. The gifts were returned by the Nagasaki Administrator."

There was a postface (in Kanbun) to the Kan'ei shōsetsu (in this edition of the Zoku shiseki shūran text) by Hayashi Nobuatsu 林信篤 (or Hōkō 鳳岡), dated "Kyōhō 3" [1718]. In it, he notes: "This work has been passed down from the Kan'ei period and is said to convey the narrative of [Iemitu's] trusted vassals, Nagai Hyūga no kami 永井日向守, Matsudaira Iga no kami 松平伊賀守, Yagiumi Tajima no kami 柳生但馬守, Captain Sakuma 佐久間将監, and others. My ancestor, Hayashi Dōshun 林道春 [Hayashi Razan 林羅山], was privy to discussions among the officialdom, and I note some differences in the details, but it would be difficult to prove... I have copied this out anew and presented it to the shogunal authorities. It may be useful for further reference."

However, in the present edition of Kan'ei shōsetsu in the Zoku shiseki shūran, this postface is cut midway (perhaps corresponding to the tail end of the first half of the work), and the aforementioned section containing Koxinga's request for military assistance appears in the latter half or after the postface. Thus, it seems as though this section of the text differs from that in which Hayashi claimed to correct discrepancies of detail between what "Hayashi Dōshun was privy to" and what was discussed by the trusted vassals of the shogun. Perhaps someone later added this portion to the text. In any event, the "facts" of this story in general were clearly handed down at the time. Because these stories were only later transcribed, inconsistencies may unavoidably have cropped up in the telling. For example, the Koxinga (Zheng Chenggong) in the text cited above was in this instance a reference to his father, Zheng Zhilong. This error was soon pointed out in a work known as Taiwan Teishi kiji 台湾鄭氏記事 [Chronicle of the Zheng Family of Taiwan] (published in Bunsei 11 [1828]) by Kawaguchi Chōju 川口長孺, who was in charge of the Mito domainal historical records.[1] We know this because the document requesting military assistance was presented to the shogunate by Zheng Zhilong's emissary, via the Nagasaki Administrator, and was subsequently included in Ka-i hentai 華夷変態 [Exchanges between

the Civilized (Japan) and the Barbarian (Foreign Countries)], a text we shall discuss later.

Although we do find in the Kan'ei shōsetsu the "Three Houses" vying with one another to request a military expedition, there is another chronicle as well. An item entitled "Teishi enpei negai ra, fuku fūsetsu" 鄭氏援兵願等附風説 [Zheng's Request for Military Reinforcements, with Appended Report] in the Tsūkō ichiran 通航一覧 [Survey of Foreign Relations (by Hayashi Fukusai 林復斎 ; Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1913)] reads:

> As the Great Ming fell ever more into chaos, Zheng Zhilong of Fujian, promoting a descendent of the emperor, the Prince of Tang 唐 , fought against the Tartars. Although there was no clear victor, because they were such a great enemy, Zheng Zhilong planned with a subordinate of his by the name of Cui Zhi 崔芝 to send a merchant by the name of Lin Gao 林高 as emissary to Nagasaki. ([Note in original:] Upon investigation, Lin Gao arrived in Nagasaki on the twelfth lunar month of Shōhō 2 [1645]). Although they were requesting military assistance from Japan, Shogun Iemitsu had doubts about their presentations and did not give permission [for the request].

This passage, quoting from the Nanryū kun iji 南龍君遺事 [Memories of Master Nanryū (Tokugawa Yorinobu 徳川頼宣 , Lord of Kishū)], indicates that Iemitsu harbored doubts and refused permission.

In another text, volume 65 of the Daiyūin tono ojikki 大猷院御実記 [Chronicle of Shogun Iemitsu] (in volume 40 of Kokushi taikei 国史大系 [Great Compedium of Japanese History], revised edition) by Narushima Motonao 成島司直 ([1778-1862] the shogun's private Confucian teacher and head of the shogunate's library), there is an entry for the tenth lunar month of Shōhō 3:

> It has become known that when Zhilong humbly requested military reinforcements, a proposal was forthcoming from the Three Houses. The lords of Kii, Owari, and Mito called together a number of men and requested the dispatching of a military expedition. However, according to the Nanryū kō furyaku 南龍公諡略 [Outline Geneology of Lord Nanryū], Lord Yorinobu said that sending an expedition from Japan would not be successful and not only would be humiliating for the Japan but would insure a long-term enemy of a foreign land, and it would cause eternal harm. Even if Japanese troops were to win victories and gain terrain, it would be like rocky soil, of no advantage to the country, in fact inviting disasters in years to come. He did not know if it

would be good for their reputation to grant this request.

Furthermore, the text notes: "If the Nanryū kō furyaku mentions the Houses, there is no doubt about it." This would indicate a recognition of the value of the historical materials recorded in the Nanryū kō furyaku and a confidence in its accounts. It effectively refutes criticism of ideas about the Kan'ei shōsetsu as a work of gossip.

One document still remains, however, that substantiates the fact that deep within private shogunal circles preparations seem to have been underway for a military expedition. In the first volume of his Shinchō zenshi 清朝全史 [Complete History of the Qing Dynasty] (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1914), Inaba Kunzan 稲葉君山 (Iwakichi 岩吉, 1876-1940) has a chapter entitled "Minmatsu Shinsho ni okeru Nihon no ichi" 明末清初における日本の位置 [The Place of Japan in Late Ming and Early Qing]. On the one hand, citing records from the Kan'ei shōsetsu in this section, he argues that the shogunate was not positively inclined toward a military expedition; yet, citing "Tomita monjo" 富田文書 [Tomita Documents] (privately held by Tomita Takahiro 富田等弘 in Fukushima City), a collection of letters of the time from Itakura Shigemune 板倉重宗 (the shugunate's representative in Kyoto) to his nephew Shigenori 重矩, he notes that "the shogunate had clearly already issued some sort of expeditionary order to Itakura Shigemune, a collateral relative of the shogun, and Shigemune had confided his personal views about it to his nephew, Mondo no suke 主水祐 Shigenori."

In an 1891 article entitled "Tokugawa Iemitsu no Shina shinryaku no kito" 徳川家光の支那侵略の企図 [Tokugawa Iemitsu's Plan for the Invasion of China] published some time ago in the journal Shigaku zasshi 史学雑誌 by Ogura Hidenuki 小倉秀貫, these Tomita Documents are cited. And, in a chapter of his book Zōtei kaigai kyōtsū shiwa 増訂海外交通史話 [History of Overseas Contacts, Revised Edition] (Tokyo: Naigai shoseki, 1930), Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助 affirmed this "plan" and made it a subject of his book.

Let us look at this section from these Tomita Documents themselves. (There seem to be some small errors of transcription or misprints in the portion cited in the Shinchō zenshi, so I follow the photographic reprints from those documents that appear in Kaigai kyōtsū shiwa).

* We plan to sail aboard ships to China [lit., the Great Ming], construct a military camp, and then wait.
* It would not be a lost cause.
* If we press forward, we can then build a moat around our

encampment.

* In all there is one Japanese general and ten assistants.
* There are ten feudal vassals with annual stipends totaling one million koku 石 of rice.
* [Item omitted]
* The feudal vassals in all gave 10,000 koku of rice to one cavalryman and either three or five foot soldiers. [Tsuji estimates that there were in excess of 20,000 troops].
* [Item omitted]
* If we do take China, we very much hope that you [i.e., the Japanese government] would offer military reinforcements.
* If we sail to China without incident, the vessels carrying the men would all need be destroyed. We pray that you will peruse the above document and then burn it. Concluded.

The instructions to burn and dispose of this document after perusing its contents indicate that the plan was moving ahead under top secret conditions. The document bears no signature, and in spite of the directions to destroy it, it [obviously] survives. These facts might lead us to conclude that this is not the original item but a copy of it. Even if it were a copy, though, the very fact that such a document exists would seem to indicate that this story is not a wholly baseless piece of fiction.

While the shogunate was secretly making preparations to dispatch troops as per the request of Zheng Zhilong, doubts were raised in deliberations within the government over Zheng's statement of request. When an emissary was about to be sent to Nagasaki, reports were received in Nagasaki to the effect that Fuzhou had already fallen [to the Manchus] and that the Prince of Tang who had made it [Fuzhou] his base was, together with Zheng Zhilong, in retreat. These matters were reported to the shogunate, and the expedition was called off. Also, a document informing the various feudal lords of these events is included in the present edition of Tsūkō ichiran (volume 212).

News that Fuzhou, where the Prince of Tang (Emperor Longwu 隆武) had set up his base with assistance from Zheng Zhilong and his son Zheng Chenggong, had come under attack by Qing armies and fallen proved apparently to be a major shock in Japan. We know this from items such as the following (dated the tenth lunar month of Shōhō 3) which appears in the aforementioned Daiyūin tono ojikki (volume 65).

> It was learned in recent intelligence coming from Nagasaki that the armies of the Ming had been defeated at Fuzhou and the Ming ruler had been killed. Retainers [in Edo] of

[daimyos] Matsudaira Nagato no kami Hidenori 松平長門守秀就, Matsudaira Shintarō Mitsumasa 松平新太郎光政, Matsudaira Ukyōdaifu Yorishige 松平右京大夫頼重, Matsudaira Awa no kami Tadahide 松平阿波守忠英, Matsudaira Aki no kami Mitsuage 松平安芸守光晟, Date Tōtōmi no kami Hidemune 伊達遠江守秀宗, Matsudaira Dewa no kami Naomasa 松平出羽守直政, Hosokawa Higo no kami Mitsunao 細川肥後守光尚, Nabeshima Shinano no kami Katsushige 鍋島信濃守勝茂, Tachibana Sakon no shōgen 立花左近将監 [Captain of the Left Guards] Tadashige 忠茂, and Arima Chūmu no shōsuke Tadayori 有馬中務少輔忠頼 were ordered to be attentive to the eventuality of foreign vessels arriving. Minister of State Komatsu Chūnagon Toshitsune 小松中納言利常, Matsudaira Echigo no kami Mitsunaga 松平越後守光長, Matsudaira Satsuma no kami Mitsuhisa 松平薩摩守光久, Mori Naiki Nagatsugu 森内記長継, and Kyōgoku Tango no kami Takahiro 京極丹後守高広 acted similarly.[m]

This would indicate that warning directives went out to the domains along the coast. In the past the Tartar pirates of the "Yuan" had made raids on Japan and greatly frightened the Kamakura shogunate. Thus, on this occasion, when the Tartar "Qing" attacked the "Great Ming" and took Fuzhou on China's southeastern coast, the base held by the Ming's last descendents, we can see that the shogunate's rapid commencement of preparations "to be attentive to the eventuality of foreign vessels arriving" indicates how greatly the collapse of the Ming exerted a ripple effect on Japan.

At first, the capital of the "Great Ming" at Beijing was attacked and taken by the Qing armies. After the Chongzhen Emperor committed suicide, descendents of the Ming imperial house bearing the surname Zhu 朱 gained followings around the country. The base established by the Prince of Fu 福 at Nanjing fell, then the base of the Prince of Lu 魯 at Shaoxing also fell; they escaped to Zhoushan Island. The Prince of Tang set up a base at Fuzhou and was there barely able to remain in existence. Both Zhoushan and Fuzhou were points from which trading vessels came to Nagasaki, and both were thus nodes linking Japan and China. Zhoushan was an isolated island which merely had a resistance capacity because of its mountain fortresses. Fuzhou, though, was situated in a corner of the mainland, and there the Prince of Tang was enthroned as emperor bearing the reign title Longwu. News that the Longwu Emperor's castle had fallen and that he had fled (he was later caught and executed by the Manchus), thus in one manner or another caused considerable shock in Japan.

Aside from the request for military reinforcements by Zheng Zhilong and others supporting the Prince of Tang at his Fuzhou base, there are records in China that indicate an application for military assistance from a group supporting the Prince of Lu in Eastern Zhejiang (Shaoxing and Zhoushan). In this instance, I am referring to the Riben qishi ji 日本乞師紀 [Record of Requesting Help from Japan] by Huang Zongxi 黃宗羲 (Lizhou 梨洲). It chronicles the unsuccessful efforts by Huang Xiaoqing 黃孝卿 (younger brother of Huang Binqing 黃斌卿, the real power at Zhoushan) and Feng Jingdi 馮京第, attendant censor to the Prince of Lu, who came to Nagasaki to request assistance. On this question, though, we can find no documents, such as might be found in the Ka-I hentai, to substantiate such a story. It would be best if the two accounts were in general consistent, thus corroborating one another's story; were this not the case, it would be precarious to try to establish the facts of the case. Not to follow such a [careful] procedure would, effectively, exceed the reach of reasoned conjecture and scrutiny. However, all manner of conjecture and scrutiny have been attempted for this case of "requesting Japanese help," and the source of proof always returns to Huang Zongxi's Riben qishi ji.

The date of Huang Xiaoqing and Feng Jingdi's request for Japanese assistance varies widely according to the historical sources (of which there are many in China), but Riben qishi ji gives the date as the third year of the reign of the Prince of Lu (in Japan it was the first year in the Keian 慶安 reign period [1648]). Although this dating remains unclear in Japanese records, it seems that the account given in the Riben qishi ji has generally been accepted in China as fact. (This work is included in: Xingchao lu 行朝錄 [Records of the Itinerant Court]; and later in Jingtuo yishi 荆駝逸史 [The Forgotten History of Jingtuo], comp. Chenhu Yishi 陳湖逸士; and Lizhou yizhu huikan 梨洲遺著彙刊 [Collected Posthumous Writings of Huang Zongxi]).[n]

This is supported, among the historical materials for the [itinerant] Southern Ming, by two sources compiled and published at the end of the Qing by Xu Zi 徐鼒 --an account in juan sixteen of Xiaotian jinian fukao 小腆紀年附考 [Chronicles of (an Era of) Small Prosperity, with Appended Annotations] (20 juan, preface dated Xianfeng 11 [1861]) and in the biographies section of Xiaotian jizhuan 小腆紀伝 [Biographies of (an Era of) Small Propserity]. In the biographies of Feng Jingdi that appear in works of the Kangxi reign of the early Qing as well--such as in the Nanjiang yishi 南疆逸史 [Forgotten History of the Southern Reaches] by Wen Ruilin 温睿

臨, the Haidong yishi 海東逸史 [Forgotten History East of the Sea (Taiwan)] by Wengzhou Laomin 翁州老民, and the Dongnan jishi 東南紀事 [Accounts of the Southeast] by Shao Tingcai 邵廷采 (most of which were passed down in manuscript form and only published in the late Qing period)--all seem to have been taken over without change from the Riben qishi ji. Although they lack "biography" sections, the "Jianguo ji" 監国紀 [Records of the Administrator of the Realm] in the Lu chunqiu 魯春秋 [Rise and Fall of Lu] and the main body of the Dongnan jishi 東南記事 [Records of the Southeast] by Zuoyin Feiren 左尹非人 [pseud. of Zha Jizuo 查繼佐] both follow accordingly.[o] Rather than all taking their information directly from Huang Zongxi's work, perhaps they all drew upon stories (?) from the same source. In any event, they all effectively repeat the same thing, and the content of their accounts is somewhat odd from our perspective.

The request for assistance from Japan from Feng Jingdi, who appears in the various "biography" sections of the works cited above (with the exception of Dongnan jishi [Accounts of the Southeast] where his biography is missing; he is mentioned in the biography of Wang Yi 王翊), for all intents and purposes, seems to have been based upon Huang Zongxi's work (or both on a common ancestor). According to this account of the story, both Feng Jingdi and Huang Xiaoqing were promised an expeditionary force by the "King of Satsuma" 撒斯瑪王, with whom Cui Zhi had become intimate after a number of trips to Japan; thus, they went as emissaries in search of help to the "island of Nagasaki." Just at that time, the story goes, Japan had concluded a war with Westerners (Portuguese?), and permission for their delegation to come on land was not forthcoming. The King of Satsuma heard that Feng Jingdi and his associates had been refused permission to land at Nagasaki; taking this as an "embarrassment to Japan," he decided, in consultation with the Tokugawa shogun, to send criminals from various islands, and he sent 300,000 Hongwu cash (some sources give a figure of 100,000). There was, however, a brothel in Nagasaki, and Huang Xiaoqing had shut himself up tightly inside, apparently forgetting that he had sailed to Japan to request assistance; he was thus ridiculed by Japanese and lost all interest in a military expedition. This is the general story, with slight differences depending on the text consulted.

Despite the fact that some of what is recorded in this account--in its more specific details--appears to be rather factually strange material, Feng Jingdi and Huang Xiaoqing probably did come to Japan regardless of the absence of any mention of such in Japanese records.

Zhang Huangyan 張煌言 (Cangshui 蒼水) has a poem entitled "Song Huang Jinwu [Huang Xiaoqing] Feng Shiyu [Jingdi] qishi Riben" 送黃金吾 [黃孝卿] 馮侍御[京第]乞師日本 [Sending Off Lord of the Imperial Insignia Huang (Xiaoqing) and Attendant Censor Feng (Jingdi) to Seek Assistance from Japan" in his poetry collection, Qiling ji 奇零集 [Drafts of Curious Fragments]. It would seem highly bizarre to have composed a poem of this sort for an entirely fictional incident. Zhang Huangyan was a soldier-scholar who, together with Zheng Chenggong, led troops in an attack on Nanjing where Qing forces had camped. When later apprehended, he refused to surrender in allegiance to his captors and was put to death. His epitaph (included in Zhang Cangshui ji 張蒼水集 [The Writings of Zhang Huangyan])[p] was written by Huang Zongxi, not someone later, and perhaps Huang patterned his Riben qishi ji after Zhang's life.

Zhang Huangyan's writings, Zhang Cangshui ji (the Qiling ji can be found in this collection as well), were proscribed by the Qing government, and were scarcely known. Late in the Qing period, the anti-Manchu nationalist Zhang Taiyan 章太炎 printed them to propagandize the anti-Qing revolutionary cause. There is now as well a 1959 edition published by Zhonghua shuju.

Something evident in the Riben qishi ji, and its traces can be found in the Ka-I hentai, is the recording of the fact that they came [to Japan] for help, carrying Buddhist texts as gifts, but they failed. A monk by the name of Zhanwei 湛微 who had returned home from Japan told them that, because the Japanese treasured such Buddhist texts, if they brought them to Japan, they would succeed in their request for assistance. The monk encouraged Ruan Jin 阮進, an "admiral" under the Prince of Lu, and Ruan sent Zhanwei together with his own younger brother, Ruan Mei, also in the navy, as an emissary carrying [Buddhist] texts "in the winter of 1649." However, earlier Zhanwei had referred to himself as the "saint of the golden lion," and thus incurred the enmity of certain Catholics and ended up under arrest and exiled from Japan. The second time he arrived with the emissary and was banished, his request for assistance having failed, and so he returned to China with the Buddhist texts he had brought along. Thus the story is recounted in the sources.

A document somewhat in correspondence with this account can be found in the Ka-I hentai (volume 1), but it is unrelated to the matter of seeking assistance from Japan. This is a document which reads at its very end: "Japanese translation of a document sent to the Nagasaki Administrator from the Prince of Lu of the Great Ming... [dated] X day of the tenth lunar month of the fourth year [1649] of the reign of the Prince of Lu, the administrator of the realm." We

have no original for the "Japanese translation." The main contents of the documents are first laid out--the "saint of the golden lion came from Japan, and explaining his aspirations on behalf of Buddhism and [Buddhist] texts, said he wished to travel to Japan with another as emissaries, carrying a statue of the Guanyin Bodhisattva and a complete set of the Buddhist scriptures, and thus to spread the Buddhist law." Then, an explanation is attched to the document which indicates that this was hearsay added at a later date.

> The golden lion was a Chinese monk [Tōsō 唐僧] who traveled back and forth to Nagasaki. He lived and worked within the domain of [the lord of] Nabeshima. Returning to China, he feigned to speak in the name of the authorities. Receiving a complete set of the Buddhist scriptures from Senguan 森宮 [a reference to Zheng Chenggong, but for Zheng to come up in this context is extremely strange and thus may be an error based on rumor--Masuda], he returned to Japan and won great fame for himself. When the false claim became known, he was banished from the territory of [the lord of] Nabeshima and sent home. Rumor has it that he was imprisoned.

It is not entirely clear if this matter concerning "saint of the golden lion" (as he appears in Japanese accounts) was conveyed in connection with the request for assistance in China or if it was conveyed in Japan unrelated to matters concerned with such requests. The Xiaotian jinian fukao and other texts merely say that he sought military assistance.

Within the Siming congshu 四明叢書 [Collection of the Siming Mountains] (ed. Zhang Shouyong 張壽鏞 , 1934), there is one juan entitled "Feng Wang liang shilang mulu" 馮王兩侍郎目錄 [Epitaphs of the Two Attendant Censors, Feng (Jingdi) and Wang (Yi)]; there it is included as the work of Quan Zuwang (Xieshan) 全祖望 (謝山). It is doubtful that these are actually the work of Quan Zuwang, as they are probably the work of a later author using his name. (They are not included in the "Sibu congkan" 四部叢刊 edition [volume 95] of the Jieqi ting ji 鮚埼亭集 [Collection from the Jieqi Pavillion], the collection of Quan Zuwang's poetry and prose essays).[q] On the issue of requesting assistance from Japan, it is consistent with the accounts and essentially the same in content as the Riben qishi ji; frequently sections are identical word-for-word.

On the other hand, Quan Zuwang's "Lizhou xiansheng shendao beiwen" 梨洲先生神道碑文 [Epitaph for the Late Master Lizhou (Huang Zongxi)] (included in juan 1 of Jichi ting ji) which recounts the career of Huang Zongxi is without a doubt the work of Quan himself, and it is often cited as such. Although Huang Zongxi never

stated it himself, the text of the "Lizhou xiansheng shendao beiwen" claims that he in fact went to Nagasaki as co-emissary with Feng Jingdi to seek assistance from Japan; a note in the text adds at this point: "This was Lord Feng's second trip seeking help." This matter is altogether absent from the epitaph for Feng Jingdi, cited above, and if this were also the work of Quan Zuwang, the texts should be consistent on this point. Furthermore, Quan seems to have been boasting about this point [in his epitaph for Huang]: "No scholars have yet mentioned the eastern travels of the Lord [Huang]"; and "After the passage of a hundred years [following Huang's death], men will then be able to consider it." Such digressions cannot be found in the epitaph for Feng Jingdi, and from the perspective of this point, Feng's epitaph appears to be the work of a hand other than Quan Zuwang's.

In any event, Quan's thesis that Huang traveled to Japan to seek assistance was first articulated by him, though the evidence to support it is weak, and it is not widely accepted. (Neither the Xiaotian jinian nor the Xiaotian jizhuan accept it). More recently, Liang Qichao and others, though, have believed it to be true and, thus, in the next chapter of this work, I would like to examine it in more concrete terms.

On the Japan side, documents indicating that in addition to Zheng Zhilong, his son Zheng Chenggong and his son Zheng Jing 鄭經 (Jinshe 錦舍), among others, came to Japan seeking help have been collected in the Ka-I hentai. In the next chapter, I would like to examine both this work and another work which used it to a considerable extent when compiled: Tsūkō ichiran ("Tōkoku bu" 唐国部 [Section on China]).

Notes

a. See Part 7 of this translation in SJS V.2 (April 1993), pp. 50-51, 55. There is a 1968 reprint of the Dunbi suiwen lu (Taibei: Wenhai chubanshe, Jindai Zhongguo shiliao congkan 298), copy in the collection of Harvard-Yenching Library.

b. Reprinted in Takasugi Shinsaku zenshū 高杉晋作全集 [Collected Works of Takahashi Shinsaku]. Ed. Hori Tetsusaburō 堀哲三郎 (Tokyo: Shin jinbutsu ōraisha, 1974), 2:141-216.

c. All of these texts are translated in volumes II and III of The Taiping Rebellion: History and Documents, ed. Franz Michael

(Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1971).

d. In his extensive, multilingual bibliography, Franz Michael (vol. III, p. 1751) gives another Japanese edition of this book: Sha Hei 謝炳, Kinryō kikō sekidan (Osaka: Kawachiya, 1869), 2 volumes. Harvard-Yenching Library holds a copy of a similarly titled work by Xie Jiehe (with the final character of his name read by its alternate reading of "hao").

e. (Beiping: Beijing yaoqi congji, 1938); (Taibei reprint: Wenhai chubanshe, 1968). Originally appeared in Yijing 逸経 2 (1936).

f. Jing-Chu: A reference to the ancient state of Chu which comprised Hunan, much of Hubei, some of Guizhou, and portions of Anhui, Jiangxi, Jiangsu, and Henan. Ca. B.C.E. 740-330. Qing-Qi: Eastern and northern Shandong.

g. There are many editions of this work. The following four are held in Harvard-Yenching Library: (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1898); (n.p.: Haishang wuyuan, 1937); (Taibei: Guangwen shuju, 1969); (Taibei: Tailian guofeng chubanshe, 1969).

h. There are three editions of this large collection listed in the catalogue of the Harvard-Yenching Library: (Tokyo: Kondō kappanjo, 1882-83); rev. ed. (Tokyo: Kondō kappanjo, 1900-03); (Tokyo: Rinsen shoten, 1967-68). All edited by Kondō Heijō 近藤瓶城, and the last edition which appeared well after Kondō's death also gives as co-editors Tsunoda Bun'ei 角田文衛 and Gorai Shigeru 五来重.

1. Luo Ergang 羅爾綱, Taiping tianguo shigao 太平天国史稿 [Draft History of the Taiping Rebellion], revised and enlarged edition (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1957), citing C. A. Tesns, "Historic Shanghai."

2. Luo Ergang, Taiping tianguo shigao.

i. Translated based closely on Michael, vol. III, pp. 1404, 1406.

3. Emphasis Masuda's. To the end he maintained this strained explanation of trying to pass Hong Xiuquan off as a Japanese (namely,

Ōshio Heihachirō). After the original leaders of the rebellion had departed, Hong's two elder brothers held power, although, as concerns these two elder brothers, Ishizaki does nothing whatsoever to resolve the question of whether they were Japanese or of mixed Sino-Japanese blood. Thus, this is undoubtedly the reason that the Yuefei jilüe and the Japanese histories of China of the time that relied on it do not even mention the two older brothers.

j. Masuda has Han 汗 instead of Wang 汪 here as well as elsewhere for the surname, though this contradicts every other citation I have seen and thus must be an error (of one stroke).

k. There is also an edition of this work in six stringbound volumes, edited by Kondō Heijō and with the same publication information, that appeared in 1917. It is held in the collection of Harvard-Yenching Library and elsewhere.

l. There is a Taibei reprint of this work by the Bank of Taiwan (1958, Taiwan wenxian congkan 5).

m. Part of this document, as well as certain details of this tale, have been closely examined in Ronald P. Toby, State and Diplomacy in Early Modern Japan: Asia in the Development of the Tokugawa Bakufu (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), esp. p. 125. The names in this list of daimyos include titles (only some of which are translated inter alia); such titles only extremely rarely indicate an actual job one performed.

n. Editions of these works, most of them held in the collection of Harvard-Yenching Library, include the following:

Huang Zongxi, Xingchao lu, in Xu Youlan 徐友蘭 , comp., Shaoxing xianzheng yishu 紹興先正遺書 [Literary Remains of Scholars from Shaoxing] (Zhejiang, 1895), volumes 47-48; (Taibei reprint: Wenhai chubanshe, 1969?).

---, Lizhou yizhu huikan, comp. Xue Fengchang 薛鳳昌 (Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1910), 20 stringbound volumes; (Taibei reprint: Longyan chubanshe, 1969), two volumes; (Taibei reprint: Wenhai chubanshe, 1969), two volumes.

---, Jingtuo yishi, comp. Chenhu Yishi 陳湖逸士 (n.p.: Jinzhang tushuju, n.d.), 24 stringbound volumes. It should be noted that the Riben qishi ji is not to be found in the list of texts given for this collection in the Harvard-Yenching catalogue.

o. The following bibliographical citations for editions of works mentioned in this paragraph can (also) be found in the collection of Harvard-Yenching Library:

Xu Zi, Xiaotian jinian fukao (1861, 20 juan); Wang Chongwu 王崇武, annot. (Shanghai reprint: Zhonghua shuju, 1957), 2 volumes; (Taibei reprint: Bank of Taiwan, 1962, Taiwan wenxian congkan 134), five volumes; (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1967), 20 juan.

---, Xiaotian jizhuan (Jinling, 1887); (Beijing reprint: Zhonghua shuju, 1958), 65 juan; appended to Xu Zi, Xiaotian jinian (Taibei reprint: Bank of Taiwan, 1963, Taiwan wenxian congkan 138), 65 juan; (Taibei reprint: Wenhai chubanshe, 1969?), four volumes; (Taibei reprint: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1977), two volumes.

Wen Ruilin, Nanjiang yishi (Shanghai reprint: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), 52 juan; (Taibei reprint: Bank of Taiwan, 1962, Taiwan wenxian congkan 132), 1830 edition in six stringbound volumes; (Tokyo reprint: Daiyasu kabushiki gaisha, 1967, in a volume entitled Ban-Min shiryō sōsho 晚明史料叢書 [Collection of Documents on the Late Ming]).

Wengzhou Laomin, Haidong yishi (Taibei reprint: Bank of Taiwan, 1961, Taiwan wenxian congkan 99), 18 juan.

Shao Tingcai, Dongnan jishi (Taibei reprint: Bank of Taiwan, 1961, Taiwan wenxian congkan 96), 12 juan.

Zha Jizuo, Lu chunqiu (Taibei reprint: Bank of Taiwan, 1961, Taiwan wenxian congkan 118).

p. The Zhonghua shuju edition of this work (mentioned in the next paragraph) appeared in 1959 (Beijing). There is an earlier edition in nine juan that appeared in Siming congshu, ed. Zhang Shouyong (preface dated 1934), ji 集 [collection] 2, volumes 30-37. Both are held at the Harvard-Yenching Library.

q. Many editions of this collection have been published, such as the following: (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1929), 38 juan; (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1936), fifteen juan; (Taibei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1969?), three volumes.