

Seigaku tōzen to Chūgoku jijō: 'zassho sakki'

西学東漸と中国事情：「雑書」札記

[The East Spread of Western Learning and Conditions in China:
Notes on "Various Books"] (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1979), pp. 31-58.

Masuda Wataru 増田渉

PART 2

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

5. The Haiquo tuzhi 海国图志 [Illustrated Gazetteer of the Sea Kingdoms] and Shengwu ji 聖武記 [Record of August {Manchu} Military Achievements] by Wei Yuan 魏源 (1794-1856)

In Japan, the most stimulating and influential Chinese-language work in the field of world geography and topography was doubtless the Haiquo tuzhi. That is to say, the Haiquo tuzhi was not simply a work that conveyed knowledge of geography and topography. It was also a study of defensive military strategy and tactics in the face of the foreign powers then exerting considerable military pressure on East Asia, including gunboats and artillery. Wei Yuan wrote the Haiquo tuzhi from an indignation borne of China's defeat in the Opium War and with that experience as an object lesson. Because of the concrete quality of their arguments concerning naval defenses, the Haiquo tuzhi and the Shengwu ji, written at about the same time, were packed with suggestions for Japan at that time. This was a time when naval defense was being actively debated in Japan, spurred by the arrival of vessels, commanded by Admiral Matthew Perry (1794-1858) and Admiral Putiatin (1803-83), along the Japanese coast and by the stringent diplomatic posture assumed by Townsend Harris (1804-78).¹

The Shengwu ji was, for the most part, a chronicle to that point in time of the Qing dynasty's "august" (sheng 聖) military victories in which the rebellions of border peoples, gangs of pirate, or rebellious religious insurgents had been suppressed. Although it did not concern the geography or topography of foreign nations, Wei Yuan did insert an appendix entitled "Wushi yuji" 武事余記 (Personal notes on military matters) after his recounting of the military victories. The material found in this section on strategy and tactics, based on the historical facts described, proved useful as a reference for naval defense in Japan at that time. Thus, it was this section of the Shengwu ji (three editions, see below) that was reprinted in Japan with reading punctuation. (One tiny portion of the original text, without Japanese reading punctuation, was also reprinted as part of a longer series).

Similarly, what many critics and analysts in Japan raised for discussion in the Haiguo tuzhi was not the portions of the text dealing with the geographical or topographical information recorded for the various continents and countries of the world, but the very first juan of the text entitled "Chouhai pian" 築海篇 [Coastal defense preparations], namely that part of the text which analyzed coastal defense strategies and the like. This portion of the original was first reprinted in Japan in Kaei 嘉永 7 or 1854. Thereafter, a number of different men successively reprinted the main part of the text on geography; these reprintings appeared for each section on a given continent or country either with Japanese reading punctuation added to the Kanbun text or with a mixture of kana inserted into the text. Hence, the conditions in the countries of the world were ultimately conveyed to Japan at the same time [as in China].

In the section on "source materials" in his Edo jidai ni okeru Karafune mochiwatarisho no kenkyū 江戸時代における唐船持渡書の研究 [A Study of the Books Brought on Chinese Vessels in the Edo Period] (Suita: Kansai daigaku Tōzai gakujutsu kenkyūjo, 1966), Professor Ōba Osamu 大庭脩 collected, primarily for the bakumatsu period, the ledgers of the Nagasaki Commercial Hall in which were recorded the titles of Chinese texts and the numbers of copies transported to Nagasaki, as well as such information as the purchase prices and the bidding prices of these texts. In comparison to other works, there are an extraordinary number of entries concerning the Haiguo tuzhi and the Shengwu ji. In all likelihood, this would indicate that members of the shogunal Council of Elders were buying up the available copies, but in addition the Haiguo tuzhi also made its way into the Momijiyama gakumonjo 紅葉山学問所 (Momijiyama Institute) and Shōheizaka gakumonjo 昌平坂学問所 (Shōheizaka Institute), facts which would indicate that this work was considered to be highly important at the time in Japan.

Each time the Shengwu ji and the Haiguo tuzhi were imported to Japan, the price shot way up. Professor Ōba's investigation indicates that, in the first year of the Kōka 弘化 reign period or 1844, when Shengwu ji first appeared in Japan, Abe Ise no kami 阿部伊勢守 (Abe Masahiro 阿部正弘, 1819-62) of the Council of Elders purchased it for 25 monme匁; in the sixth lunar month of Ansei 安政 6 or 1859, Motoya Keitarō 本屋啓太郎 made a successful bid for 160.3 monme. The Haiguo tuzhi was first imported to Japan in Kaei 4 or 1851 and fetched a price of 130 monme, but a record of a bid for the seventh month of Ansei 6 (1859) indicated that Motoya Keitarō successfully bid the high price of 436 monme to obtain this work. These points provide evidence to show that people vied to get their hands on these books to read them.

Biographies of the author of these two works, Wei Yuan (Wei Moshen 魏默深), can be found in the Qing shi gao 清史稿 [Draft History

of the Qing Dynasty] (liejuan 列伝 [biographies] 273, "wenyuan" 文苑 3) and Qing shi liejuan 清史列伝 [Biographies in Qing History] (juan 69, "Rulin" 儒林, hsia 2). He was well known as a scholar and author. In addition, in his Qingdai puxue dashi liejuan 清代樸學大師列伝 [Biographies of Great Teachers of Pure Scholarship in the Qing Period] (Shanghai: Taidong tushuju, 1925), Zhi Weicheng 支偉成 (1899-1928) includes Wei among his "biographies of historians," and perhaps on the basis of his writings he deserves to be recognized as a historian. When Wei passed the juren 举人 or second stage of the imperial civil service examinations [in 1822], the emperor (Daoguang 道光) saw his examination paper and admired and praised it highly. This high evaluation is recorded in both the Qing shi gao and the Qing shi liejuan. His name was thus well known from early in his career. Later, Wei was invited by He Changling 賀長齡 (1785-1848), provincial administration commissioner of Jiangsu, to edit the Huangchao jingshi wenbian 皇朝經世文編 [Collected Writings on Statecraft of the August Dynasty], a collection of essays by men who had served state and society under the Qing dynasty. Wei actually wrote the introduction to this multi-volume work in He's stead. He then proceeded to write the Shengwu ji and Haiguo tuzhi, which only increased his fame.

In recent years, many scholars have discussed Wei as a thinker. After the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949, Hou Wailu 侯外盧 published his Zhongguo zaoqi qimeng sixiang shi 中国早期启蒙思想史 [A History of Early Enlightenment Thought in China],² and in it he regarded Wei as an enlightenment thinker of the late Qing period. In other words, he was arguing that Wei's political thought had played a progressive role, and, drawing on Wei's writings, Hou explained that Wei was among the earliest of "reform-minded" (pianfa 變法, weixin 維新) thinkers.

Similarly, in an essay entitled "Wei Yuan di sixiang" 魏源底思想 (Wei Yuan's thought),³ Feng Youlan 馮友蘭 analyzed Wei ideas from the perspective of their class basis. Feng argued that, although Wei came from a landlord household that lacked even a semi-decadent authority, his stress on the economic power of merchants reflected the beginning of the decline of Chinese feudalism and the fact that capitalism was beginning to emerge in China. Both Hou and Feng reserved esteem for Wei's knowledge not because it was based on a set of fixed writings but because of its basis in his own genuine changing experiences. They both saw him as an advocate of "reform" who placed emphasis on the notion of bian 變 (change, transformation) and adopted historical and political positions different from all traditional Chinese thought in feudal society. Hence, they argued that Wei was a progressive intellectual who appeared at a time of great change in Chinese history.^a

Furthermore, one finds in Shi Jun's 石峻 Zhongguo jindai sixiang shi cankao ziliao jianbian 中国近代思想史参考資料簡編 [Volume of Reference Materials on Modern Chinese Intellectual History] (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 1957) reference documents for the history of modern

Chinese thought, including: the introduction and first *juan* ("Chouhai pian") of Haiguo tuzhi; the introduction to Shengwu ji; and Wei's introduction to the Huangchao jingshi wenbian.⁴ Also, the Zhonqguo zhexue shi ziliao xuanji, jindai zhi bu 中国哲学史資料選輯、近代之部 [Selected Materials from the History of Chinese Philosophy, Modern] (Beijing: Zhong-Hua shuju, 1959), put out by the Philosophy Institute of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, contains reference documents for the history of modern Chinese philosophy and it includes: the introductions to the Huangchao jingshi wenbian and the Haiguo tuzhi as well as the section entitled "Mogu" 默觚 [Reading notes] from Wei's Guweitang neiji 古微堂內集 [Inner Works from the Hall of Ancient Subtlety].

In his "Lun Zhongguo xueshu sixiang zhi bianqian dashi" 論中国學術思想之變遷大勢 [On overall conditions surrounding modern Chinese scholarly thought], in Yinbing shi wenji 飲冰室文集 [Collected Writings from an Ice-Drinker's Studio] (Taipei: Taiwan Zhong-Hua shuju, 1960), vol. 3 (originally published in 1902), Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873-1929) noted: "Wei wrote fondly of the art of statecraft and wrote the Haiguo tuzhi to encourage a conception of foreigners among the [Chinese] people. Although today this work has only the value of wastepaper, in Japan it exerted influence on [Sakuma] Zōzan 佐久間象山 [1811-64], Yoshida Shōin 吉田松陰 [1830-59], Saigō Takamori 西郷隆盛 [1827-77], and others, and hence played an indirect role in the Meiji Restoration." I have no material the connection by which Saigō Takamori came to have a copy of the Haiguo tuzhi,⁵ but we learn from the writings of Sakuma Zōzan and Yoshida Shōin that the two of them read both Haiguo tuzhi and Shengwu ji and something of the stimulation these works provided them with. Yet, whether these works actually played a role, however indirect, in the Meiji Restoration remains dubious.

In his Seiken roku 省讐錄 [Reflections on My Errors]^b (Japanese woodblock edition, 1 volume, preface dated 1871 by Katsu Kaishū 勝海舟), Sakuma Zōzan chronicles his reflections and feelings during a seven-month stint in jail where he was thrown in the fourth month of 1854. Written in Kanbun, he touches on Wei Yuan and Wei's writings:

At the time that my former lord [Sanada Kōkan 真田幸貫, daimyō of Matsushiro 松代, Shinshū 信州] assumed office in the government and took charge of coastal defense matters, rumors were rife of the English invasion of China. Greatly lamenting the events of the time, I submitted to the throne a plan for coastal defense in the eleventh lunar month of Tenpō 天保 13 [December 1842-January 1843] in a memorial.⁶ Later, I saw the Shengwu ji of the Chinese writer Wei Yuan, a work he too had written out of sorrow over events of that time. The preface to his work was composed in the seventh month of the same year [August-September 1842], a mere four months before my own memorial. Thus, without any consultation, our two views were often in complete agreement. Ah!

Isn't it strange indeed that Wei Yuan and I, born in different places and ignorant even of each other's names, wrote of our views in sadness with the times during the same year and that those view should be in such accord? We really must be called comrades from separate lands.

What is clear here is that, although Zōzan and Wei Yuan were born in different countries, they were developing and expressing similar ideas at the same time. Thus, even if Wei perhaps served as some sort of stimulus to Zōzan, however well-disposed he may have been to Wei in spirit, we can see that Zōzan was not influenced by Shengwu ji. Hence, their difference of opinion over coastal defences is clear.

However, Wei...argues that the best method for coastal defense is to strengthen fortified towns and clear the fields and thereby cut off the enemy's landing from sea. My view, though, is that, through education in military techniques involving guns and warships, we establish a plan of attack whereby the enemy is intercepted, destroyed, and hence its fate is sealed before it ever reaches our shores. This is a point of difference between Wei and myself.

Yet, we could point to instances as well where their opinions were the same:

In the winter of Kaei 2 [1849-50], I came to Edo... During the time I was there, I first obtained Wei's book and read it. He argued [in this book] that, in the cause of mastering the enemy, it would be useful to establish schools in his country primarily for the translation of foreign writings and foreign histories and to promote a clear understanding of conditions among the enemy nations [just as I had argued]. In this, too, his opinion concurred with my own.

In this instance concerning what Zōzan referred to as "Mr. Wei's writing" (Gi shi no sho 魏氏の書), the words cited correspond to a section of Wei's "Wushi yuji" (juan 12 of Shengwu ji).

Zōzan was also reading Haiguo tuzhi and had the following to say:

The main requirements for maritime defense are guns and warships, and guns are the more important item. Wei included a section on guns in his Haiguo tuzhi. It is altogether inaccurate and unfounded, like the doings of a child at play. Without personally engaging in the study of a subject, its essentials cannot be learned. Although a man of considerable talent and intellect, Wei was inattentive to this fact. I have profound pity for Wei that, in the world of today, he, ignorant of artillery, should have perpetuated these errors and mistakes.

Perhaps it was because Zōzan was himself knowledgeable in artillery and prided himself in knowing how to produce artillery, that he

pointed out Wei Yuan's lack of knowledge in this area.

If we were to look only at the Seiken roku (I have only this text before right now, as I do not have a copy of Zōzan's collected works), it would certainly seem as though he was not influenced to any great measure by Wei Yuan. At least insofar as matters of coastal defense are concerned, Zōzan as artillery specialist, prior to reading Wei Yuan, seems to have concocted his own ideas. How then did Zōzan's disciple, Yoshida Shōin, approach Wei Yuan? We move next to consider this question on the basis of a text known as Shōin sensei ichō 松陰先生遺著 [Posthumous Works of Yoshida Shōin] (Tokyo: Min'yūsha, 1909).

6. Yoshida Shōin and Wei Yuan

Sakuma Zōzan's Seiken roku carries an introduction by Katsu Kaishū (1823-99) which has the following say. After it was completed, the Seiken roku was stored at the bottom of a bamboo basket when Zōzan, after meeting with misfortune, was thrown in jail. (Zōzan was arrested for his alleged connections with the activities of Yoshida Shōin; the latter was apprehended for trying to stow away on an American ship in 1854 after the arrival of Commodore Perry's warships). Zōzan's son Kaku 恪 (or Kakujirō 恪二郎) was also implicated, but he managed to preserve the manuscript even during his peregrinations and in times of great danger. During that time he carried the text with him and showed it to Kaishū, asking for help in getting it published. Kaishū's younger sister was Zōzan's legal wife; as Kaishū put it in his preface, he "was related to the honorable Zōzan by marriage." Through this link, Kaishū supplied the necessary funds, and in the early Meiji era it was first published.

In this preface, Kaishū praises Zōzan as a pioneer in "calling for enlightenment and progress," but, when he stripped away the formalities, he offered this criticism of Zōzan: "His learning was broad, and he did have a fair number of views of his own. However, his boasting often caused problems."⁷ Perhaps because they were in-laws, Kaishū felt he ought to speak of Zōzan with reservation, but one can clearly see a tendency toward bragging and exaggeration in Zōzan's words about Shengwu ji and Haiquo tuzhi.

Shōin assiduously studied the works of Wei Yuan; while he referred to Japan's more prominent analysts of coastal defense of the time mimics of Wei Yuan, he also severely cross-examined Wei Yuan's work.

In his 1850 work Seiyū nikki 西遊日記 [Diary of a Journey to the West],^c a diary account of a trip to Kyūshū, Shōin noted that, on the fifteenth day of the ninth month of that year, he traveled to Hirado 平戸 to visit Hayama Sanai 萩山佐内, a local Confucian teacher, and borrowed from him the Seibu ki furoku 聖武記附錄 [Shengwu ji with

Appendices] in four string-bound volumes [YSZ, 9:36]. This edition of Wei's work was a Japanese woodblock reprint. I own a copy of it, but it does not give the name of the reprinter. Because it is a woodblock printed edition, there are no Japanese reading punctuation inserted into the text. It would seem that Shōin's first contact with the Shengwu ji was the appendix portion of this reprint edition. For, from that day forward, he spent practically every single day covetously reading the Seibu ki furoku and copying out excerpts.

Shōin's diary entry for the sixteenth, the day after he borrowed Seibu ki furoku from Hayama, reads in part as follow: "I returned to Hayama's and read the Shengwu ji." On the seventeenth as well, he wrote: "I went to Hayama's and read the Seibu ki furoku," and he copied out by hand sentences from the text, "its marvelous words," which were of interest to him. On the eighteenth he was again reading the same work and excerpting its "marvelous words," and on the nineteenth he was doing the same [YSZ, 9:36-39]

From the 21st, he borrowed the Ahen ibun 阿芙蓉彙聞 [Reports on Opium], compiled by Shionoya Tōin 塩谷容陰, and was meticulously copying out its book list and excerpting from it as well [YSZ, 9:39-41]. It would seem that he had taken a brief respite from his reading and copying from the Seibu ki furoku, but on the 24th and 25th he was again reading and excerpting as well from the Shengwu ji [YSZ, 9:42-44]. From the 26th, Shōin borrowed the second part of the Keisei bunpen shō 經世文編抄 [Selections from the Huangchao jingshi wenbian] (a Japanese reprint edition to be discussed below) and began copying out its lists of books and excerpting it as well [YSZ, 9:44-45]. For the 28th, he noted in his diary: "I have finished reading the seven string-bound volumes of the Ahen ibun" [YSZ, 9:47]. The Ahen ibun was circulated in manuscript, and I have yet to see a copy, but from Shōin's detailed table of contents and excerpts one can get a general picture of the work.⁸

When Shōin finished reading the Ahen ibun, he returned once again to Seibu ki furoku, as his diary reads for the twelfth day of the tenth month of 1850: "I read the Shengwu ji at Hayama's" [YSZ, 9:55]. On the same day, he noted: "I asked if Master Issai had copied out any excerpts, and Gaiken 鎧軒 [Hayama's style] responded that he knew of none, but that [Issai] left numerous stickers and the like inserted into the margins of every book he read, and with the various slips placed here and there he indicated important points in the text. I thus learned a great deal in examining Gaiken's books" [YSZ, 9:55-56]. We thus learn that Satō Issai 佐藤一斎 (1772-1859), Confucian official for the Tokugawa bakufu and teacher at the Shōheikō 昌平齋 [informal name of the Shōheizaka gakumonjo, the official academy of the Tokugawa shogunate], carefully read the Shengwu ji, making interlinear notations and inserting slips of paper along the way.

On the sixteenth of the month, Shōin noted: "I read the Shengwu ji at Hayama's" [YSZ, 9:57], though precisely when he completed it

remains unclear. On this day he borrowed the Sentetsu sōdan 先哲叢談 [Collection of Biographical Notes on Wise Men of the Past]^d and began copying out excerpts from it. While in Nagasaki during this same trip, Shōin also had occasion to borrow: two works by Takano Chōei 高野長英 (1804-50), Yume monogatari 夢物語 [Story of a Dream] and In'yū roku 陰憂錄 [Record of Hiding Gloom] which concerned the Opium War; and the Haiguo wenjian lu 海國聞見錄 [Record of Things Seen and Heard Among the Maritime Kingdoms] by Chen Lunjiong 陳論炯 (fl. 1730) of the Qing dynasty.^e And, as had become his standard practice, Shōin copied out the table of contents and excerpts from the text. Although Chen's work was never reprinted [in Japan], according to Ōba Osamu's [magisterial] work cited above, it was imported to Japan in roughly similar numbers as the Haiguo tuzhi; and it too provided Shōin with knowledge of foreign lands. I now have in my possession only a portion of the text, two string-bound volumes (second edition, dated Daoguang 3 or 1823): one of essays and one of maps.

In a letter (dated the eighth month of 1851) from Edo to his uncle [and teacher from youth], Mr. Tamaki [Bunnoshin] 玉木 [文之進], Shōin wrote: "On the morning of the 23rd of the eighth month, I met Yamaga 山賀 [Bansuke 万介]^f, and in the evening we read and studied the Shengwu ji together until nightfall when I returned home" [YSZ, 7:80]. That he met other interested men with whom he read the Shengwu ji together indicates that he was continuing his study of this text. In a letter to his elder brother (dated the twelfth month [24th day] of 1854), Shōin indicated that the Shinron 新論 [New Theses] by Aizawa Seishisai 会沢正志斎 (1782-1863) and Shionoya Tōin's Chūkai shiqi 番海私議 [Personal Views on the "Chouhai" Chapter {Wei Yuan's first chapter in the Haiguo tuzhi}] were then quite popular: "these men both ask why warships need be constructed, but neither knows how to do so" [YSZ, 7:310].

He was criticizing the fact that arguments and points of view were by themselves of no practical utility. He then proceeded to mention that he had read Tōin's memorial and that it proposed a plan to purchase warships and artillery from the Dutch. Shōin continued in a deprecatory tone: "'The construction of ships is not the same thing as the purchase of ships, nor is the building of artillery the same as buying it'; one can find these points made in the Shengwu ji of Wei Yuan of China... People who today make plans to purchase such things are all mimicking Wei Yuan" [YSZ, 7:310]. In any event, this sort of criticism on the part of Shōin reveals just how widely read and studied Wei Yuan was at that time. Hence, be it in the area of political programs or ideas of military strategy, we can see the considerable influence Wei exerted on Shōin in matters of maritime defense from the latter's assiduous daily reading schedule.

There are points, however, where he opposed things that Wei had written. In an essay written by Shōin in Kanbun, entitled "Kōin Rondon hyōban ki o yomu" 読『甲寅囉頓評判記』 (Reading an account

of the fame of London in the kōin year [1854]),^g he had the following to say:

Wei Yuan of China often writes about conditions in foreign lands.⁹ However, inasmuch as Russia, the United States, and France all despise Great Britain, it would be fine, argues Wei, to accept their naval and infantry support. To substantiate this point clearly, he quotes from sources both ancient and modern. Yet, as far as I can tell, such a view is biased, only looking at one side of the picture [YSZ, 2:333-34].

Shōin then goes on to develop his own understanding. It is the way barbarians usually do things, he argues, that they look only after profit and ignore righteousness; if it is beneficial to them, they will forge alliances even with their enemies, and if their allies cause them harm, they become enemies.

As I was reading this account [cited above], I learned that, once Russia and Turkey commenced hostilities, Britain and France joined to help Turkey. The fact that Russia and Britain hate one another is just as Wei Yuan supposes, but the union of France and Britain indicates that Wei strikes wide of the mark here. Furthermore, who knows where the United States will fall on this matter? [YSZ, 2:334]

Thus, Shōin here noted points where Wei's analysis of international conditions of the time went astray.

In another essay by Shōin entitled "Chūkai hen o yomu" 読籌海編 [Reading (Wei Yuan's) "Chouhai pian"], he raised his most basic doubts about Wei's ideas. This essay was composed in Kanbun in the fifth month, [fourth day,] of Ansei 2 or 1855.^h Shōin had great praise for Wei, noting that the sections "Yi shou" 議守 (Discussion of defense), "Yi zhan" 議戰 (Discussion of war), and "Yi kuan" 議款 (Discussion of treaties) from the "Chouhai pian" clearly hit the mark, and that if the Qing government would put these measures into effect, not only would it be able to control the British, but Russia and France could also be kept at bay. His "only doubts" run as follows:

This book was published in Daoguang 27 [1847], at a time when he did not know that only three or four years later the popular uprising in Guangxi [namely, the Taiping Rebellion] would erupt and spread disorder over eight provinces and misfortunes would continue for a decade, and Beijing would come to a standstill under perilous conditions. It is not the barbarians but the Chinese people who need to be apprehensive about the [future of the] Qing. Why is it that Wei Moshen mentions not a word about this? [YSZ, 2:322]

In addition to raising doubts about the absence of evident concern in Wei's book for domestic conditions then pregnant with upheaval and chaos, there is a sense of rebuke in Shōin's style as well.

Shōin was himself deeply concerned at the time with the Taiping Rebellion, and, at 25 years of age in 1855 while in Noyama Prison, he translated into Japanese a lively report of the Taiping Rebellion (both the uprising and its background) by a Chinese who had come to Japan aboard one of Perry's vessels, and he entitled it: Shinkoku Kanpō ran ki 清國咸豐亂記 [Record of the Uprising in China during the Xianfeng Reign].ⁱ Although Shōin noted in his own preface, "I do not know the name of the author of this work, and it has no title" [YSZ, 2:99], from the manuscripts in my possession, I have done a fairly detailed investigation of the author of the manuscript Shōin had and its transmission. I have also done some work on the quality of Shōin's translation in relation to the original.¹⁰

Shōin's note that "this book was published in Daoguang 27 [1847]" refers to the fact that the Haiquo tuzhi which had been imported to Japan at the time was published that same year in a 60-juan edition (of which I have a photolithographic edition). Inasmuch as the original publication of the Haiquo tuzhi came out in 50 juan in 1842, this was an enlarged edition. A 100-juan edition, with added front and back material, appeared in 1852.¹¹

On the [22nd day of] eleventh month of 1854, Shōin wrote to his older brother: "A few days ago, I copied out one juan of the Haiquo tuzhi so that you could make use of it" [YSZ, 7:265]. He then continued: "Lin Zexu 林則徐 and Wei Yuan are really men of will, and they were quite capable at reading books written in horizontal [Western] script. I have exhorted [our own Japanese] men of will [to study] works in horizontal script, for I would like to see them write such fine works. What is your opinion?" [YSZ, 7:266]. While admiring the Haiquo tuzhi as a "fine work," Shōin was also encouraging interested Japanese men of spirit to study Western works, and it was his earnest desire that the latter might write such works. However, Shōin was incorrect in assuming that Lin Zexu and Wei Yuan were fluent in horizontal script. On the frontispiece to each of the sections on India, Europe, and the United States in the Haiquo tuzhi, the following notation appears: "Originally written by a European, translated by Lin Zexu of Houguan 侯官, and edited by Wei Yuan of Shaoyang 邵陽." There are as well juan that read simply: "Edited by Wei Yuan of Shaoyang." These notes would seem to indicate that Lin and Wei read foreign languages.

The basis of the Haiquo tuzhi was the Sizhou zhi 四洲志 [Gazetteer of Four Continents] which was translated by Lin Zexu. In his introduction to the 60-juan edition of the Haiquo tuzhi, Wei explained something of his sources: "First is the Sizhou zhi of the Western barbarians translated by former Liang-Guang Governor-General Lin Zexu; and second are the various historical records, the gazetteers of islands from the Ming dynasty forward, and recent barbarian maps and writings." Thus, we know that the note in the text--"Originally written by a European, translated by Lin Zexu of Houguan,

and edited by Wei Yuan of Shaoyang"--refers to the Sizhou zhi. The Sizhou zhi is now included in the "Zaibu bian" 再補編 (Second Supplement) to the Xiaofang huzhai yudi congchao 小方壺齋輿地叢鈔 [Collection of Documents on World Geography].] Although this last work is primarily a collection of excerpts, I have long thought of trying to check or compare the portions of the Haiquo tuzhi translated by Lin Zexu, but I have still been unsuccessful in getting my hands on this section of the Xiaofang huzhai yudi congchao. Thus, there is nothing at this point that I can say with surety about the relationship of the Haiquo tuzhi to the Sizhou zhi.

I think it is correct to say, though, that Lin Zexu did not directly translate the work in question but ordered someone with a knowledge of foreign language(s) to translate it and affixed his name only. The writings of high Chinese officials while in office often took this form, and I think that this case in particular exemplifies a kind of "report of conditions" which Lin collected from his interactions with foreign powers as Chinese official of highest diplomatic and military responsibility. Wei Yuan touches on this briefly in the Shengwu ji (juan 10, "Daoguang yangsau zhengfu ji" 道光洋艘征撫記 [Record of the pacification of the foreign vessels in the Daoguang reign], part 1): "Since coming to Guangdong last year, Lin Zexu has employed someone every day to investigate Western affairs, translate Western books, and purchase Western newspapers as well."

It would thus seem as well that the note "edited by Wei Yuan" referred to the "recent barbarian maps and writings" mentioned in the preface, and these "barbarian maps and writings" were used as source materials by Wei Yuan's close associates. An examination of the chronological biographies of Lin and Wei or of any of their writings reveals not a trace of evidence that either of them ever studied a European language. Thus, Shōin's note that this work took much of its material from "writings in horizontal script" is due to the fact that "how this book [namely, the Haiquo tuzhi] differs from the works about maritime nations of men of the past, the older works are all Chinese discussing the West, while this is Westerners discussing the West."

7. The Opium War and the "Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji"

As noted in his diary, cited above, Shōin spent nearly every day coping out excerpts and studying in great detail the Shengwu ji, but absent from mention in his diary, it seems, was the "Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji," which appeared in juan 10 of the text. This is apparently due to the fact that Shōin's study of the Shengwu ji was based on the Japanese edition of Wei Yuan's work which only reprinted the "Wushi yuji" portion of this juan. But, it seems that, even if he had been able to examine the original edition of the Shengwu ji, that too did not include the "Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji" section at the

end of juan 10--namely, a section discussing the Opium War.

The story becomes rather complicated at this point, but that final portion of juan 10 dealing with the Opium War was apparently first introduced in the third revised edition of the text in 1846. Yet, in the Sibu beiyao 四部備要 edition (in my possession) of the Shengwu ji in six string-bound volumes,¹² it reads: "based on the original woodblock edition by the Hall of Ancient Subtlety." In a note following the table of contents, there is a discussion of the places in the text revised with each edition of the work, and it claims that "this is the third revised edition of the text." Despite the Daoguang 26 (1846) date given, the "Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji," a treatment of the Opium War, is missing.

In another printing of the third revised edition of the Shengwu ji, published in 1936 by "Shijie shuju" 世界書局, we find this section included. It is not precisely clear what edition of the text the "Shijie shuju" printing was based on, but, inasmuch as "Shenbaoguan" 申報館 in Shanghai published this work at the end of the Qing period, this was probably the edition used. Although I do not now have a copy of the "Shenbaoguan" edition, I do have at hand a pamphlet, entitled Shenbaoguan shumu 申報館書目, which describes the books published by them. Since it carries a preface dated Daoguang 5 (1879), the Shenbaoguan publication of the Shengwu ji must predate this. In an addendum to this pamphlet there is an explanatory note concerning the Shengwu ji; it says that the Shengwu ji "has been handed down by men for the past 30 or more years, but because portions of the text were avoided, ultimately two portions [namely, parts one and two] entitled 'Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji' were forcibly excised." Yet, this pamphlet goes on, "we are now reprinting them on the basis of the original edition of the work." Thus, so too was the "original woodblock edition by the Hall of Ancient Subtlety" upon which the "Sibei buyao" edition was based, though it would seem that "Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji" has been excised from editions now in circulation.

At the time, discussing a topic such as the Opium War in which China had just sustained a crushing defeat called China's face into question, and perhaps for that reason this section was avoided.¹³ Who it was that actually "forcibly excised" this section from the text remains unknown. If, however, this section of Shengwu ji made its way to Japan, it would certainly have been quickly reprinted as a didactic piece of source material on an urgent issue at hand. Though, were it reprinted for dissemination in Japan, it would still have had to get bureaucratic approval prior to publication, and it is impossible to say what might have happened at this point. At least, it appears certain that the text circulated in manuscript form, but there is no trace of it now. Incidentally, the Ahen shimatsu 鴉片始末 [The Disposal of Opium] by Saitō Chikudō 斎藤竹堂 (1815-52) was banned for publication and circulated in manuscript. I have a manuscript edition of this work dated Kaei 3 (1850), though it was not published

until 1937.

Neither coastal defense policies during the sakoku period nor the military exploits of the Qing regime are of engrossing interest to us now. However, the Opium War is a major issue in world history, or at least in East Asian history. In China, the period following defeat in the Opium War is considered the dawn of "modernity," and for Japan as well the Opium War marked a major shift in the direction our history would take. American envoy Townsend Harris, who pressured Japan into signing a commercial treaty, gave a major address before an assemblage of shogunal leaders at the residence of Hotta Masayoshi 堀田正睦 in October of 1857. He argued that, with Great Britain's relentless pressures forcing a surrender on the Qing, the English would be coming with their opium next to Japan; if they were prevented from doing so, he noted hearing from the British governor-general of Hong Kong, then they might turn their warships docked in Hong Kong on Japan.

The stunned shogunate had no choice but to open Japanese ports, setting the direction for subsequent Japanese history, and Harris's threatening speech at the Hotta residence was widely disseminated in manuscript as "Amerika shisetsu mōshitareru sho" 亜墨利加使節申立書 (Declaration of the American envoy). I have several different editions of this work. It appears as well in a number of works: Sanjū nen shi 三十年史 [Thirty-Year History] (Tokyo: Kōjunsha 交詢社, 1892) by Kimura Kaishū 木村芥舟 (1830-1901), battleship commander and head of the department of the navy in the bakumatsu period; Katsu Kaishū, Kaikoku kigen 海国起原 [Origins of the Opening of the Country] (Tokyo: Kunaishō, 1891); in summary form in Naitō Chisō 内藤耻叟 (1826-1902), Kaikoku kigen Ansei kiji 海國起原安政紀事 [Account from the Ansei Period on the Origins of the Opening of the Country] (Tokyo: Tōgaidō 東崖堂, 1888 or 1889; quoted in by Ōkuma Shigenobu 大隈重信 (1838-1922), Kaikoku taisei shi 海国大勢史 [History of General Trends Since the Opening of the Country] (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1913); and more recently mentioned in Yoshino Maho 吉野真保, ed., Kaei Meiji nenkan roku 嘉永明治年間錄 [Account of the Years from Kaei to Meiji] (Tokyo: Gannandō, 1968).^k There is no lack of access to a published text. Harris's speech and the shogunate's response were undoubtedly a major shock, especially to the anti-foreign (jōi 攘夷) group. One of the manuscript editions in my collection was an item sent by Ueda Unpin 梅田雲浜 (1815-59) to his comrades in Totsukawa 十津川, Yamato 大和 (in 1881 a man by the name of Tamada Onkichi 玉田音吉 from the village of Yamazaki 山崎 in Totsukawa copied out this text).

In his Bakufu suibō ron 幕府衰亡論 [The Decline and Fall of the (Tokugawa) Shogunate] (Tokyo: Min'yūsha, 1892),¹ Fukuchi Gen'ichirō 福地源一郎 (1841-1906) wrote:

On [October] 26th, [Harris] proceeded to the residence of Minister Hotta. In his speech lasting roughly six hours, he spoke of the drawbacks to keeping the country closed and of

the necessity of opening it up... He drew references to examples from as far away as the West and as near as Qing China. He spoke with the fluid eloquence of a rushing stream. Minister Hotta, of course, paid heed to this practical discourse on politics; although the shogunate's finest man, this was the first time he had his umbilical cord severed. The effect on his frame of mind was remarkable, as if with his spirits crushed and his soul excised, he were being awakened in a daze from illusion... It is clear that the spirit he showed in later drafting a national plan for the opening of the country and facing all manner of obstacles owed its origin to the harsh criticism of Harris's speech.

Also, in Sakumu kiji 昨夢紀事 [Diary of Recent Dreams], Nakane Yukie 中根雪江 (1807-77) noted: "The story was later told by people who gathered there at the time" that Minister Hotta "was disconcerted and, wincing," he could only "let out a great sigh," having effectively lost all powers of speech. To use contemporary language, this speech by Townsend Harris was truly "a decisive moment in the history" of Japan, and from that point forward Japan had become firm in its determination to step ahead into a new era.

The Opium War was a major event of unprecedented proportions for China, and chroniclings of it are numerous.¹⁴ Among such documents, Wei Yuan's "Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji" was transcribed as the first item in Zhongguo jindai shi ciliao xuanji 中国近代史資料選輯 [Selected Materials on Modern Chinese History], rev. ed. Rong Mengyuan 義孟源 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 1954), pp. 3-33, surely because it was so suited to the theme of this volume. As described in the "publication information" included in this work, it was a collection published first in 1940 in Yan'an and reprinted for use in the various base areas thereafter; Rong Mengyuan later made some revision in the contents in re-editing the work for subsequent republication.

In mentioning the Opium War, I have for some time wanted to check certain historical facts on the basis of Wei's piece and Liang Tingnan's 梁廷柟 (1796-1861) Yifen wen ji 夷氛聞記 [Reports of Barbarian Portents]. It is also necessary to make simultaneous use of Yapiān zhānzhēng shíshí kǎo 鴉片戰爭史實考 [A Study of the Historical Facts of the Opium War] (Shanghai: Xin zhishi chubanshe, 1955) of Yao Weiyuan 姚薇元 who verifies and revises the deficiencies and errors in Wei's work by comparison with many other historical texts, such as the Chouban yiwu shimo 粛辦夷務始末 [The Management of Barbarian Affairs from Beginning to End].¹⁵ In his own preface, Yao notes with perhaps a touch too much praise: "The 'Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji' is a first-class work recording the historical facts of the Opium War. Reports that later circulated about the Opium War were generally recastings or copies of this work."¹⁵

The totality of the actual facts themselves concerning the Opium

War is overwhelming, and it seems meaningless to try to use this alone as a way to understand the history of cultural relations. Yet, if we look primarily at the records and writings of the time and those that were reprinted in Japan, then perhaps this is the best framework for analysis. Before examining the Japanese reprintings and translations of Shengwu ji and Haiquo tuzhi (both were written, as well as reprinted and translated, out of concern for the Opium War), we need first look at the contemporary reports passed to the shogunate by the Dutch, reporting the concrete details of the Opium War, the importation to Japan of Chinese chronicles, as well as the repintings in Japan and the writings of Japanese about the war (including novels).

While reports about the war with and defeat by a "foreign barbarian" of a neighboring country were vague, they seemed to have caused a startling shock generally for many Japanese then living in the dream world of sakoku. Reflecting this image of things, even novels based on the war were published, and I have collected several such works myself.

8. The Ahen fūsetsugaki 阿片風説書 [Reports about Opium]

There were a number of written reports and various accounts concerning the Opium War that circulated in Japan at the time, and I would now like to take a look at some of the more important of the historical materials I have at hand.

Generally speaking, there were two sorts of contemporaneous reports: those conveyed as part of overseas intelligence which the shogunate obtained, via the Nagasaki Magistrate, from the director (or "Captain")ⁿ of the Dutch trading factory at the island of Deshima, near Nagasaki; and those conveyed piecemeal from Chinese merchant vessels that called at the port of Nagasaki. In his preface to the Ahen ibun, the editor Shionoya Tōin wrote: "I worked to compile news from the documents and detailed records of the Chinese merchants and Dutch residents here. They have filled to overflowing the box in which I keep them, and it is sufficient to make me realize the great quantity of detail here."¹⁶

Among them, the reports from the Captain offered considerably detailed information, based largely on foreign newpapers, and he was in a position to amass a wide range of accounts and reports. In this connection, we have the following note by Fukuchi Gen'ichirō, which appears in his Shinbunshi jitsureki 新聞紙実歴 [A Career in Newspapers] (Tokyo: Min'yūsha, 1894).^o

When I was fifteen or sixteen [Japanese style], I was still in my hometown of Nagasaki, studying Dutch with my teacher Namura Hanamichi 名村花蹊 . While I was practicing at being an interpreter, every time Dutch ships arrived in port, they produced documents entitled fūsetsugaki 風説書

which reported to the Nagasaki Magistrate on conditions overseas. The shogunate at the time considered this one indication of the loyalty of the Dutch. Mr. Namori received these documents from the Captain of the Dutch factory and assisted in their translation into Japanese. He always had me prepare the actual transcription of the text. When I once asked how the Captain, who lived in Deshima, gained knowledge of the information contained in the fūsetsugaki, my teacher replied: "In the countries of the West, they speak much of the news and publish it every day. The newspapers reveal information not only of one's own country but of other countries as well. The Captain reads these newspapers, and he writes down the more prominent information from them to present to the Magistrate."

When Dutch arrived at port, they apparently bought with them various foreign newspapers for the factory at Deshima and the Captain gathered his information from the reports received. In special cases, it would seem, reports were assembled and dispatched by the Dutch governor-general in Batavia and then these were presented to the Japanese. The fūsetsugaki, written annually for presentation to the Japanese on the order of the governor-general in Batavia, contained all manner of information.

Among related works in my possession is a three-volume manuscript entitled Ahen fūsetsugaki. It is a detailed, year-by-year chronicle that frequently repeats information concerning the importation of opium to China some 300 years before, its prohibition, its illicit sale, severe punishments surrounding it, and the like; then, it concerns the sending of Lin Zexu to Guangdong and his efforts to maintain strict control over opium, his incineration of the opium of the English merchants, the resultant commotion (from war to diplomacy), the nature of the war in its different locales; and, finally, from the negotiations to the peace treaty and disturbances following the incident. Information was drawn from Guangdong, Hong Kong, Macao, Xiamen (Amoy), Shanghai, Singapore, and elsewhere.

This fūsetsugaki manuscript (dating to the late Edo period) is written with tiny characters on roughly 80 pages of Mino paper [Minogami 美濃紙], a kind of Japanese paper], folded in half, and bound into three string-bound volumes. The material contained in it brought together translations from the Dutch documents presented to the Nagasaki Magistrate, covering four occasions. A preface at the beginning of the first volume reads: "Written here are the remarkable incidents which arose in China [lit., Tōkoku 唐国] due to the [Chinese] prohibition imposed on the sale of opium by the English and others from 1838 to 1840 according to the Dutch calendar." At the beginning of the second half of the first volume, there is another preface which reads: "Chronicled here is the prohibition imposed on the sale of opium in China by the English and others from 1840 to 1841 according to the Dutch calendar."

Volumes three and four similarly carry prefaces "chronicling the exceptional events" that transpired, respectively, from 1841 through the fourth month of 1842 and from the fifth month of 1842 through 1843. The passage of the events are then recounted in a kind of itemization.

At the end of the translated text presented first, there is the following note: "As stated by the governor-general in Jakarta [i.e., Batavia, Asian headquarters of the Dutch East India Company], the materials immediately preceding are presented as instructed. The Captain."^P Concerning the translations presented by the Captain, the next line reads: "As to the foregoing report, the Japanese translation is presented along with the original text," and it is dated to what corresponds to the seventh month of 1840. The signatures of the interpreters who provided the translation are also given: Nakayama Sakusaburō 中山作三郎 (1785-1844) and Ishibashi Jojūrō 石橋助十郎 .

As this passage indicates, in the name of the Dutch governor-general in Batavia, the information was sent to the Captain in Deshima and then he presented it to the Nagasaki Magistrate. We know also of special reports (betsudan fūsetsugaki 別段風説書 [additional reports]) prepared by the governor-general in Batavia. Beyond the fūsetsugaki, there also many documents which were referred to as Jagatara no kashirayaku no mono kara mōshitsukete kita kara 咬噏吧の頭役の者から申しつけて來たから [Inasmuch as instruction from the governor-general in Jakarta have arrived]; sometimes, in place of kashirayaku no mono (governor-general), this kind of document might read totokushoku no mono 都督職の者 (military commissioner).

At the time, Holland enjoyed preferential treatment as the only Western country allowed to carry on trade with Japan, but in compensation the Dutch were obliged to present these reports on foreign affairs. This arrangement was said to have derived originally from the shogunate's policy of preventing the intrusion of Christianity into Japan. According to section eight of the "Oranda koku bu" 阿蘭陀國部 (Section of Holland) in the Tsūkō ichiran 通航一覽 [Survey of Foreign Relations] of Hayashi Fukusai 林復齋 (1800-59) (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1913), kan 246: "In the Kaei era [1848-54], every year when the [Dutch] ships arrived at port, as he was obliged the Captain presented his report on the black ships under restraint and on observations concerning views on the various disorders overseas. Thereafter, it became the practice that these documents were presented from the ships when they entered port."

Below this entry a note goes on to explain: "These were called fūsetsugaki. Many of these annual fūsetsugaki are included in such works as Ka'i hentai 華夷變態 [The Transformation of the Civilized and the Barbarian], compiled by Hayashi Shunsai 林春齋 (1618-80) (Tokyo: Tōyō bunko, 1958-60, four volumes). Its principal purpose arose with the matters involving the Christian southern barbarians." Yet, there were fūsetsugaki whose aim was to illuminate Japan, then

under the sakoku policy, about the Opium War.

Itazawa Takeo's 板沢武雄 article in this connection, "Oranda fūsetsugaki no kenkyū" 阿蘭陀風説書の研究 [Studies of the Dutch fūsetsugaki], in his Nichi-Ran bunka kōshō shi no kenkyū 日蘭文化交渉史の研究 [Studies in the History of Japanese-Dutch Cultural Interaction] (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1959), mentions nothing of the Ahen fūsetsugaki. Itazawa has also written: "Oranda fūsetsugaki no kenkyū, Oranda fūsetsugaki no kaidai" 阿蘭陀風説書の研究、阿蘭陀風説書解題 [A study and explanation of the Dutch fūsetsugaki] (published as the third issue of Nihon kobunka kenkyūjo hōkoku 日本古文化研究所報告 (Tokyo, 1937)). In the latter piece, he put together 158 of these Dutch fūsetsugaki covering the period from 1644 (Shōhō 正保 1) to 1745 (Enkyō 延享 2) with appended materials and annotations. Since he includes nothing after 1745, the Ahen fūsetsugai of the Tenpō period were not included in his collection, and these fūsetsugaki have been published nowhere else.

Now, let us return to the story of the Ahen fūsetsugaki. At the end of the translated text of the report of the second batch of them (1840-1841), the interpreter added this postscript: "Last year when [the documents] about to be presented arrived, the ships turned around and did not follow the established procedures. The Japanese translation was prepared in the tenor of the materials brought during the years in question." In other words, with the translation still incomplete, the reports seem to have been delivered hurriedly in midstream. "The final items will delivered very soon." It remains unclear whether the ships withdrew without having arriving at Nagasaki or, if they in fact did arrive but the presentation of the fūsetsugaki was forgotten amid the confusion. In any event, the previous year's material was brought back and delivered as that year's. In the end the translator appended the following justification:

In the matter of the presentation of the Japanese translation of the betsudan fūsetsugaki, in due time it was pressed for. Although we worked on it diligently day and night, and there were documents which we copied out into Dutch from the record of daily events of the aforementioned Englishman, it was still different from the customary materials translated into Japanese. When we reported on it secretly, it was only among a small group of people and was not released. Thus, maximum discussion of this could not make much headway at all. When about half of it was completed, we delivered it first, and that left the remaining portion.

This note is dated the "seventh month, year of the tiger" It goes on: "Seals of the overseer, the major and the minor translators," but the names of these three individuals were omitted from this manuscript.

I cannot say if the foregoing applied only to the fūsetsugaki, but, as can be seen in the quotation above, it had to be reported on

in secret. Thus, because it was apportioned to a small number of people and not released, the translation did move ahead rapidly. Was this was due to official secretiveness or were they additionally wary of the considerable impact that would be exerted on the general populace by this affair?

The subsequent sections were similarly presented in the "seventh month, year of the tiger," and in the postscript it reads: "The earlier material was already delivered, and the final item was translated into Japanese and presented," and the official titles of those responsible for the translation are given as "overseer, major translator, office of document translation, and minor translator." And, finally, it reads: "Presented according to the instruction stated above from the governor-general of Jakarta," and signed: "Notetaker Captain." The next line reads: "Translation and original of the text presented together as above," and it is signed "seal of the major translator," though the major translator's name is omitted. Although no date is given (it may have been omitted from the manuscript), from the content it was clearly brought aboard the ships that entered port in the year after the year of the tiger, corresponding to the translated reports of 1843 or Tenpō 14.

This three-volume manuscript is an extremely detailed transcription of reports. As can be seen, however, from the translation office's efforts not to allow any leaks in the process, this manuscript was probably delivered to either the Nagasaki Magistrate or to the Tokugawa shogunate and then later copied by people in their service. Thus, the Japanese authorities had concrete, detailed reports from the beginning of the Opium War, through its course of development, and the consequences of its conclusion.

I also have in my collection a one-volume manuscript record of the Opium War entitled Kanton nikki 広東日記 [Canton Diary]. It is identical in content to the Ahen fūsetsugaki, with the minor caveat that the copyist was a different person and hence there are a few differences in characters. For example, the Ahen fūsetsugaki notes only "shinko ryō Kapitan" 新吉両かびたん (the two Captains, old and new) and omits their names, but the Kanton nikki inserts the two Captains names. Also, where the Ahen fūsetsugaki noted only "overseer, major translator, office of document translation, and minor translator" for the official titles of those responsible for preparing the translation, the Kanton nikki lists in a row the names of thirteen individuals. However, the Kanton nikki only contains about half of the volume of records found in the Ahen fūsetsugaki, ending with the translated texts through the seventh month of 1842 and not covering the final peace talks.

Notes

1. With Russians already beginning to appear from time to time in Hokkaidō to the north, (Kansei 寛政 9) Ōhara Sakingo 大原左金吾 (Donkyō 吞響, d. 1810) wrote Hokuchi kigen 北地危言 [Alarming Words about the Northern Lands] in 1797. The edition of this work in my possession, dated 1888, was published as a supplement to the Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun 東京日日新聞, with an introduction by Fukuchi Gen'ichirō (1841-1906). Furthermore, in the tense atmosphere with Russian and British ships off Japanese and Chinese coastal waters, Koga Dōan 古賀洞庵 (1788-1847) in 1838 (Tenpō 9) wrote Kaibō okusoku 海防臆測 [Speculations about Coastal Defenses]. My woodblock-printed edition of this work, dated 1880, carries prefaces by Yamagata Aritomo 山県有朋 (1838-1922) and others. Both works attracted considerable attention.

During the Kaei reign period (1848-54), as British and American ships arrived at Japanese shores and imperial instructions on strictly enforcing coastal defenses were issued several times, Shionoya Tōin 塩谷右陰 wrote the Chūkai shigi 署海私議 (Personal Views on the "Chouhai" Chapter {Wei Yuan's first chapter in the Haiquo tuzhi}) was written; my edition of this work carries the tag "Tōin's unpublished manuscripts" and is a copy of that owned by Tamura Hisatsune 田村久常, daimyo of Kashiwahara. In 1853, with the arrival of Perry's ships at Uraga and Putiatin's at Nagasaki, the Kaibōbi ron 海防備論 [On Coastal Defense Preparedness] by Fujimori Tenzan 藤森天山 (Kōan 弘庵, 1799-1862) appeared; my edition of this work is a copy with a postface dated Kaei 6 or 1853. These works too created a major sensation. When Townsend Harris arrived to demand a commercial treaty with Japan, views on coastal defenses were already an established phenomenon.

Translator's note. Ōhara's work in three volumes appears also in Chihoku gūdan 地北寓談 [Stories about the North], ed. Ōtomo Kisaku 大友喜作 (Tokyo: Hokkō shobō, 1944).

2. (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1958), pp. 633-40. This work comprises volume 5 of his Zhongguo sixiang tongshi 中国思想通史 [Comprehensive History of Chinese Thought].

3. In Zhongguo jindai sixiang shilun wenji 中国近代思想史論文集 [Historical Essays in Modern Chinese Thought] (Shanghai: Renmin chubanshe, 1958), pp. 11-25.

a. It is hard, so far removed in time and space and with Masuda no longer alive, to know if he really found these absurd arguments the least bit convincing or interesting. Like the opening quotation to this book from Mao's On the People's Democratic Dictatorship (see the first installment of this translation, SJS II.2, pp. 20-21), such use of contemporary Chinese references were probably being used

largely to add some sort of authority to the topic under discussion. In other words, Wei Yuan's thought certainly is important in and of itself and influential in nineteenth-century Japan, precisely as Masuda has and will show. To drop citations about the "progressiveness" (in Marxist-Leninist terms) of his thought not only has no place in this discussion; it is virtually meaningless, unless the author is merely trying to demonstrate that contemporary Chinese scholars (and hence the Chinese government) accept Wei Yuan as "important." This phenomenon is not unique to Japanese scholars.

4. Also, the Yapian zhanzheng shiqi sixiang shi ziliao xuanji 鴉片戰爭時期思想史資料選輯 [Selected Materials on the Intellectual History of the Period of the Opium War], ed. Editorial Selection Group on Modern History of the Modern History Institute of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (Beijing: Zhong-Hua shuju, 1963) first transcribes Wei Yuan's introduction to the Huangchao jingshi wenbian (pp. 1-2) and then proceeds to his introductions to the Shengwu ji (pp. 73-74) and the Haiquo tuzhi (pp. 74-75), followed by the first four sections of "Chouhai pian" from the main text of the Haiquo tuzhi (pp. 75-86).

5. I have searched through the three volumes of the Dai Saigō zenshū 大西郷全集 [Collected Works of the Great Saigō Takamori] (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1926-27), but I have been unable to find any reference to the relationship between Saigō and the Haiquo tuzhi. Perhaps, Liang Qichao was mistaken.

b. The Seiken roku was written originally in Kanbun. This translation follows Masuda's modern Japanese rendition with help from Charles Terry's somewhat outdated English version, as it appears excerpted in Sources of Japanese Tradition, ed. Ryusaku Tsunoda, Wm Theodore de Bary, and Donald Keene (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), vol. 2, pp. 105-07. I take responsibility for all errors.

6. I have a one-volume copy of this work in which Zōzan discusses policies for coastal defense. It is included in Fujita Mokichi 藤田茂吉, Bunmei tōzen shi 文明東漸史 [A History of the Eastward Movement of Civilization] (Tokyo: Hōchisha, 1886).

7. Katsu Kaishū jiden: Hikawa seiwa 勝海舟自伝 : 氷川清話 [The Autobiography of Katsu Kaishū: Pure Conversations from the Icy Stream], ed. Katsume Mitake 勝部真長 (Kashiwa: Hiroike gakuen shuppanbu, 1967; Tokyo reprint: Kadogawa shoten, 1972).

c. Saiyū nikki, in Yoshida Shōin zenshū 吉田松陰全集 [Collected Works of Yoshida Shōin], ed. Yamaguchi ken kyōikukai (Tokyo: Daiwa shobō, 1976), volume 9, pp. 23-107. Hereafter, Yoshida Shōin zenshū will be referred to as YSZ in text and notes.

8. Furthermore, according to the Tōin sensei nenpū 宿陰先生年譜 [Chronological Biography of Shionoya Tōin], edited by Tōin's grandson, Shionoya Tokitoshi 時敏 (Seizan 青山) (n.p.: Shionoya On, 1923), Ahen ibun (in seven volumes) was compiled by Tōin in Kōka 4 (1847) when he was 39 years of age (East Asian style); "prior to that time the Opium War had occurred in China, and with the growing sense of crisis felt [in Japan], sensei said that we had to make preparations. Thus, he compiled the Ahen ibun in seven volumes. Such domains of Chōshū, Satsuma, Saijō, and Sakura dispatched men to copy this text which hence served as a warning." From this we learn that various domains vied to chronicle the Opium War in China as an "exhortative lesson" (imashime no kagami 戒めの鑑) which might bear upon the destiny of Japan itself.

d. The original by Hara Nensai 原念斎 (1774-1820) is in Kanbun: (Ōsaka: Gungyoku shodō, 1816, eight kan), held in the collection of the Harvard-Yenching Library; translated into Japanese and edited by Oyanagi Shigeta 小柳司氣太 (1870-1940) (Tokyo: Shun'yōdō shoten, 1936).

e. The two works by Takano Chōei can be found in the collection of the Harvard-Yenching Library. Yume monogatari has been reprinted in Watanabe Kazan, Takano Chōei, Kudō Heisuke, Honda Toshiaki 渡辺華山、高野長英、工藤平助、本田利明, ed. Satō Shōsuke 佐藤昌介 (Tokyo: Chūō kōron sha, 1972). Chen's work has been printed in many editions, such as: (Taibei: Taiwan yinhang, 1958).

f. Yamaga was the lineal descendent of the great philosopher Yamaga Sokō (1622-85). See YSZ, 7:27, n. 1. Masuda mistranscribes the date here, as it should be eighth month, 23rd day, the same date as the letter itself; see YSZ, 7:80-81.

g. In Noyama goku bunkō 野山獄文稿 [Manuscripts from Noyama Prison], in YSZ, 2:333-35. The original Kanbun texts of the Noyama goku bunkō have been annotated by Andō Kiichi 安藤紀一, Kunchū Yoshida Shōin sensei Noyama bunkō 訓註吉田松陰先生野山文稿 [The Noyama Prison Manuscripts of Yoshida Shōin with Annotations] (Yamaguchi: Yamaguchi ken kyōikukai, 1932).

9. From this point on, Shōin is referring to "Yi zhan" 議戰 [On war], the third part of "Chouhai pian" in juan 1 of the Haiguo tuzhi.

h. In Noyama goku bunkō, in YSZ, 2:322-23.

i. In YSZ, 2:93-131. See SJSN I.2, p. 43. The Chinese author was Luo Sen 羅森.

10. See my "Man-Shin kiji to sono hissha, waga kuni ni tsutaerareta 'Taihei tengoku' ni tsuite" [満清記事とその筆者、わが國に伝えられた太平天国]について [The Man-Qing jishi and its author, how the "Taiping Heavenly Kingdom" was transmitted to Japan], in Torii Hisayasu kyōju kakō kinen ronshū 鳥居久靖教授華甲記念論集 [Essays in Honor of Professor Torii Hisayasu on the Occasion of His 61st Birthday] (1973), reprinted in the volume presently being serially translated.

11. The 100-juan edition which I own is a reprint edition of the Guangxu 1 (1875) text; it carries a postface by Zuo Zongtang 左宗棠 (1812-85) and was published by Shanghai shuju in 1895. In the 60-juan edition from juan 53 on and in the 100-juan edition from juan 84 on, both texts are concerned with issues of manufacturing cannons, ships, explosives, and telescopes; also, it covers the earth and astronomy, and in various sections there is material on coastal defenses and military preparedness.

j. The Xiaofang huzhai yudi congchao is a work in 84 string-bound volumes (ce 冊), comp. Wang Xiqi 王錫祺 (1855-1913), originally published in Shanghai (Zhuyitang 著易堂, 1877-97). Lin Zexu's Sizhou zhi appears in the 82nd ce. It has been reprinted several times: (Taibei: Guangwen shuju 広文書局, 1962; Taibei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1975).

12. In the prewar period, "Sibei buyao" was a series of reprints of fine works published by Zhong-Hua shuju.

13. Also it might be argued that, because those responsible for the Opium War, with the cruel consequences it brought, were still alive and held power as high officials of the court, there was reason to fear it.

k. Kimura Kaishū's work has been reprinted: edited by Nihon shiseki kyōkai (Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1978), 2 volumes; Katsu Kaishū's work: (Tokyo: Hara shobō, 1968), 2 volumes; and the original of Yoshino Maho's work: (Tokyo: self-published, 1883), 17 kan.

l. Reprinted several times, such as: (Tokyo: Min'yūsha, 1926); (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1967); (Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1978).

14. In the "Zhongguo jindai shi ciliao congkan" 中國近代史資料叢刊 (Publication Series of Materials on Modern Chinese History) series, there are six volumes of documents entitled Yapian zhanzheng 鴉片戰爭 [The Opium War] (Shanghai: Shenzhou guoguangshe, 1954); the sixth volume includes "Yapian zhanzheng shumu jieti" 鴉片戰爭書目解題 [Explanation of Writings on the Opium War].

m. Liang's work has been reprinted several times: (Beijing: Zhong-Hua shuju, 1959); and (Taibei: Wenhui chubanshe, 1970). A more recent edition of Yao's work is: (Beijing: Renmin chubansha, 1984).

15. Shi Daogang 師道剛 has put forth the thesis that "Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji" was not the work of Wei Yuan at all, but actually fourteen years prior to the revised edition from the Shenbaoguan, its ancestor text, "Yingjili yichuan rukou ji" 英吉利夷船入寇記 [Account of the plunder by the barbarian ships of England] (later retitled "Yangwu quanyu" 洋務權輿 [The origin of Western affairs]) by Li Dean 李德庵 was published in Tongzhi 4 (1865); and borrowing Wei Yuan's name, he made a series of revisions to the text, thereby changing its original appearance. Shi's view has given rise to a debate with Yao Weiyuan who thoroughly denies this entire position. The May 3, 1959 issue of Guangming ribao 光明日報 carried an essay by Shi entitled "Guangyu 'Yangwu quanyu' yishu" 関於「洋務權輿」一書 [On the essay "Yangwu quanyu"]; and in the December issue of Lishi yanjiu 歷史研究 that year, Yao published a rebuttal entitled "Guanyu 'Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji' de zuozhe wenti" 関於「道光洋艘征撫記」的作者問題 [Questions concerning the author of the "Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji"]. The debate was not over, for in the April 1960 issue of Lishi yanjiu Yao responded with "'Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji' zuozhe wenti de zaishangquan" 「道光洋艘征撫記」作者問題的再商榷 [Renewed discussion of the questions of authorship of the "Daoguang yangsao zhengfu ji"], and it spawned a variety of rebuttals. The reason this text was later included in the Shengwu ji had given rise to a number of different points of view. I do have sufficient space to give a detailed explanation for the position I have taken, and while each point can convincingly be made, it cannot be made decisively.

16. Preface dated 1870, contained in Tōin sonkō 岩陰存稿 [Extant Writings of (Shionoya) Tōin], kan 4.

n. The factory director, or opperhoofd as he was known in Dutch, was referred to by the Japanese as Kapitan or "Captain." See Grant K. Goodman, Japan: The Dutch Experience (London: The Athlone Press, 1986), p. 13.

o. Reprinted: (Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1979).

p. The name of the "Captain" is given here in Japanese syllabaries, and, deficient as I am in Dutch, I have as yet been unable to identify him. I hope to do so before the next issue of SJS. Incidentally, the Ahen füsetsugaki were composed in sorobun and virtually call out for mistranslation. Readers are implored to point out errors to me.