

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. 59-81.

Masuda Wataru 増田 渉

PART 3

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

9. The Influence of the Opium War on Japan

The Second Opium War developed as a joint Anglo-French military force invaded Tianjin and Beijing, and as a result the Chinese signed the Treaty of Tianjin (1858) and the Convention of Beijing (1860) with England and France. These supplied the legal basis to spur on the latter's policies for the colonization of China. This development transpired with the eruption of the "Arrow Incident" in October 1856, or the ninth month of the third year of Ansei 安政, according to the Japanese calendar. As a result of this incident, the British military forces burned the Guangzhou (Canton) market area to the ground. Information regarding all of these "incidents" was conveyed to Japan in concrete detail in documents submitted to the shogunate which were based on direct conversations between Opperhoofd Donker Curtius and the overseeing officials under the command of the Nagasaki Magistrate (bugyō 奉行), Nagamochi Kōjirō 永持享次郎 and an assistant overseer.

It was similar to the transmission of an explanation of incidents conveyed by the British authorities stationed in Hong Kong, and at this time many members of the British Parliament were opposed to their government's hardline stance. Richard Cobden (1804-65), William Gladstone (1809-98), and other influential political figures fiercely attacked their government's policies, and the issue became entangled in the events leading to the dissolution of the House of Commons. At this time (1857), Karl Marx (1818-83) was living in London and he took up the issue himself. He published two articles in the New York Daily Tribune which scathingly exposed and attacked

Britian's China policies (March 15, 1857 [no. 4970] and April 10, 1857 [1984], both unsigned).^a What caught the eye of the Japanese, though, was the latter half of the conversations with the Opperhoofd, inasmuch as these included instructions from the Dutch government, where an important recommendation was offered to the Japanese government.

The Opperhoofd pointed out that, while the British had become caught up in the attack on and destruction of Guangzhou, the shogunate's inclination to self-conceit and condescension toward foreign nations was readily apparent in the diplomatic correspondence; this was due either to Japan's dissatisfaction with the other party or to its being completely out of line with commonly accepted diplomatic knowledge at the time, being mired in details and causing delays in negotiations. As the Guangzhou case indicated, trivial events could clearly give rise to grave matters. Although the Dutch did not actually say "Your country is as weak as China," if the peace were broken, the shogunate was not as well prepared militarily as the Europeans. Thus, the Dutch warned that, "in this matter concerning China, we should like your candid judgment and disposition insofar as they concern matters of foreign nations with nothing overlooked."

It was just at this time that Townsend Harris (1804-78) arrived aboard ship and, through face-to-face meetings with the shogunal Council of Elders (Rōjū 老中) and an audience with the shogun, he persistently demanded that he be allowed to present his credentials to the bakufu. However, unable to come to a decision about public opinion easily, the bakufu was embarrassed by this treatment and tried simply to gloss over the matter through procrastination and the like. Thus, the authorities received something of a shock from the recommendation of the Dutch Opperhoofd, apparently sufficient to make them reconsider matters.

Among the senior members of the Council of Elders, Hotta Masayoshi 堀田正睦, who was now employed full-time by the Office of Foreign Affairs, circulated a report of the Opperhoofd's conversation to "the members of the Office of Evaluation, the naval defense office, the Nagasaki magistracy, the Shimoda magistracy, and the Hakodate magistracy" to which he attached his own "opinions" as follows: "It is extremely difficult for you to recover rapidly from even a single cannon firing... There shall be changes in the methods used to this point, and there will be ways to improve management for further control." He went on to say that "deliberations with kindness and forbearance are underway concerning past dispositions, and we shall let you know as quickly as possible the results of our analy-

ses," and he ordered an evaluation of the Dutch recommendation.

In my manuscript edition of the work that excerpts this document, it reads: "On the 24th day of the second lunar month of Ansei 4 [1857], the lord of Sakura [namely, Hotta Masayoshi] delivered this document in person. The original was sent to the Office of Evaluation, and a copy went to the overseer. The very fact that this document was "delivered in person" by Japan's highest diplomatic official would seem to indicate the gravity of the matter.

In their joint "Letter Presenting Discussions on the Matter of Your Note [namely, Hotta's position piece] Concerning the Matter of the British Burning of Guangdong," Matsudaira Chikanao 松平近直 (Kawachi no kami 河内守), Kawaji Toshiakira 川路聖謨 (1801-68), and Mizuno Tadanori 水野忠徳 (1810-68, Chikugo no kami 筑後守) reported the same views of the "discussants": "It is difficult to foresee what shall come in the wake of [the despoilation of] Guangdong," and thus "there shall be changes in the methods used to this point, and there will be ways to improve management for further control." Later, Japanese foreign policy underwent a rapid transformation with the "changes in the methods used to this point" (namely, from a policy of exclusion to one of peaceful diplomatic intercourse), Harris's audience with the shogun, his presentation of credentials to the bakufu, his speech to shogunal leaders at Hotta's residence, and his conversations (negotiations over the concrete details of the texts of treaties) with important bakufu officials (Inoue Kiyonao 井上清直 [1809-67, Shinano no kami 信濃守] and Iwase Tadanori 岩瀬忠震 [1818-61, Higo no kami 肥後守]).

I also have a three-volume manuscript copy of a text entitled Amerika shisetsu taiwasho 墨夷使節対話書 [Text of Conversations with the American Envoy]. It notes that on the sixth day of the eleventh lunar month of Ansei 4, such important shogunal officials as Toki Yorimune 土岐頼昌 (Tanba no kami 丹波守), Kawaji Toshiakira, Udonō Chōei 鵜殿長銳, Inoue Kiyonao, and Nagai Hisayuki 永井尚志 "had a variety of questions to raise about certain items which they wished to examine among those discussed at the home of Bichū no kami 備中守 [Hotta Masayoshi] the other day [Ansei 4/10/26]. Upon receiving word from Bichū no kami, they discussed it in great detail." They then set out for Harris's lodgings at the Bansho shirabesho, and at the time of the conclusion of the treaty, they questioned him about conditions in foreign lands; they listened to his answers in the greatest detail.

Later, from the eleventh day of the twelfth lunar month of that

year until the twelfth day of the first month of the following year, Inoue and Iwase as representatives of Japan met with Harris on thirteen occasions to examine in the finest detail and go over questions and answers one by one concerning the draft of the treaty proposed by Harris. A detailed record of these meetings, the Amerika shisetsu taiwashō, was compiled as a documentary report and signed by Inoue and Iwase.

Reports on conversations with the aforementioned Oppperhoofd Donker Curtius and other documents from the same time period are collected in a manuscript edition in my possession (twelve string-bound volumes of Mino paper, edited and a clean copy made in what appears to be the early Meiji period). It carries the title Gai chinsetsu zakki 外夷珍説雑記 [Collection of Strange Ideas of the Foreign Barbarians], although it ought to be called "A Collection of Documents on Foreign Relations of the Late Edo Period." In particular, the Oppperhoofd's conversations have been cited in a number of works now, such as volume 15 of the Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei monjo 幕末外国関係文書 [Documents Concerning Foreign Relations in the Late Edo Period], which is in Dai Nihon komonjo 大日本古文書 [Ancient Documents of Japan] (Tokyo: Shiryō hensanjo 史料編纂所 [Historiographical Institute, Tokyo University], 1922), and Bakumatsu Ishin gaikō shiryō shūsei 幕末維新外交史料集成 [Compilation of Historical Materials on Foreign Affairs in the Late Edo and Meiji Restoration Eras] (Tokyo: Ishin shigakkai 維新史学会 [Study Group on the Meiji Restoration], 1942).

Also, in the Ishin shiryō kōyō 維新史料綱要 [Essentials of the Historical Materials on the Meiji Restoration] (Tokyo: Ishin shiryō hensan jimukyoku, 1937), one finds an item dated Ansei 4/2/24: "The shogunate has learned a lesson from the disputes between China and Britain in Guangdong and has laid out the essentials for reforms in the apparatus of diplomacy. Orders went out to the members of the Office of Evaluation, the naval defense office, the Nagasaki magistracy, the Shimoda magistracy, and the Hakodate magistracy to review these [reform ideas] closely." It then proceeds to cite numerous documents (manuscripts, largely). The traumatic conversations of the Oppperhoofd apparently circulated rather widely at the time.

Hotta Masayoshi attached his own "opinions" to Oppperhoofd Curtius's conversations, and I first saw this document in two works: Naitō Chisō 内藤耻史 Kaikoku kigen Ansei kiji 開國起原安政記事 [Account from the Ansei Period of the Opening of the Country] (Tokyo: Tōgaidō, 1888 or 1889) and Kimura Kaishū 木村芥舟, Sanjū nen shi 三十年史 [Thirty-Year History] (Tokyo: Kōjunsha, 1892), both cited earlier.^b

The former, in particular, after mention of the Opperhoofd's conversations and Hotta's "opinions," goes on to say: "Here was a proposal for trade and peace negotiations, and opinions among shogunal officials were fixed." Despite the regularized nature of opinions at the bakufu, public opinion among influential members of the populace at large was by no means standardized. Within many domains, the uproar continued with countless views being expressed on the exclusion policy. Be that as it may, the shogunate had taken the decisive step toward reform in the world of foreign affairs. Thus, the burning of Guangzhou to the ground by the British military as a result of the Arrow Incident, which precipitated the Second Opium War, eventually drove Japanese history to a new stage.

Among the works written about the Opium War (the first one) from the perspective of China as the victimized country and then conveyed to Japan where it was widely read in manuscript form was the Yifei fanjing lu 夷匪犯境錄 [A Record of the Invasion of the Barbarians, J. Ihi hankyō roku].^c It is still unknown who wrote it and the route by which it made its way to Japan. While this work was indeed well known in Japan as a text describing the events of the Opium War, it did not circulate widely in China. The "Yapian zhanzheng shumu jieti" 鴉片戰爭書目解題 [Annotated bibliography of works on the Opium War], included in volume six of the documentary series Yapian zhanzheng 鴉片戰爭 [The Opium War], is a compilation with explanatory notes of numerous historical materials concerning the Opium War that are extant within and without China. At the mention of the title Yifei fanjing lu in this bibliography, however, it is listed only as a work presently being search for. For, although only the name was known in China for this work that circulated in Japan, the work itself could not then be found in its native land. Perhaps, it was never published in China, but made its way overseas only in manuscript form.¹

Although manuscripts of the work were made in Japan as well, Katsura Isoo 桂五十郎 (Koson 湖村, 1868-1938) notes in his Kanseki kaidai 漢籍解題 [Explanations for Chinese-Language Texts] (Tokyo: Meiji shoin, 1905) a text by the name of Ihi hankyō bunkenroku 夷匪犯境明見錄 [A Record of Observations about the Invasion of the Barbarians, Ch. Yifei fanjing wenjianlu]^d (in six volumes): "This work chronicles the circumstances surrounding the British invasion of the southern border of China during the Daoguang reign period, hence its title. Its author does not make his identity clear." The following words are further appended at the very end of the Japanese reprint:

"Fourth year of the Ansei reign in Japan, woodblock print edition in the collection of the Meirindō 明倫堂." By the same token, though, Kasai Sukeji 笠井助治 (b. 1905), in his Kinsei hankō ni okeru shuppan-sho no kenkyū 近世藩校に於ける出版書の研究 [Studies of Published Works in the Domainal Schools in the Early Modern Period] (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1962), mentions a Ihi hankyō kenbunroku 夷匪犯境見聞録 (Ch. Yifei fanjing jianwenlu) as a publication of the Meirindō from the domain of Takanabe 高鍋 in Kyūshū, and notes: "Written by domainal lord Akitsuki Taneki 秋月種殷 published in Ansei 4." As concerns its contents, Kasai writes: "It describes events concerning diplomacy with various foreign countries in the Kaei 嘉永 and Ansei periods prior to the Meiji Restoration. It also compiles various diplomatic documents, and is thus a work intended to teach students knowledge and the circumstances appertaining at the time in foreign lands."

Although both of these works were published in six juan in Ansei 4 at the Meirindō (note the slightly different titles), in the annotations offered by each we can see that they are entirely different in content. Furthermore, where the Kanseki kaidai says that the "author [of Ihi hankyō bunkenroku] does not make his identity clear," the Kinsei hankō ni okeru shuppansho no kenkyū mentions that the Ihi hankyō kenbunroku was: "Written by domainal lord Akitsuki Taneki."

The Itsuzon shomoku 佚存書目 [Listing of Lost Books] (edited by Hattori Unokichi 服部宇之助 [1867-1939], and, according to the introduction, compiled by Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎 and Nagasawa Kikuya 長沢規矩也 [Tokyo: Bunkyūdō, Sōundō, 1933]) is a listing with annotations of old Chinese texts lost in China but still extant in Japan. It carries the following notation: "The Yifei fanjing lu in three volumes and the Ihi hankyō bunkenroku in three volumes." Noting that "no author's name is given," it says they were both published and manuscripts, "a woodblock printing from the Ansei period and manuscript copies from the Edo period." It goes on to offer the explanation that these works "chronicle events concerning the eruption of the Opium War. Many manuscript copies came to Japan, and woodblock printings have recently circulated somewhat." However, it is incorrect in saying "the eruption of the Opium War," for the work lacks material about the start of the war and describes events from the British military's abrupt call for the surrender of the Dinghai magistrate through to the peace treaty negotiations. It would seem that the annotator had not read the text here closely.

In the section entitled "zasshi" 雑史 [various histories] in the Naikaku bunko tosho dainibu Kansho mokuroku 内閣文庫圖書第二部漢書目錄 [Bibliography of Chinese-language Books in Section Two of the Naikaku

bunko] (1914), there is an entry which reads: Ihi hankyō roku, published in Ansei 4, six volumes.² However, in the section entitled "zasshi rui" 雜佳史類 [varieties of histories] in the Seikadō bunko Kanseki bunrui mokuroku 靜嘉堂文庫漢籍分類略 [Catalogued Bibliography of Chinese-language Texts in the Seikadō Library] (Tokyo: Seikadō, 1930)^e, there is also an entry for the Ihi hankyō roku which reads in fine print: "Three volumes, appended is the Ihi hankyō kenbunroku in three volumes... Author's name missing, manuscript." The number of volumes would thus be six. This work was originally from the collection of Nakamura Keiu 中村敬宇 (1832-91). Although a manuscript, had this been copied from a woodblock printed edition of the work, then perhaps: there was the three-volume chronicle of the Opium War, Yifei fanjing lu, which came to Japan from China; and Akitsuki Taneki wrote "appendices" to this work and compiled a collection on diplomacy and foreign relations with foreign lands in the years of the Kaei and Ansei reign periods, which was called the Hankyō kenbunroku in three volumes; and these two works (each with two different editions) were combined into one six-volume work.

10. The Ihi hankyō roku 夷匪犯境錄 and the Ahen shimatsu 鴉片始末

Of the two manuscript editions of the Yifei fanjing lu in my possession, one is in four volumes and one is in two volumes. Although they are the same in content, the four-volume edition is missing some of the material found at the end of the two-volume text. The two-volume text is written on thin paper in small characters close to one another; although only half as many volumes, it actually has somewhat more material contained within it. Because these were manuscripts that were not originally separated into juan, they have now become the basis, respectively, for the Iwanami bunko edition in five volumes and the Sonkeikaku bunko 尊經閣文庫 edition in three volumes.

My two editions of the original have Japanese reading punctuation inserted into the text, lines beside the names of places, people, and the like, and notes indicating where incorrectly transcribed characters appear in the text. The four-volume edition has the library seal of the Meimeidō 冥々堂, although I do not know to whom the seal belonged. Two red seals are stamped in the two-volume edition: "Library of the Seinokan" 誠之館 and "Seal of the Fukuyama 福山 Military School." The reference here is to the library of the former Bingo 備後 Fukuyama domainal school, the Seinokan. For a time toward

the end of the Edo period, daimyo Abe Masahiro 阿部正弘 (1819-62) was the leader of the shogunal Council of Elders. Since he was as well mindful of and in actual charge of foreign relations, perhaps such books were collected at the domainal school by the vassals. As with the four-volume edition, so too the two-volume edition of this work contains reading punctuation, lines beside the names of people, places, and bureaucratic offices, and corrected inaccurately transcribed characters. In addition, there are many declensional syllabaries (okurigana 送り仮名) added to the text of the two-volume edition, and the latter's explanations are much more detailed, with more inaccuracies and omissions noted.

Furthermore, in the two-volume edition, there are explanatory notes added in the blank spaces beside and above the words in the text that seem difficult to understand. It gives the appearance that it was rigorously read in detail. It would seem that the scholars--perhaps the Confucian scholars of the domainal school or the officials for military coastal defense--read the work careful and added notes where appropriate. However, there are a fair number of erroneous or simply undependable notes, such as explaining: the Chinese term maomei 冒昧 [ignorant, rash] as shi o okashite 死を冒して [defy death]; the Chinese expression matou 碼頭 [wharf, jetty] as shijō 市場 [market]; and the Chinese term zhongtang 中堂 [large scroll hung in a reception room; also an unofficial reference to a grand secretary] as kenrei 縣令 [prefectural ordinance].

The Yifei fanjing lu does not describe the changing circumstances in the Opium War on the basis of any chronological order; it has neither preface nor afterward; and the name of its compiler is absent. It simply begins in the seventh month of 1840 with a list of the names of the leaders of the British land and sea assaults and the demand for surrender that they sent to the magistrate at Dinghai. After that it is primarily a compendium of documents and reports from the time of the war--such as directives of the highest governmental authorities, reports from local officials, memorials to the Daoguang Emperor from various responsible officials, imperial edicts, promulgations from officials to the general populace as well as those from the British military to local officials, dispatches from influential Chinese, documents exchanged between the British military and the Chinese, and the text by knowledgeable Chinese entitled "Pingyi xiance" 平夷獻策 [Plan to pacify the barbarians]. Among them we find mixed in the depositions of British captives, a biography of Chen Huacheng 陳化成 who fought valiantly to the death as a Chinese mili-

tary leader, as well as a record of the atrocities committed by soldiers of the British navy. However, primary among them remain the public pronouncements and reports, and from them one can glean the concrete circumstances of the war and the changes over time. It concludes with the text of the peace treaty of 1842, but this portion is missing from the four-volume edition of this work in my possession.

Although the reports of the Opperhoofd may have been known by one group of the authorities and other concerned parties, the general intelligent public, it seems, was able to get a rather detailed description of the Opium War that had erupted in their neighboring land through the Yifei fanjing lu and its successive transcriptions. In an 1853 letter to Nagahara Takeshi 長原武 (Kaei 6), Yoshida Shōin 吉田松陰 (1830-59) wrote: "I have heard that you are engaged in a comparative textual reading of the Fanjing lu, and I would like to join your group. I hope you will accept me." This would indicate the enthusiastic, academic pose taken by Japan as they tried to study the Opium War through group reading of texts.

In this connection, Shōin had at the age of sixteen in 1846 (Kyōka 弘化 3) copied out the text of a report on foreign relations of the time entitled Waiyi xiao shi 外夷小史 [Short History of the Foreign Barbarians].³ In it he transcribed reports (perhaps from the lower Yangzi region) concerning the Opium War brought by British ships that called at the port of Nagasaki in 1841 (Tenpō 天保 12). These were quite vague and contained a large number of incorrect characters and clerical errors.

I also have a copy of an anti-Christian tract written by Aizawa Seishisai 会沢正志斎 (1782-1836), Sokuja manroku 急邪漫録 [Full Record of Putting a Stop to Wickedness] (manuscript copy completed in 1852), in which the author cites the Shengwu ji and, when touching on the Opium War, occasionally cites the Fanjing lu. Earlier yet, at the very beginning of his Shin-Ei sen ki 清英戦記 [Record of the Sino-British War] (four string-bound volumes in manuscript, preface dated 1849, to be discussed more fully below), Nagayama Nuki (or Kan) 長山貫 notes: "I have recently read books on the British bandits, Shinpan and Hankyō." These last two are references to Shinpan kiryaku 侵犯事略 [Summary Account of the Invasion] and Yifei fanjing lu.

Similarly, in the "introductory remarks" (reigen 例言) to his Kaigai shinwa 海外新話 [New Stories from Overseas] (published in five string-bound volumes, to be discussed in more detail below),⁴ Mineta Fūkō's 嶺田楓江 (1817-83) book on the Opium War, with a preface dated

1849, he also notes: "The reports in this work are based on the Yifei fanjing lu." It would thus seem that the Yifei fanjing lu was widely disseminated, although I still have no hard historical material to date precisely when this work actually came to Japan from China. In the Iwase bunko tosho mokuroku 岩瀬文庫圖書目録 [List of Books in the Iwase Collection] (published by the Iwase bunko, Nishio city, Aichi prefecture, 1936), there is an entry dated 1848 (Kaei 1) for a manuscript edition of the Yifei fanjing lu in one string-bound volume. That may mean that the book initially came to Japan in the preceding Kōka 弘化 period (1844-48). If that is the case, it would place it just after the ratification of the peace treaty (the Treaty of Nanjing).

As I noted earlier, though, this book strangely begins with the British demands for surrender conveyed to the magistrate of Dinghai. Perhaps an earlier section of the text [dealing with events in the Opium War before that] has since been lost.

One work, compiled concisely in Japan, which deals with the Opium War from its eruption through the small commotion following the conclusion of the peace treaty and which concludes with the author's own views appended is the Ahen shimatsu 鴉片始末 [The Opium {War} from Beginning to End] (original in Kanbun, one string-bound volume) by Saitō Kaoru 齋藤 馨 (1815-52, also known as Chikudō 竹堂 and Shitoku 子徳). In an afterward to this work, dated the sixth month of Kōka 1 [1844], Saitō Setsudō 齋藤 拙堂 (1797-1865, Seiken 正謙) writes: "This chronicling of the events is far better than reading the reports (fūsetsugaku) of the Chinese and Dutch. The writing is far clearer as well."

The next postface, dated the ninth month of the same year, is signed Heikei 平啓 (Sakuma Zōzan 佐久間 象山, 1811-64), and it reads in part:

There is no greater danger to the realm to be feared more at present than the foreign bandits. Nothing is more important than our making military preparations and coming to understanding them... However, people today are confused about this and few know that this is something to be overcome. By himself Shitoku has worked hard in this cause to compose his Ahen shimatsu to provide the material to know them. The breadth of his knowledge is such that he is not just a gifted writer.

He thus saw this book as a valuable piece of work to come to understand "them" (foreign countries) and to encourage Japan toward mili-

tary preparedness.

There is also an appended afterward, dated to the next year (1845), by Kanda Mitsuru 神田充 which notes: "How well [are described] the affairs of foreigners!" And, from the same year, there is an afterward by Murase Shū 村瀬賢 which reads: "Border defenses must also be attended to."

All of these authors saw the Opium War as a mirror of sorts, encouraging Japan strongly to make defensive preparations. With these events of the time as its background, the Ahen shimatsu seems to have been widely circulated.

In a preface (dated Kaei 6 or 1853) to Saitō Chikudō's Tokushi zeigi 読史贅議 [Superfluous Words upon Reading History],^f Asaka Gonsai 安積良斎 (1791-1860) notes: "When he was a student [at the Shōheikō, the shogunal school in Edo], he wrote the Ahen shimatsu in one string-bound volume, and it won him a high reputation for his talents." He goes on to mention that Chikudō died at the young age of 37, leaving over twenty written works. The creator, he notes, provided him with an abundance of talent but was stingy in his allocation of years. Shinozaki Shōchika 篠崎小竹, in an 1844 postface to Chikudō bunshō 竹堂文鈔 [Selections from the Prose Writings of (Saitō) Chikudō] (1879), writes: "Shitoku's writing and his intelligence are widely known and each of his prose and poetic writings have stunned men. This great admiration is enough to inspire jealousy." In any event, the facts that he was a highly talented man and that he had a wealth of ability as a writer may have been sufficient to make this book known at the time.

According to the Chikudō Saitō kun nenpu 竹堂斎藤君年譜 [Chronological Biography of Saitō Chikudō] (written by Saitō Daizaburō 斎藤大三郎 and included at the front of the Chikudō bunshō), the Ahen shimatsu was a work was written in 1843 (Tenpō 14) when Chikudō was 28 years of age and a student at the Shōheikō. The next year he became the headmaster at the Shōheikō. As can be seen from the many afterwards cited above, already from these years the Ahen shimatsu seems to have been a well known work, widely distributed, and it would seem a work that slightly predated the coming to Japan of the Yifei fanjing lu. For this reason, the first part of the Ahen shimatsu (in Kanbun) on the whole corresponds to the Ahen fūsetsugaki (in Japanese) of the Tenpō period, introduced earlier. Possibly, it was written on the basis either of the Ahen fūsetsugaki or a similar work (such as the reports of the Oppelhoofd). One sees in the section at the end of which Chikudō appended his own views that he wrote in a highly deprecatory fashion of China and was apparently taking sides with the

British.

I have three different editions of the Ahen shimatsu. One is the aforementioned manuscript (ten sheets of Mino paper, with two pages of postfaces); another is a printed edition dated 1937 with Ise Saisuke 伊勢斎助 from Sendai listed as "editor, publisher, and printer." In the text of the latter, there is in addition to the afterword by Saitō Setsudō (Seiken) a "Seiken yūshiki" 正謙又識 [Additional words from Seiken] and it reads: "It was circulated but prohibited from being published, [so] people copied it out and placed it on their shelves." We thus learn that this work was banned from printing at the time, and only in 1937 did Mr. Ise, an apparent admirer of Chikudō's, also from Sendai, manage to have the work published. Ise actually printed ten of Chikudō's works, including Chikudō bunshō and Chikudō shishō 竹堂詩鈔 [Selections from the Poetic Writings of {Saitō} Chikudō].

The third edition of the Ahen shimatsu in my possession is a manuscript edition with Japanese syllabaries inserted into the text, an effective Japanese translation of the Kanbun original. There are lines drawn along the sides of the names of countries, place names, and personal names, and the owner of this edition was quite an enthusiastic reader. He wrote at the end on the last page: "Borrowed from Mr. Kubō 久保 in the third month of Kaei 3 [1850] and copied by hand." It is signed "Takemura Shōrei" 竹村勝礼. The fact that this work was circulated in manuscript, as was the original Kanbun in manuscript form, indicates well the great concern of Japanese intellectuals about the Opium War.

According to his chronological biography, Chikudō was born in Tōdai 遠田 in Mutsu in the year of Bunka 文化 12 (1815) and died in Edo at the age of 37 in Kaei 5 (1852). He studied at the Shōheikō, served as the headmaster there, and was a scholar of Chinese learning (Kangakusha 漢学者). However, we find in his "Yaku Yōsho gi" 訳洋書議 [Ideas for translating Western works] (contained in the first volume of Chikudō bunshō) the following lines: "We must not sever ties with Holland; we must read and study Western books"; and "those who call themselves Confucian scholars have not observed Western learning in breadth. As a rule, they try to ban it as heterodoxy." These citations would tend to indicate that he was preparing translations of Western works with the aim of learning about foreign lands.

This orientation in his thought appears in his Banshi 蕃史 [History of Foreign Lands] (one string-bound volume). At the end of the introductory remarks to this work, he signed the pretentious name "Bō

Yōshi" 茫洋子 (he who has vast knowledge of the West). In his preface (dated 1851) to this work, Sakaya Yutaka 昌谷碩 writes: "Japanese translators have not written general accounts of the major events [in the West]," and "this made Saitō Chikudō angry, do extensive reading in history, and gather together [information concerning] these major events. On that basis he wrote a historical chronicle tracing the history from past to present of the ups and downs which would be clear at a glance." It is from this note that we learn Chikudō to be the author of the work. Written in the spring of 1851, it circulated in manuscript of which one such copy is now in my library.

Later, in 1882, Takenaka Kuniyoshi 竹中邦彦 transcribed the Banshi in six string-bound volumes in volume five of his edited work Tenkōrō sōsho 天香楼叢書 [Collection from the Tower of Heavenly Fragrance]; this information can be gleaned from Hamano Tomosaburō 浜野知三郎, Nihon sōsho mokuroku 日本叢書目錄 [List of Book Collections in Japan] (Tokyo: Rikugōkan, 1927; later appended to Kokusho kaidai 國書解題 (Japanese Books, Annotated)].⁹ I have not seen this last publication, but the Nihon sōsho mokuroku incorrectly gives the author as "Saitō Setsudō."⁵

11. On Saitō Chikudō's Banshi and Other Writings

At the very beginning of the Banshi is the preface by Sakaya. It indicates what provided the motive for Chikudō to write this piece in the first place:

Scholars at present are discussing the skill of Westerners in military tactics and the relative strengths of their materiel. On this basis they are establishing national defense policies as the most important task. Often, however, they are ignorant of the reasons for victories or defeats, successes or failures, and they express their opinions on the basis of thin air. However skillful they may elaborate such a point of view, however brilliant their argumentation, they are, figuratively speaking, searching about in a dark room, with no necessity that they will gain their objective. Indeed, it is dangerous. We have no recorded histories for foreign lands, because Japanese translators have not written general accounts of the major events [in the West]. This made Saitō Chikudō angry, do extensive reading in history, and gather together [information concerning] these major events. On that basis he wrote a his-

torical chronicle tracing the history from past to present of the ups and downs which would be clear at a glance.

In other words, people at the time considered it urgent to discuss and debate Western military tactics and weaponry and to consider a wide range of defense policies. He pointed out that, because Japanese did not know what had occurred in the histories of the countries of the West, they were spinning many fanciful, imaginary theories. This situation enraged Chikudō, so he went foraging among the histories of Western lands and wrote up [his research].

Sakaya goes on to say: "He planned this piece of work [Banshi] and established his principal points of view. He discussed the times and the most efficacious timing for implementing policy. Thus, his views were well founded, offered clear examples, and illuminated that which had been little known."

If we argue that the Banshi was written to try and point up what were the bases to the generally vacuous positions being taken on foreign affairs at the time as well as to match his own insatiable curiosity, then the writing of the Ahen shimatsu was based on similar premises.

In the "introductory comments" to the Banshi, Chikudō notes:

When you look through the affairs of foreign countries and various books, you see that there are as yet no unified chronicles [in Japanese]. There is thus no way to think about major trends in their histories. This has always deeply troubled me, so I did extensive reading in Western history, taking notes and copying out material here and there, and in a chronological form I have now enabled men to gain an outline view at a glance... Inasmuch as I have not obtained every single book on Western history, I cannot claim to have gained full detail of its long past. For the time being, let us divide [this history] into three eras: antiquity (taiko 太古), the new world (shin sekai 新世界), and revolution (kakumei 革命). From revolution to the present, there has not yet been another change in period. Thus, we can stop there. As yet I do not know Western theories on the subject.

The "introductory comments" conclude with: "Kaei shingai [4 or 1851], early spring; signed: one who has vast knowledge of the West."

The opening sentences [of the main body of the work] read as follows. In the taiko period of high antiquity, we find Adam 亞當 and Eve 厄娃 in a paradise 波羅第斯 known as Eden 厄典. At the time, the climate there was conciliatory and there were no illnesses. There

were four rivers: the Andes 安日, the Tigris 知幾里斯, the Indus 印度, and the Euphrates 欧法臘得. There were numerous fish everywhere; and there were numerous trees in the water where one could relax and lots of fruit and grains for consumption. Birds and beasts formed groups, but they did not harm people. Adam, however, eventually became very proud in his heart and did not obey heaven's teachings. As a result, the earth's vapors changed, the five grains did not ripen, and the birds and beasts harmed people. Thereupon, men began to labor in the fields, and women began to bear children. The concerns of livelihood commenced.

To this section a "viewpoint" (ron 論) is attached:

In the theories of Westerners, heaven and earth are not self-generating. There is an entity which must give birth to them, and it is called the Creator 造物主. After heaven and earth were formed, He produced Adam and Eve and warned them against eating the fruit. They did not obey and were visited with limitless retribution. The Creator had mercy on them, and he vowed that one born of human beings would expiate their sins, and over 3000 years later was one who was born to Judea 如德垂, the founder of their faith, and he was crucified.

He then cites from a critique of these ideas by Arai Hakuseki 新井白石 (1657-1725), who wrote to the effect [in Chikudō's words]: "Although the exaggerations and falsehoods of this theory are those of a mere child, it clearly lacks the basis sufficient for belief."

The next portion returns to the main text and describes as follows. Adam's eldest son Cain 加印 succeeded him and administered government far and wide, as towns and cities came into existence. People all lived to the old age of several hundred years. The descendants of Cain divided into four generations; allotted to each era was one of four metals (gold, silver, copper, and iron), and machines of many kinds came into existence in this period. The taiko universe lasted from Adam for 1650 years. In the era of his descendants, the Seruteito 食爾的伊德 [the Celts?] (implying the "iron age"), there was a great flood. At that time, Noah 諾厄, the son of Lamech 羅墨吉斯, was a man of sagely morality.^h He gained forewarning of the great flood and helped construct a large box like a boat. Thenceforth, the "new world" began.

The flood was brought under control, and once again the world returned to its former state of peace, but this was the "second world" or "new world," Chikudō argued. Noah had three sons, all men of sagely morality:ⁱ "each became the founder of a state in the

West." Later, Noah's descendent Nimrod 泥模路多 became the king of Babylonia 羅鼻落你亞; his was the first of the great Western kingdoms, and he remained in power for 63 years. Thereafter, the lineage of kings continued with Persia 百兒西亞, Greece 厄勒黎亞, and Rome 羅馬, and they are "referred to as the four great Western kingdoms." (Another "viewpoint" is inserted at this point).

Next, we enter the era of "revolution." What is indicated by the term "revolution" here is the epoch of the birth of Christ. When the daughter of Judea, Saint Mary 撒多私馬利牙 [Santa Maria], was sixteen, it was revealed to her by God in a dream that she would be blessed with a sagely son; the era began when she gave birth to this son without a father. Yet, insofar as he was the "founder of a religion," it is strange that he did not earn the reputation of Jesus or Christ. There are no subsequent epochs in the West, argues Chikudō, and as such on that basis he explains the rise and fall of the states of Europe in chronicle form. He touches as well on the Mongols and the Turks 都爾格, and he concludes in 1840 with the ceremony by which the king of France enacted the reburial of Napoleon 那波列翁.

The passages summarized and quoted above were all written in Kanbun, and in my manuscript edition the "ancient" and "new world" sections fill roughly ten pages. The section from "revolution" forward, however, occupies some 60 pages. And, here and there Chikudō inserted his own evaluations in the form of "viewpoints" into the text, each roughly half a page in length.

Chikudō did not read original texts in Dutch directly and then proceed to write the Banshi. He wrote, it would seem, on the basis of translated works. This can be gleaned from the last entry in his "introductory comments": "I have still not had time to study how to read Western languages and thereupon try to put things in order."

He does not specify which variety of translations he used for writing, but his "introductory comments" note: "I did extensive reading in Western history, taking notes and copying out material here and there." This comment would seem to indicate that he took information from a wide variety of translated works. From what I have seen, he put into Kanbun but otherwise took unchanged at least the portions "antiquity" and "new world" from the first volume of a work entitled Seiyō zakki 西洋雜記 [Chronicles of the West] (published in four string-bound volumes, with a preface dated Kyōwa 享和 1 [1801]). The latter work, "newly carved for a woodblock printing in Kaei 1 [1848]," was written in Japanese by Yamamura Shōei 山村昌永 (1770-1807), a scholar of Dutch Learning who edited and enlarged Arai

Hakuseki's Sairan igen 采覧異言 [Varying Words Observed]; I have an incomplete edition of this Zōtei sairan igen 増訂采覧異言 [Varying Words Observed, Edited and Enlarged] which circulated in manuscript.

In the volume Sakoku jidai Nihonjin no kaigai chishiki: sekai chiri, Seiyō shi ni kansuru bunken kaidai 鎖国時代日本人の海外知識世界地理西洋史に關する文献解題 [The Overseas Knowledge of the Japanese During the Period of the Exclusion Policy: Explanation of Documents Concerning World Geography and Western History] (Tokyo: Kangensha, 1953),¹ Ōkubo Toshiaki 大久保利謙 argues that Chikudō's work was written in Kanbun but was structurally almost identical to two works written in Japanese: Yōgai tsūran 洋外通覽 [Overall View of the West] in three string-bound volumes (by Muze Kōshi 無是公子, Kōka 5 [1848]); and Seiyō shōshi 西洋小史 [A Short History of the West], a manuscript in three string-bound volumes (by Nagayama Nuki, preface dated Kaei 2 [1849]). A comparison of Chikudō's Banshi with the Yōgai tsūran, in particular, reveals almost parallel sentences, which leads Ōkubo to conclude that "although perhaps unsuccessful as a Kanbun translation it was not that far off"; and, hence, "this author of the Yōgai tsūran, 'Muze Kōshi,' may be none other than Saitō Chikudō himself." Inasmuch as I do not own a copy of the Yōgai tsūran, I cannot make the comparison nor offer an opinion on the matter, but I present Ōkubo's views by way of a precaution.

Chikudō interest in learning about the world overseas was built on curiosity. The last volume of Chikudō shishō (published by Ise Saisuke of Sendai in 1893) includes eight items under the title "Ryūkyū chikushi" 琉球竹枝 [Songs of the Ryūkyūs], ten under the title "Ezo chikushi" 蝦夷竹枝 [Songs of Hokkaidō], and four under "Oranda chikushi" 和蘭竹枝 [Songs of Holland]. One of the "Oranda chikushi" reads as follows: "The bluish lapis of the tower matches the colorful pendant-like moon in the evening; and not using the silvery candle-light at the banquet, this poem moves along sideways to convey its clarity."

In a preface (dated 1888) to the Chikudō shishō, Ōnuma Chinzan 大沼枕山 (1818-91) notes: "Shitoku [i.e., Chikudō] knew a great deal about the affairs of foreign countries, and thus wrote these poetic songs. He was very clear about what was being sung, and they may be superior to those of You Tong 尤洞 [1618-1704]." Thus, it would seem that Chikudō's knowledge of foreign lands was considerable, which is praised here with examples from his songs about foreign lands, but these songs probably were written in imitation of the You Tong's Waiguo zhuzhi ci 外国竹枝詞 [Songs and Prose Poems of Foreign Lands]

(reprinted with Japanese reading punctuation by Okuda Mototsugu 奥田元繼, Tenmei 天明 6 [1786]).^k

Furthermore, in his preface (dated 1882) to Chikudō shishō, Ono Kozan 小野湖山 (1814-1910) praises Chikudō's poetry: "Ancient in flavor and modern in style, he conveys his intentions throughout." In particular, "one can see his mental powers and his scholarship at their best when it comes to songs of events in the countries of the West." By "songs of events in the countries of the West," he may have also been referring to the thirteen poetic songs entitled "Gaikoku eishi" [Historical poems of foreign lands], contained in Chikudō shishō. He wrote poems: to Noah's ark; to the unification of Western lands by the kings of Babylonia; to Alexander the Great for spreading his boundaries to the three continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia; to Alexander again for taking as his teacher the sagely Aristotle; and to Aristotle who, being coldly treated by Alexander's descendents, committed suicide by drowning like Qu Yuan 屈原 [the origins of this apocryphal tale are unknown]. He also wrote poems to Columbus for sailing to the American continent with the help of the queen of Spain and to Peter the Great of Russia for traveling incognito through a number of countries, studying ship-building technology there, and returning home to encourage navigation vigorously and raise national prestige. He also wrote poems concerning a number of anecdotes and stories about Napoleon and about the great achievements of George Washington in attainment of American independence. Such deep-felt interest in the events of foreign lands make it only natural that Chikudō would be profoundly concerned by the Opium War and national defense issues, and that he would investigate these matters and compile a book on the subject.

There are also poems in Chikudō shishō written for Chen Huacheng 陳化成 and for Liu Guobiao 劉國標. These also belong in the category of "historical poems." At the time of the Opium War, Chen Huacheng was the aged provincial military commander guarding the Wusong fortress which was strategic to the defense of Shanghai. Though the great majority of the garrison troops had fled midway, Chen was greatly praised for his bravery in fighting to the bitter end and dying on the field of action. Liu Guobiao, Chen's commandant and close associate, was a military jinshi 進士. At the time [of Chen's bold battle], Liu carried Chen's corpse on his back away from the fray and hid it in a clump of reedy grass, protecting it from the enemy. He also wrote a record of Chen's martyrdom in which he described for all the conditions prevailing at the end.

Scholars from Shanghai and its environs collected poems written to commemorate the brave actions of these two men in a work entitled Biaozhong chongyi ji 表忠崇義集 [Collection of Demonstrated Devotion and Revered Righteousness]; an edition in three string-bound volumes, including appendices, was reprinted with Japanese reading punctuation in 1851 ("printed," according to the text itself, "by Takishirō 多志楼 [Tower of Bountiful Determination], and Chikudō contributed a preface to this Japanese edition [which would have circulated under the title Hyōchū sūgi shū]. In his preface, he wrote: "Matsuura Shijū 松浦子重 prepared a woodblock printing of this for me, so I would have it in my library." Either the Japanese punctuator of this preface was not clear about it or perhaps it was Chikudō who was vague on the subject, but the relationship between this Matsuura and Chikudō remains unknown. Perhaps, there is some connection with the Ahen shimatsu which was reprinted for Chikudō so that the students in his private academy (at the time in Shitaya, Edo) would be able to read it.

We have been looking at the second volume of the Chikudō shishō, but in the first volume we find a regulated verse entitled "A Poem Chronicling News of the English Barbarians' Invasion of China" as well as a long poem entitled "A Poem in Commemoration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Death of Hayashi Shihei" 林子平 (1738-93). The former reads: "The lands across the seas are vague and distant / Suddenly we have heard that the might of the Western barbarians has come galloping." The latter poem also deals with the issue of the Opium War: "Recently, the extraordinarily violent English bandits...have encroached upon nearly all of Europe and are now moving south, seeking to gobble up China"; and "Although victory or defeat remains undecided, the noxious vapors remain foul / Everyone in the two capitals [Beijing and Nanjing?] and thirteen provinces remains confused."

These poems were from the time of the Opium War that he "suddenly heard" of and in which "victory and defeat remain[ed] undecided." We thus know that they were composed before the Ahen shimatsu which he wrote after the conclusion of the peace negotiations.

In his "A Poem Chronicling News of the English Barbarians' Invasion of China," he wrote of one who "unknitted [her] arched eyebrows to become the commander of a great army"; and, in his commemorative poem for the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Hayashi Shihei, Chikudō wrote of a "woman general who took troops under her command and crossed the sea." It seems he meant that the commander of the invading British armed forces was a woman. This story was undoubtedly based on a rumor circulating at the time, perhaps brought on

Chinese ships, but it was incorporated as well into the Ahen shimatsu. In this latter work, we read of the [Chinese] capture of a "brave and superb" woman chieftain who, it turns out, is the third British princess (kōshu 公主). The English have three princesses: the eldest is known as kinshu 今主; the second is known as the fushō 副主 (perhaps on the Tokugawa pattern of an assistant [fu] to the shōgun) who remains at home; and the third princess is known as the senshō 船將 (commander of a naval vessel), and she is the one presently being held captive. "She has bright eyes and beautiful eyebrows. Her hair is jet black, and her skin tone is like snow. She is only eighteen years of age" (Japanese-style).

While recognizing that "she may not actually be the younger sister of the king of England," Chikudō notes that "a barbarian official [of England] immediately sent a communication demanding the return of the princess. If complied with, he promised to offer up all lands seized, but if she were killed, he vowed to raise an army and take revenge." Thus, we are told, the Qing government dispatched two specially deputed officials, Yilibu 伊里布 (Elipoo, d. 1843) and Qishan 琦善 (d. 1854), to hold negotiations with barbarian officials. When agreement was reached on her return, and they memorialized the throne for permission to do so, but, prior to the arrival of permission, they boldly went ahead and set her free on the fifth day of the second month of Daoguang 21 [1841].

Although the Ahen shimatsu chronicled in considerable detail the events of the war in a month-by-month, year-by-year fashion, as the above anecdote demonstrates, unreliable stories were also mixed into the account. Perhaps, when trying to describe such major occurrences of a distant country and a culturally more familiar one in which "everyone in the two capitals and thirteen provinces remains confused," it is to be expected that such stories as these seemed to be half-truths. This particular story was subsequently incorporated into novels, such as the Shin-Ei kinsei dan 清英乂世談 [Recent Tales of China and England],¹ and with such egregious elements included. Here we read that, in order to save the captive princess, peace negotiations were held, the English army gained control over her, and took her back to England.

Fiction was not the only outlet for this story of a British princess being taken prisoner. One finds it as well in a history of the Qing dynasty written in the second decade of the Meiji period (1877-86) by a Japanese scholar of Chinese studies. Before we move on to a discussion of this work, we should touch on a similarly detailed chronicle as the Ahen shimatsu, the Kairiku senbō roku 海陸戦

附録[Account of Military Defenses on Sea and Land] by Satō Nobuhiro 佐藤信淵(1769-1850).

Notes

(Translator's note: As with previous installments of this translation, the numbered notes below are those of Masuda; lettered ones are mine.)

a. See Dona Torr, ed., Marx on China, 1853-1860: Articles from the "New York Daily Tribune" (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1968).

b. See SJS III.1, p. 48.

c. The Yifei fanjing lu can be found in the Chinese collections of both the Harvard-Yenching Library and the Hoover Institution (Stanford University). The former is a two-volume Japanese manuscript edition, and the latter is dated Kaei 4 (1851) and contains Japanese reading punctuation; hence, both should really be listed as Ihi hankyō roku and placed in their respective Japanese collections.

1. I may be getting ahead of myself, but let me mention the Renyin Zhapu xunnan lu 壬寅乍浦殉難錄[Record of Those Who Gave Their Lives at Zhapu in 1842], cited as a "book still being sought" in volume nine of the aforementioned Yapian zhanzheng shumu jieti. It too is an extremely rare work in China, but I have a copy of it in my own collection. Published in the 24th year of the Daoguang reign [1844], compiled by Shen Yunshi 沈筠実.

d. A copy of this work (dated Ansei 4), printed by the Meirindō, can be found in the Harvard-Yenching Library, listed as a Chinese work, Yifei fanjing wenjian lu; inasmuch as this title circulated solely in Japan, it should be in the Japanese collection and titled Ihi hankyō bunken roku.

2. In the revised edition of the Seikadō bunko Kanseki bunrui mokuroku, there is the addition of an entry for Ihi hankyō kenbunroku in six volumes, "published in Ansei 4 (woodblock printing, Takanabe domain)." The edition printed at the Meirindō in Takanabe domain was photolithographically published by by Kyūko shoin in 1974 as the first volume in a series entitled Wakokuhon Min-Shin shiryōshū 和刻本

明清資料集 [Collection of Documents from the Ming and Qing Dynasties in Japanese Woodblock Editions]; it was based on the text held in the library of the late Obama Toshie 小汀利得.

e. There is also a Taipei reprint edition: Daili chubanshe, 1980.

3. In Shōin zenshū 松陰全集 [Complete Works of (Yoshida) Shōin] (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1935), volume 9.

4. Yoshida Shōin copied out separately the "introductory comments" and bibliography from this book.

f. There is a reprint of the Tokushi zeigi: (Tokyo: Zuiōginsha, 1938). A copy can be found in the Harvard-Yenching Library.

g. The Kokusho kaidai was compiled initially by Samura Hachirō 佐村八郎 (1865-1914) and reprinted several times: (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1904); and (Tokyo: Rikugōkan, 1926). Either it was reprinted again thereafter, or Masuda has confused something, for the Nihon sōsho mokuroku only appeared in 1927.

5. The Banshi received a certain amount of attention from scholars concerned with events overseas. Yoshida Shōin, in a letter to his elder brother, Sugiume Tarō 杉梅太郎, dated the eleventh month of Ansei 1 [1854], wrote: "I have taken a glance through Saitō Chikudō's Banshi and [Yasuzumi] Gonsai's Yōshi kiryaku 洋史紀略 [Brief Chronicle of Western History]. If you have the opportunity, I would gladly offer them to you." Yasuzumi's work, correctly titled Yōgai kiryaku 洋外紀略 [Brief Chronicle of the West] (preface dated Kaei 1 [1848], written in Kanbun) circulated rather widely in manuscript form. I have two such copies: one in one string-bound volume; another in three string-bound volumes but dated Genji 元治 1 [1864].

h. Noah "walked with God" (Genesis 5:9).

i. "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations" (Genesis 6:9).

j. Edited by Kaikoku hyakunen kinen bunka jigyōkai 開國百年記念文化事業会, this volume is the work of both Ōkubo and Ayusawa Shintarō 魚住信太郎, each authoring discrete sections of the text. It

was reprinted unchanged by Hara shobō (Tokyo) in 1978.

k. This work by You Tong appears in volume 18 of his Xitang
quanji 西堂全集 [Collected Works of Xitang (You Tong)] (Changzhou,
Kangxi era).

1. Written by Hayano Kei 草野惠 (Edo, 1850), 5 volumes; a copy of
this rare work can be found in Harvard-Yenching Library.