

Sino-Japanese Relations in the Edo Period

Ôba Osamu

大庭脩

Kôgakkan University

Translated by Joshua A. Fogel

Part Eleven. Shipmasters and Crewmen¹

Anonymous Crew Members. I once reported that throughout the year of Genroku 1 (1688) 193 Chinese ships called at the port of Nagasaki, and altogether they carried 1128 Chinese aboard. Upon hearing this, Professor Marius Jansen expressed the thought: “I’m stunned that such a large number of Chinese made the trip to Japan.”

There are a number of people whose names are known to us by virtue of their deeds—such as Shen Xie'an 沈燮庵, Sun Fuzhai 孫輔齋, Yi Fujiu 伊孚九, Shen Nanpin 沈南頻—but about the great majority of Chinese who traveled to Japan we know nothing. The Japanese with whom they made contacts also remain unknown to us. We have said plenty about the famous people. Here, I would like to look at the anonymous men.

According to the *Zôho Ka'i tsûshô kô* 増補華夷通商考 (Examination of Commercial Exchanges between China and the Barbarians, Revised Edition), large Chinese ships carried crews of 100 men, mid-sized ships 60-70 men, and smaller ships 30-40, but these are surely average numbers which coordinated with some yardstick. From the text of the *Ka'i hentai* 華夷變態 (Transformation from Civilized [Ming, China] to Barbarian [Manchu Qing]), the largest crew—124 men—came aboard Siam Vessel Number Seventy-Five in Genroku 6 (1693), and the smallest recorded crew—fifteen men—aboard Malacca Vessel Number One Hundred Forty-Four in Jôkyô 5 (1688). The former makes sense because the ships that set sail from Siam were large, but to come from Malacca with a crew of fifteen was brave indeed. The *okubune* 奥船 did not always come with large numbers of men, as Malacca Vessel Number One Hundred Seventy for that same year had a crew of only 25. Just to raise a counterexample, there was a crew of 111 aboard Nanjing Vessel Number One Hundred Ninety-Four that year, and although *kuchibune* 口船 vessels had, as a rule, small crews, they did not cram people onto *shachuan* 沙船.² Some ships had comparatively stable numbers of men aboard and others had fluctuating numbers. Vessel Number One for Hôei 2 (1705),

*Unless otherwise noted, all notes are the translator’s.

¹ *Edo jidai no Nit-Chû hiwa* 江戸時代の日中秘話 (Tokyo: Tôhô shoten, 1980), pp. 224-51.

² On *okubune* (ships coming from Southeast Asia) and *kuchibune* (ships from Chinese coastal cities), see part two of this translation. On *shachuan*, see part ten.

mentioned in the previously chapter, made fourteen voyages over an eleven-year career span, and it carried between 30 and 33 men. This would be a more stable example. By contrast, Vessel Number Nineteen for Genroku 7 (1694) had between 32 and 49 men over an eight-year period; Vessel Number Seventy for Genroku 4 (1691) had between 33 and 60 men over a five-year period; and Vessel Number Sixty-seven for the same year carried between 30 and 53 men over a five-year period. Inasmuch as the number of men necessary to operate the same ship on the seas was unchanged, these fluctuations must reflect changes in the number of merchants on board ship. Thus, since they jointly outfitted ships for their journeys, the more of them the shipper could get on board as passengers, the larger the number of men aboard. One aspect of this situation can be seen in the testimony of such men as Saisho Chôzaemon 稅所長左衛門 who was shipwrecked at Guangdong in Bunka 13 (1815): "We have heard that, at the beginning of the fifth month of the year, a Japanese vessel is going to call at port. I have heard that someone has sent a messenger to the shippers in Suzhou."

Shipmasters and Other Functionaries. On many occasions in this book, I have used the expression "shipmaster" (*chuantou* 船頭). The ferry-master of a village was different from the shipmaster, and he was not the captain concerned with the navigation of the ship. We find the following explanation in the *Zôho Ka-i tsûshô kô*:

Chuanzhu 船主 • *Chuantou*. He has no function aboard ship. In Japan he is in charge of the merchants. He has a public function in keeping control over all the men. There are two types of *chuantou*. One is the man who is responsible for the goods shipped. The other is similar to a clerk, though not the man in charge of the transported merchandise.

From this easy-to-understand explanation, we can see that the shipmaster was responsible for the ship in general, though he was a merchant. On occasion there were assistant shipmasters as well. He represented the entire ship and negotiated on its behalf. When oaths were sworn to formal offices on the Japanese side, such as that of the Nagasaki Magistrate, it was he who signed on behalf of the entire ship's passengers. Among the other functionaries on board were the *caifu* 財副, *ketou* 客頭, *huozhang* 駄長, *duogong* 舵工, and *zongguan* 總官.

"*Caifu*. The functionary charged with keeping a daily record of calculations of all matters concerning the cargo and commerce." The *Nagasaki miyage* 長崎土産 (Souvenirs of Nagasaki) explains this position as "scribe, clerk." Undoubtedly some sort of clerk, in later years the *caifu* came on occasion as shipmaster.

The *ketou* represented the passengers or guests (*ke* 客), where *ke* is understood to be the "lesser shippers," according to the *Zôho Ka-i tsûshô kô*. There could be no *ke* in instances in which the entire ship's merchandise was in the hands of a single shipper. In cases in which a number of merchants jointly came to Japan to engage in trade, the principal shipper was the shipmaster, and the lesser shippers rode on the same vessel. They were *ke* or "guests." As noted above, the existence of the *ke* contributed to the increased number of men aboard ship. Thus, ships in which the number of men fluctuated were ships, it would seem, in which the numbers of shippers aboard varied depending on circumstances.

“*Huozhang*. The man in charge of loading at sea. He is the functionary who knows the laws of the compass well, calculates the heavenly bodies, takes the weather into consideration, and investigates geography.” In the *Nagasaki miyage*, it states that the *huozhang* was in charge of watching the compass (lit. *anjin yaku* 按針役)³; he had command over the sailors and saw to loading the ship. In other words, he was responsible for navigation.

“*Duogong*. This is the helmsman. In coordination with the *huozhang*, his is an important post, as he keeps close watch on the winds and crosses the waves.” In other words, he was in charge of the helm.

“*Zongguan*. He oversees and carries out various duties aboard ship.” In the *Nagasaki miyage*, it notes that the *zongguan* was in charge of a variety of general tasks, comparable to a supervisor aboard ship while at sea.

In addition, there were: the *touding* 頭碇 who was in charge of the anchor; the *yaban* 亞班 who was responsible for the mast; the *shanbangong* 杉板工 in charge of barges or sanpans; the *xianggong* 香工 who served the ship’s deity; and the *gongshe* 工社 who were the ordinary sailors.

On the 29th day of the twelfth lunar month of Bunka 12 (1815), a Nanjing vessel was shipwrecked at Shimoda in Izu. The ship’s crew of 92 men are listed in Asakawa Zen’an’s 朝川善庵 (1781-1849) account of the incident, *Shinpaku hitsuwa* 清舶筆話 (Notes on a Chinese Vessel). However, aside from two *chuanzhu*, one *caifu*, one *huozhang*, two *zongguan* (of whom one is given as a resident of Nagasaki), and three *duogong*, all of the crewmen are listed as *gongshe*. The latter include *paoshou* 炮手 (gunners), *chafen* 揣份 (in charge of the men, head of the service personnel), and the *suishi* 隨使 (service personnel). We have here the general contours of a ship’s crew. Furthermore, there is a post in the *Nagasaki miyage* called the *banzhu* 板主 which is explained as the owner of the vessel.

Vessel Number One for Hōei 2, the Year of the Bird. We can safely assume that there were ship owners in addition to all the positions we have thus far noted, and in some cases *chuantou* owned the vessels themselves, but it seems to have been more common for a shipper to rent a vessel and set out to sea. Vessel Number One for Hōei 2 (1705), which we have cited several times, made fourteen trips to Japan and virtually every time with Zhu Kexi 朱克熙 as shipmaster and roughly the same number of crewmen. It would thus appear that he probably owned the ship himself and was carrying his own freight overseas for sale. Perhaps, he was the clerk for a large merchant and he had come to sell the merchandise of this merchant on the vessel owned by the same large merchant. In Zhu’s case, he essentially traveled to Japan on the same ship between Genroku 8 (1695) and Hōei 2. Before this time, it is unclear if he was using the same ship, but he did come as a passenger aboard Vessel Number Three in Jōkyō 4 (1687) and as shipmaster for Vessel Number One Hundred Two for Genroku 1 (1688), Vessel Number Forty for Genroku 2, Vessel Number Two for Genroku 3, Vessel Number Ten for Genroku 4, and Vessel Number Thirty-eight for Genroku 6. Thus, he made trips to Japan over the years between 1687 and 1705, and we can trace his travel history over this roughly twenty-year period.

³ This is, of course, the position (*anjin*) that Will Adams was said to have occupied, as portrayed fictionally in the novel and television miniseries, *Shogun*.

While we have cases of the travel histories of individual shipmasters, there were also groups of *chuantou* who might use the same vessels. Here we see the possibility of trading circles, and ship owners (the *banzhu*) themselves may have been able to join these groups as well. The era when the reports in the *Ka-i hentai* appeared includes the period of free trade following the promulgation of the “expand to the sea” (*zhanhai* 展海) order. Thus, we need to investigate this data, the task to which we now turn.

Vessel Number Seventy-Two for Genroku 9, the Year of the Rat. I would like next to take a closer look at several cases of how an individual vessel was used over the course of its life. First, let us examine cases involving ships that operated between the same port in China and Nagasaki. One such ship was Nanjing Vessel Number Ten for Genroku 15 (1702). It first came to Japan as Nanjing Vessel Number Seventy-two in Genroku 9 (1696) and made altogether eight trips over the course of seven years.

- 1 Left Shanghai, Genroku 9, seventh lunar month, third day (Vessel Number Seventy-two, shipmaster Cheng Kunru 程坤如, crew of 33), arrived Nagasaki on the seventh month, sixteenth day (requiring fourteen days for the journey)
- 2 Left Shanghai, Genroku 10/4/29 (Vessel Number Forty-six, *chuantou* Zhong Yuanzhang 鍾元長, crew of 35), arrived Nagasaki 5/13 (requiring fourteen days)
- 3 Left Shanghai, Genroku 11/12/29 (Vessel Number Seven, *chuantou* Zhong Yuanzhang, crew of 36), arrived Nagasaki 1/4 (requiring six days)
- 4 Left Shanghai, Genroku 12/6/29 (Vessel Number Twenty-seven, *chuantou* Cheng Hongyu 程弘玉, crew of 33), arrived Nagasaki 7/5 (requiring six days)
- 5 Left Shanghai, Genroku 13/3/18 (Vessel Number Twelve, *chuantou* Pan Gaichen 潘蓋臣, crew of 43), arrived Nagasaki 4/2 (requiring fifteen days)
- 6 Left Shanghai, Genroku 13/9/20 (Vessel Number Forty, *chuantou* Cheng Hongyu, crew of 42), arrived Nagasaki last day of ninth month (requiring ten days)
- 7 Left Shanghai, Genroku 14/7/25 (Vessel Number Forty-two, *chuantou* Cheng Hongyu, crew of 34), arrived Nagasaki 8/6 (requiring twelve days)
- 8 Left Shanghai, Genroku 15/1/18 (Vessel Number Ten, *chuantou* Zhong Yuanzhang, crew of 38), arrived Nagasaki 2/10 (requiring twenty-three days)

Examining this data, we see that this ship carried a crew of as few as 33 and only sailed to and from Shanghai. It is thus possible that it was a *shachuan*. Cheng Hongyu and Zhong Yuanzhang alternated in service as shipmaster, but Cheng Kunru and Pan Gaichen only came once during this era. From this one might study further if the two Chongs were related (perhaps father and son), how Zhong Yuanzhang was engaged in trade, and why Pan Gaichen was included in this group of shipmasters.

Vessel Number Eighty-Two for Jôkyô 3, the Year of the Tiger. Siam Vessel Number Thirty for Genroku 14 first came to port as Vessel Number Eighty-two for Jôkyô 3 (1686) and made a total of thirteen roundtrip voyages to Nagasaki over an eighteen year career, coming the last time as Vessel Number Seventy and Vessel Number Seventy-one for Genroku 16. It was always a Siam vessel. In Genroku 6 and 7, the shipmaster was Jiang Jingguan 江景官, but otherwise it was always someone else. It took 47 days to make the voyage in Genroku 2, 52 in Genroku 7, and 49 in Genroku 10. Aside from arriving in the middle of the sixth lunar month, in the seventh and eighth months it confronted great winds and was shipwrecked at Yakushima as well as Makishima in

Hirado, and entered port by tugboat. This may have been because it left Siam late and might have run into a typhoon in the Japanese coastal waters. The reason the shipmaster changed for the same vessel is that the King of Siam sent it out as a trading ship, and they were all his representatives. Thus, this vessel undoubtedly belonged to the King of Siam.

Guangnan Vessel Number Ninety-Eight for the Year of the Ox. In contrast to this sort of ship, Guangnan Vessel Number Ninety-eight for Genroku 10 made its first voyage to Japan as Guangnan Vessel Number Thirty-six in Genroku 6, and thereafter over a ten-year career made nine trips to Japan.

It departed Guangdong on the 22nd day of the fifth month of Genroku 5 and arrived in Nagasaki on the fifteenth day of the sixth month. It then returned to Ningbo and in the winter went to Kalapa. On the 22nd day of the fourth month of Genroku 6, it departed from Kalapa and arrived in Nagasaki on the first day of the eighth month via Putuoshan 普陀山. Later, it left Guangdong on the 25th day of the fifth month of Genroku 7, arrived in Nagasaki on the 26th day of the fifth intercalary month, and then returned to Guangdong. In the first month of the following year, Genroku 8, it traveled to Taini 太泥; on the 24th day of the fifth month it departed from Taini and reached Nagasaki on the first day of the seventh month. In the second month of Genroku 9, it left Guangdong for Guangnan, departed Guangnan on the twelfth day of the sixth month, and arrived in Nagasaki on the second day of the seventh month. One has the sense that this vessel was involved in great deeds in the East China Sea and the South China Sea. It was rather more often the case that vessels, as in this case, would change their ports of embarkation almost every year.

Even to Liaodong. Not only did these vessels travel to southern areas of the ocean, but we have records of ships as well that traveled to Liaodong in the north. Although there are many examples, there is a report concerning one Chen Kaifu 陳開夫 of Vessel Number Thirty for Kyôhô 6 (1721) who first came to Nagasaki aboard Vessel Number Seven in 1719, traveled to Liaodong in the autumn of 1720 to engage in trade, and then died there of illness. Also, there was one Qiu Shihong 丘士鴻 who entered port aboard a Nanjing vessel without a trading license on the 27th day of the fourth month of Kyôhô 2 and departed two days later on the 29th. He had spent the period from the eighth month of the previous year engaged in the buying and selling of tea in Liaodong. Then, on the fifteenth day of the third month of Kyôhô 2, he left Liaodong and attempted to sail directly to Shanghai, but he encountered a head wind and sought refuge in Nagasaki. Loaded with roughly 200 catties of jinseng, he and his men were given drinking water and tugged out of port.

Hu Yunke. As noted earlier, I would like to single out and introduce several virtually anonymous personalities. They are surely the protagonists of this scattered history. Let us first turn to Hu Yunke 胡雲客. We know that he came to Japan as the *caifu* for Vessel Number Twenty-two in Hôei 3 (1706), and thereafter he made the trip to Nagasaki as shipmaster for Vessel Number Twenty-two in Hôei 6, Vessel Number Three for Shôtoku 3 (1713), and Vessel Number Fifty for Shôtoku 5. Shôtoku 5 was the very year of the implementation of the New Shôtoku Laws, and Hu Yunke together with 42 other *chuantou* received their trading licenses and returned home. There was, however,

awaiting him back home a lawsuit of Fujian merchants, and Hu was taken to be the head of the *chuantou* who had received licenses. According to the affidavit for Nanjing Vessel Number Nine for Kyôhô 3:

The opposition concocted the false story and slander that “the shipmasters with Hu Yunke as their leader who had traveled to Japan violated the institutions of the [Qing] court, monopolized trade in Nagasaki, and received trading licenses.” In connection with being the leader, Hu was thus frequently summoned to appear before numerous government offices. As his worries mounted greatly, he sank into depression which continued for a long time. Various and sundry remedies were applied but with no results. He eventually died from his illness in his hometown of Hangzhou on the 23rd day of the fifth month of Kyôhô 2. The *chuantou* on this ship was Ding Yiqian 丁益謙, a nephew of Hu Yunke. Toward the end of his life, Hu gave Ding a trading license, and the latter made the trip to Nagasaki to engage in trade. Hu’s last request was for the needs of his family members to be taken care of. But Hu Yunke was slapped with these unfair charges over trading licenses for several years, had to quit his business affairs, and then died. Thus, his funds disappeared, and he sold off his lands and family valuables. Hence, we have no way to outfit his ship, and we borrowed cargo from Hu’s close friend Ge Youzhang 葛有章 and eventually set sail.

He may have been a victim of the New Shôtoku Laws. Hu Yunke’s trading license was brought before the Kangxi Emperor as an evidentiary document in the disputed case. Thus, in the *Shinpaikata kiroku* 信牌方記錄 (Records of the Office of Trading Licenses) as well, it states that he suffered heavy losses.

The Death of Yi Hanchen. When the person in whose name a trading license was issued died, who would acquire his rights was a big issue. There were, of course, instances in which Chinese passed away while residing at the Chinese Compound in Nagasaki. Yi Hanchen 伊漢臣, shipmaster of Nanjing Vessel Number Twenty-three for Kyôhô 5, died. The assistant shipmaster Wang Binglong 王炳龍 and Yi Douwen 伊斗文, *saifu* for Ningbo Vessel Number Thirteen, petitioned to receive his trading license. At the office of the Nagasaki Administrator, there was a sharp decrease in the number of vessels arriving just at this time as an aftereffect of the license incident in China in Kyôhô 2. Thus, at the moment when they were trying to recover newly issued licenses that had been temporarily issued, a report was issued to the effect that Wang Binglong was the alias of Wang Tuanjiu 王團久, one of the four men indicted as central players in the license controversy of the previous year. Yi Douwen came to Japan aboard a different vessel. When these two facts were taken into consideration, the license belonging to Yi Hanchen and his family was discontinued and the petition sent back. Yet, it is my strong suspicion that when Vessel Number Thirteen set sail to return on the sixth day of the fourth month of Kyôhô 6, the trading license of Feng Yushu 馮玉書, a passenger aboard Vessel Number Twenty-three, was that very day given to Yi Douwen. A brawl ensued in which there was an attempt on Yi Douwen’s life. The investigation by the Nagasaki Magistrate’s office that followed this incident revealed a complex background of relationships.

After the trading license incident in China, the Qing government handed a license in the name of You Ruyi 游汝義 of Nanjing over to Zhuang Yunqing 莊運卿. Although Wang Tuanjiu—together with Zhuang, Xie Xieyun 謝叶運, and Liu Yiju 劉

以玖—had given rise to a lawsuit, he claimed it was unfair that Zhuang Yunqing alone should receive a license. Thus, the other three men together hired Yi Hanchen at the wage of six *kanme* [52.32 pounds] of silver and made him shipmaster to engage in trade. This was Vessel Number Ten for Kyôhô 3. Yi received a trading license for Kyôhô 5 and returned home, but this time the Guangzhou prefect was the veritable shipper and Feng Yushu was the man responsible for the trip to Japan. All buying and selling was carried out by proxy, and Yi Hanchen and Wang Binglong (namely, Wang Tuanjiu) acted as the ostensible proxies. Because Yi Hanchen, the critical name in which the trading license had been authorized, had died, despite the expectations among the proxies that Wang Binglong would be made the nominal possessor of the license, Yi's relative Yi Douwen claimed the rights to the license from an unexpected place. Chaos ensued until the genuinely responsible party, Feng Yushu, attempted to use force. The Nagasaki Magistrate declared that all concerned were to be thrown in prison. The next day, Wang was released, and on the tenth day Feng was also released. Three days later, they were ordered to set sail for home, and Feng was henceforth forbidden from traveling to Japan. It is important to pay particular attention to the fact that the shipper in this fascinating case for which we now know the background relations concerning the person named on the trading license was the prefect of Guangzhou.

The Veteran Luo Jiuyi. We move now to a man by the name of Luo Jiuyi 駱九宜. A shipmaster by the name of Lin Dingsheng 林鼎升 came to Japan aboard Vessel Number Twenty-seven for Kyôhô 12 with a license given to him six years earlier by Luo Jiuyi and enabling him to enter Nagasaki four years earlier. Luo was getting old and he was ill. He wanted ever so much to make the trip overseas himself one more time, but because he was unable to do so, he kept putting it off. Thus, he eventually turned his trading license over to his relative Lin Dingsheng.

In Kyôhô 6, Fei Huaixiang 費懷湘 and seven other shipmasters were sent home without licenses. Luo Jiuyi was one of them. The reason they were so treated was as follows. Before they returned home, they wanted to sell off the remainder of their goods for personal use, but there were limits to this. These eight men requested that they be allowed to dispose of their goods even though it exceeded the limit. The Magistrate granted their request precisely as asked, but for willfully violating the regulated amount of sales he refused to grant them licenses.

In Kyôhô 7, Luo came to Japan as a passenger aboard Vessel Number Five and once again requested that he be granted a trading license. On the basis of a reexamination of the case, the Magistrate issued him a license: "We have heard that this man has traveled overseas [to Japan] over forty times. He has truly followed the laws of our land, and has never smuggled any goods at all." This was thus the license given to Luo six years previously.

This is proof that Luo Jiyi was a confirmed veteran of journeys to Japan with forty such trips under his belt. And, he was indeed old and infirm. I have investigated how many times we can demonstrate that he actually made the trip overseas. We shall need a general mobilization of the *Tô tsûji kaisho nichiroku* 唐通事會所日錄 (Daily Accounts from the Hall of the Chinese Interpreters), the *Ka-i hentai*, the *Tôban kamotsu chô* 唐蠻貨物帳 (Register of Chinese and Barbarian Cargo), the *Shinpaikata kiroku*, and similar sources. As a result, we find that first mention of him as a shipmaster comes from

Nanjing Vessel Number Twenty-four for Hōei 2 (1705). According to this source, we can affirm that he came as shipmaster aboard Vessel Number one in Genroku 17 (i.e., Hōei 1). Thereafter, he came aboard Vessel Number Forty-five for Hōei 4, Vessel Number Four for Hōei 5, Vessel Number Seventeen for Hōei 6, Vessel Number Fifty-seven also for Hōei 6, Vessel Number Seven for Hōei 7, Vessel Number Twenty-eight for Shōtoku 1, Vessel Number Seven for Shōtoku 3, Vessel Number Twenty-nine for Shōtoku 4, Vessel Number Nineteen for Kyōhō 2, and Vessel Number Sixteen for Kyōhō 4. This comes altogether to thirteen trips. The number 40 for his voyages probably includes those predating the issuance of the “expand to the sea” order.

The Son of Huang Zheqing. We can also trace the travels from China to Japan of a man by the name of Huang Zheqing 黃哲卿 over a long stretch of time. We have a record of his coming to Japan as shipmaster aboard Vessel Number Twenty-eight for Hōei 5 (1708), and on the basis of this account we know that he had come as shipmaster aboard Vessel Number Fifteen for Hōei 4. Thereafter, we can affirm an additional nine voyages: Vessel Number Thirty-six for Hōei 6, Vessel Number Thirteen for Hōei 7, Vessel Number Eighteen for Shōtoku 1, Vessel Number Sixteen for Shōtoku 3, Vessel Number Twenty-eight for Shōtoku 4, Vessel Number One for Kyōhō 3, Vessel Number Twenty-one for Kyōhō 5, Vessel Number Thirty for Kyōhō 7, and Vessel Number Twenty-six for Kyōhō 10. Huang reached the age of 71 (Chinese style) in Kyōhō 8 (1723). In Kyōhō 12 he either cancelled his trip due to old age or he died. In any event, we presume this because Hong Gongzhi 洪拱之 arrived aboard Vessel Number Thirteen that year with Huang’s trading license having been given to him. En route home after completing his commercial transactions in Nagasaki with Vessel Number One in Kyōhō 3, his ship was attacked by pirates and they robbed the crew of the majority of their outer garments and other goods on board. Still, he felt a need to visit Japan in spite of such great dangers. This becomes clearer from the following reference which appears in the *Shinpakata kiroku*:

Huang Zheqing of Vessel Number Thirty in the year of the tiger privately made this request. He had but one son born to a courtesan in Nagasaki and no other children in China. He was 71 years of age in this year and traveling the oceans had become particularly difficult, but he was worried about his son and so made the trip despite misgivings. Having arrived in port in the twelfth month of the previous year, the license he would receive for his next trip would surely be not for the present year but for the next one. Knowing his days were numbered, if he could only obtain a license for that year, he would make the trip soon and give his son enough to live for his entire life. Lord [Ishikawa] Tosa no kami 石川土佐守 granted his request and ordered that the allotment for the year be changed because of [Huang’s] compassion [for his son]. This was forwarded to Lord [Kusakabe] Tanba no kami 日下部丹杷守.

“There was a merchant who had a child with a prostitute from the Maruyama 丸山 district in Nagasaki, and as he was getting older he wanted on behalf of the child to move up his place in the order and so requested a certificate to enable him to sail [to Japan] the following year.” I once said this during a coffee break at a symposium on Sino-Japanese cultural relations at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. An American scholar sitting across from me stopped stirring the spoon in his coffee cup and asked with

a start: "What did the Magistrate do? Did he permit it?" I replied: "He permitted it. It was okay." And he once again started stirring the spoon in his cup.

The Most Loyal and Meritorious Man to the Trading License. Whether or not a Chinese shipmaster received a trading license was a matter of life and death. Thus, no matter how unreasonable Shōgun Yoshimune's demands were, they were accepted and carried out. For his part, Li Wei 李衛(1686-1738), grew to be concerned that he did not know to what extent illegalities were taking place.

After the promulgation of the New Shōtoku Laws, there was one shipmaster who gained the trust of the Japanese and was treated excellently in matters concerning trading licenses. This was a man who, by contrast with foreigners in the service of the Japanese government during the Kyōhō era, I would dub a foreign merchant in the employ of the Japanese government in the Kyōhō era. His name was Guo Hengtong 郭亨統.

He came to Japan no later than the twelfth day of the sixth month of Shōtoku 5 (1715) as *caifu* to shipmaster Chen Qideng 陳啓登 aboard Nanjing Vessel Number One that year. Chen had come to port as shipmaster aboard Guangnan Vessel Number Forty-three for Shōtoku 2. His relationship with Guo remains unknown, but clearly they had commercial ties, and on that basis Guo for the first time appears in the historical sources from Shōtoku 5. At this time Chen requested that he be allowed to transfer his next license to Guo, and a license in the name of Guo Hengtong was forthcoming. He then returned home on the third day of the second intercalary month of Shōtoku 6.

Just at this time, the tumult surrounding the trading licenses had arisen, and shipmasters who had entered the port of Nagasaki had promised not to accept their next licenses. However, Guo tendered the following note to the office of the Magistrate:

Inasmuch as each of the many shipmasters do not now have trading licenses, I would be pleased to receive several dozen of them. Without delay, I shall myself put together a number of vessels and make certain that they cross the sea to you. If I fail on the off chance in China, even if it costs me my life, I shall see to it that the ships come to you in time and shall have no regrets whatsoever.

When the shipmasters heard of this, they began to say they wanted to receive licenses. Guo Hengtong thus earned the commendation of being the most loyal and meritorious man to the trading license.

The State's Official Chinese Merchant Guo Hengtong. Having returned home on the third day of the second intercalary month, Guo proceeded to Guangnan via Shanghai. He then entered the port of Nagasaki once again, via Shanghai, aboard Vessel Number Four for Kyōhō 1 on the third day of the tenth month. The assistant shipmaster of this ship, Chen Qiying 陳啓瀛, was the younger brother of Chen Qideng. He returned home on the ninth day of the fourth month of Kyōhō 2 and then proceeded to Shanghai. Having procured cargo produced in Guangnan, he once again entered port in Japan aboard Vessel Number Thirty on the sixth day of the tenth month of Kyōhō 2. The following year he left Nagasaki on the tenth day of the sixth month and returned to Shanghai. Guo Henglian 郭亨聯, who came with him as *caifu* in Kyōhō 3 for business reasons, made the voyage as his proxy, leaving Shanghai on the sixth day of the eleventh month and arriving in Nagasaki on the seventeenth day of the same month. This vessel

remained in Nagasaki until the twelfth day of the seventh month of the following year, Kyôhô 4. Guo Hengtong had a trading license which had been given to Guo Henglian, the assistant shipmaster in Kyôhô 3. It entered the port of Nagasaki on the 26th day of the first month of Kyôhô 4 as Vessel Number Five for that year, with Guo Hengtong as shipmaster and Chen Bowei 陳伯威 as the assistant shipmaster. We learn from this point of a particularly close tie between Guo and Chen. Guo then left Nagasaki on the 23rd day of the twelfth month of that year and returned to Shanghai. He remained there and set sail again on the sixth day of the sixth month of Kyôhô 5, arriving in Nagasaki as Vessel Number Eleven on the eighteenth day of the sixth month. That year, Chen served as his assistant shipmaster.

He departed Japan on the eighteenth day of the twelfth month, but about this time there was a reorganization going on of temporary licenses hitherto issued, and his entry into port was to be spaced at intervals of a year apart according to the original plan of the New Shôtoku Laws. Thus, he did not come to Japan in Kyôhô 6, but did aboard Vessel Number Seventeen on the 28th day of the seventh month of Kyôhô 7. Guo Lijie 郭利傑 served as his assistant shipmaster, and they loaded the vessel with Guangdong produce at Danshan. However, they were struck with forceful winds, were shipwrecked at Tatehama 館濱 on Ikizuki Island 生屬島 in Hirado, and entered port under tow. They remained in dock until the twelfth day of the third month of the following year, and as they set off for home Guo had contracted to bring Chinese horses to Japan on official business. “This person has always strictly obeyed the laws of our land,” noted the *Shinpaikata kiroku*. “As a reward we shall give him this time one temporary Guangdong license. In addition, we have given a temporary Ningbo license to assistant shipmaster Guo Lijie.” He was thus able to enter port in Kyôhô 8.

For a shipmaster who had not been issued a trading license, this was extraordinary treatment. He came aboard Vessel Number Twenty-eight and entered port on the twelfth day of the twelfth month. He brought along one stallion and two mares, and presented in addition to the authorities four packs of ginseng, three packs of aloes wood, and twelve jars of honey-preserved sweets. This event would certainly have left a happy memory, and when he left Nagasaki on the sixth day of the ninth month of the following year, Kyôhô 9, the following favorable measure was enacted: “In addition to his standard Guangdong license, which Guo Hengtong has received throughout his life, bestow upon him three additional licenses when he enters port each year in recognition of his service.” A Ningbo license was awarded to Guo Lijie of Vessel Number Twenty-six which had entered port with a temporary Ningbo license (just for this year) given the previous year; a Guangdong license went to Guo Yiren 郭翊任 who was traveling with Guo Hengtong, and a Ningbo license also went to Guo Yuanjie 郭元捷. That year, Vessel Number Twenty-nine was Guo Henglian’s Guangnan ship, while Guo Lijie came with Vessel Number Twenty-six and Guo Hengtong himself on Vessel Number Twenty-eight. Thus, three Guo ships entered port in Kyôhô 8.

An Unredeemed Trading License. Guo Hengtong left Nagasaki on the sixth day of the eighth month of Kyôhô 9, and he returned to port without a license on the ninth day of the seventh month of Kyôhô 10 on what should have been Vessel Number Sixteen. Why did he come empty-handed? Here is his explanation:

Last year you gave me a license from the regular allotment, but someone falsely accused me of transporting forbidden Chinese horses. Therefore, I paid a bribe to the Chinese officials. Because this cost a great deal, I put up my license as collateral to a man named Wang 汪 and borrowed silver. When the day of repayment passed, my license became the property of Mr. Wang. Therefore, I do not possess the license.

Because someone had complained about the illegal transporting of horses, a bribe had been necessary and a license was borrowed as security. But it was not redeemed. After asking advice from Edo, the Magistrate instructed that Guo be given another license, and a temporary license for that year was issued to Guo under his alternative name, Guo Yuguan 郭裕觀. Guo then left port on the 27th day of the tenth month, saying he was going to fill up his ship and return, and he arrived back in Japan as Vessel Number Twenty-four on the seventh day of the eleventh month. Observing the procedures, he lacked a license and thus did not engage in trade, and then re-entered port with a temporary licence for that year and only then pursued commerce. According to his own explanation, he had gotten as far as somewhere near Putuoshan en route home. Because prevailing winds were blowing at that point, he chose not to come ashore but just to return to Japan. Vessel Number Twenty-two for that year entered port with a license in his name. The shipmaster was Huang Ruizhou 黃瑞周, and the assistant shipmaster was Wang Yushang 汪虞上. This was the trading license lost as collateral. The lenders who had received this license as collateral sent out this ship, and the assistant shipmaster was “a man named Wang.”

Thereafter, Guo Hengkai 郭亨愷 came to Nagasaki aboard Vessel Number Fifteen for Kyôhô 11 as Hengtong’s representative, and Guo Lijie entered port as his representative on Vessel Number Twenty-six for Kyôhô 12 and Vessel Number Fourteen for Kyôhô 13. After that until Chen Bozhou and Xu Qiyu 許啓宇 came as proxy shipmasters on Vessel Number Twenty-three in Kyôhô 17, no ship came into Nagasaki harbor with a trading license in the name of Guo Hengtong. Perhaps, because of the severity of Li Wei’s superintendence, Guo was engaged at that time in commerce in the Southeast Asian region.

We turn next to licenses issued in the name of Guo Yiren. He himself came to port aboard Vessel Number Ten in Kyôhô 10. Guo Lipan 郭利磻 served as his representative aboard Vessels Number Seven and Thirty for Kyôhô 12 and Vessel Number Thirty for Kyôhô 14. Zhuang Kehong 莊克弘 did the same aboard Vessel Number Two for Kyôhô 16, as did Guo Lipan once again for Vessel Number Thirty-four in Kyôhô 17. It certainly seems that coming twice in Kyôhô 12 betokened the service of some important state business, but at this point we have no evidence to explain it.

Overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia. Although we do not know the extent to which Guo Hengtong proved useful in carrying out official business for the Japanese, we can offer something of an explanation for why in Shôtoku 6 a strong statement requesting issuance of a handful of trading licenses to this man alone could have come about. That year, despite the problems in China surrounding trading licenses, the reason he was able to enter port and engage in commerce was that originally he came aboard an *okubune*, a vessel from Southeast Asia. The ships that traded in Japan in Shôtoku 5 were one Guangnan, one Xiamen, one Guangdong, one Kalapa, one Siam, and two Taiwan ships; in Shôtoku 6 (which became Kyôhô 1), it was two Taiwan, two Xiamen, one Guangdong,

one Guangnan, and one Kalapa—seven vessels in each year. In other words, the license issue in China surrounded the area from whence *kuchibune* vessels departed China—Ningbo and Shanghai—and did not directly influence *nakaokubune* from Fujian and Guangdong or *okubune* from Southeast Asia. Guo Hengtong first arrived in Nagasaki aboard a Guangnan vessel, and this would clearly indicate that he was an overseas Chinese from Southeast Asia. This is an issue that awaits future research.

Other People. The Chinese employed by the Japanese government and shipmasters who have been the focus of this overall study have been limited primarily to the period from the Shōtoku through the Kyōhō reigns (1711-36). The principal reason for this is that research to date on these years has been relatively scarce, and to the extent that I have been able to unravel it, it has proven to be a fascinating period.

Many earlier studies have been spread over a longer time frame, examining the Chinese who came to Japan throughout the Edo period. Itchien, namely the two brothers Wei Zhiyuan 魏之瑗 and Wei Zhiyan 魏之琰, who were the greatest commercial rivals on the Tonkin market of the Dutch East India Company in the latter half of the seventeenth century, have been well studied by Nakamura Tadashi 中村孝志 in “Tonkin daihakushu Itchen kō” 東京大舶主イッチエン攷 (A study of Itchien, the great shippers of Tonkin).⁴ We also have a biographical study of Lin Yuteng 林于騰, a Tonkin merchant who came to Japan in the same period, by Wada Hisanori 和田久徳, “Tonkin Kakyō Rin Utō no Nagasaki bōeki” トンキン華僑林于騰の長崎貿易 (The Nagasaki trade of the Tonkin Chinese merchant, Lin Yuteng).⁵

In his study, “Raihaku Shinjin to Usai” 来舶清人と迂齋 (Usai and Chinese merchants who sailed to Japan), Yoshimura Eikichi 吉村栄吉 clarifies many details about the biographies of sixteen men, including Zhu Lüdi 朱綠地 who had interactions with his own ancestor Yoshimura Usai.⁶ Concerning Chinese merchants who came to Japan in the mid- and late-Edo years, we have recent research by my colleague Matsuura Akira who has painstakingly pored over Chinese-language materials and collections of random Japanese notes, among many works, and as a result has given us the contours of the lives of Wang Shengwu 汪繩武, You Puan 游樸庵, Zhang Yunwen 張蘊文, Gong Tingxian 訾廷賢, Wang Shiji 王世吉, Cheng Chicheng 程赤城, Song Jingting 宋敬亭, Fei Qinghu 費晴湖, and Wang Zhuli 汪竹里, all for the eighteenth century, and Yang Xiting 楊西亭 and Cheng Jiatang 程稼堂, among others, for the nineteenth century.

Among these figures, Wang Zhuli (also known as Wang Peng 汪鵬) is the author of essays introducing Japan, such as *Xiuhai bian* 袖海編 (Essay from the Sea of My Sleeve) and *Riben suiyu* 日本碎語 (Details about Japan). A friend of [the great Hangzhou bibliophile] Bao Tingbo 鮑廷博 (1728-1814), he made important cultural contributions inasmuch as it was he who obtained such works as the *Guwen Xiaojing* 古

⁴ In *Ishihama sensei koki kinen Tōyōgaku ronsō* 石浜先生古稀記念東洋学論叢 (Essays in East Asian Studies to Commemorate the Seventieth Birthday of Professor Ishihama) (Osaka: Kansai University, 1958), pp. 376-96.

⁵ In *Suzuki Shun kyōju kanreki kinen Tōyō shi ronsō* 鈴木俊教授還暦記念東洋史論叢 (Essays in East Asian History to Commemorate the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Suzuki Shun) (Tokyo: Suzuki Shun kyōju kanreki kinensai, 1964), pp. 765-82.

⁶ In *Nagasaki dansō* 長崎談叢 30 (1942).

文孝經 (The Ancient Script Version of the *Classic of Filial Piety*) and the *Lunyu yishu* 論語義疏 (Exegetic Commentary to the *Confucian Analects*) of Huang Kan 皇侃 (488-545) in Japan which were then included in the *Zhibuzuzhai congshu* 知不足齋叢書 (Collected Reprints from the Studio of Insufficient Knowledge) [printed by Bao].

In his *Xiuhai bian*, Wang Peng notes:

Every year they bring in a huge number of Chinese texts. Curious Japanese buy them up without regard to their price. Many are those who stock them up in warehouses, though many are unable to read them as well. Like the tripods of Yin or Han, they have acquired them solely to exult in their great value.

We see here a description of the purchase by Japanese of Chinese books. These words of Wang's were one of the impulses behind my examination in an earlier section of this work of the question of whether they could read the books they bought. A similar critique can be found in Qian Yong's 錢泳 (1759-1844) *Lüyuan conghua* 履園叢話 (Collected Stories from Lüyuan). In discussing Yao Xuejing's 姚學經 production of such fake texts as the *Wanxiang tang sutie* 晚香堂蘇帖 (Documents from the Late Fragrance Hall) and the *Baiyun ju mitie* 白雲居米帖 (Documents from the Residence of White Clouds), he offers the humorous note: "Furthermore, it is most amusing that they spread to Japan and the Ryûkyûs." It is essential to study quality, in addition to quantity, when examining the reception of Chinese culture in Edo-period Japan. I fully recognize that my study of Chinese books brought to Japan provides only the entrance into a further study of quality.

A curious note appears in the *Meian chôhôki* 明安調方記 (The Meian Account Register) to the effect that a vessel was shipwrecked at Bôshû 房州 and entered port a *kaisen* 解船 (a dismembered ship) as an off-list ship for the year of the rat on the seventh day of the eighth month of An'ei 9 (1780). This is a reference to a Nanjing vessel shipwrecked at Chigura in Asaina-gun 朝夷郡, Bôshû on the last day of the fourth month of that year. Ultimately, the crew members and cargo were divided into two Japanese boats, and the ship itself broke apart and its timber was hauled ashore. It thus entered port as a *kaisen*. The shipmaster was Shen Jingdan 沈敬瞻 who was reprimanded for bringing to Japan a copy of *Dijing jingwu lüe* 帝京景物略 (Views of the Imperial Capital). We can trace his travels to Japan from An'ei 6 (1777) through Kyôwa 3 (1803). The books he brought to Japan in Tenmei 2 (1782) were purchased by Môri Takasue 毛利高標 and were later included with the rare books placed in the Momijiyama Bunko 紅葉山文庫 [the shogunal library]. Furthermore, he also brought to Japan a reprint of a lost work from the Yuan period, the *Yuyaoyuan fang* 御藥院方 (Formulary of the Imperial Dispensary) in Kansei 4 (1792). Fang Xiyuan 方西園 was on board a vessel making its way from Nagasaki to Bôshû in An'ei 9, and he drew sketches at each site where the ship docked. These were published in the *Piaoke qishang tu* 漂客奇賞圖 (Rare Illustrations of a Guest at Sea) by the Karikaneya Seikichi 雁金屋清吉 which was situated in front of the Denzûin 傳通院 [a Pure Land Buddhist temple] in Koishikawa [in Edo] in the autumn of Kansei 2.

Thus, Chinese who names are not heard of in ordinary Japanese history—in this sense, literally anonymous Chinese—truly advanced Chinese culture in Japan during the Edo period.

Part Twelve. The Opium War and the Haiguo tuzhi

Special Reports. There is still much that I would like to write. What I have described to this point focuses on the Shōtoku and Kyōhō eras, and it might seem as though there was no Sino-Japanese trade outside of this period. There are many stories to be told about the latter half of the Edo period as well, but let me attend to the following. As I have started with books, I would like to finish up with books.

News of the Opium War (1839-42), that major turning point in Chinese history which exerted an influence on the entire history of East Asia, was transmitted to the authorities of the Edo government via a special report (*betsudan fūsetsugaki* 別段風說書) submitted by the Captain of the Dutch Factory. Wei Yuan 魏源 (1794-1856) was inspired by the Qing government's loss in the fighting against Great Britain in the Zhejiang region at the time of the Opium War, and he came to see the necessity of the brute force of Western material culture, in 1842 he wrote his two works, *Shengwu ji* 聖武記 (Record of August [Manchu] Military Achievements) and *Haiguo tuzhi* 海國圖志 (Illustrated Gazetteer of the Maritime Kingdoms). Fascicles 11-14 of the *Shengwu ji* contain a critique of the old-style Confucian scholar's views of the modern Western nations and of the military administration of politicians. He advocated policies to rebuild military strength and to promote finances for the purpose of "enriching the country and strengthening the military." In the *Haiguo tuzhi* he described world geography and called for the need to study the strong points of the West. How did these works of warning to the Chinese come to Japan?

Shengwu ji. The *Shengwu ji* dates, as noted, to 1842 (Daoguang 22). It was brought to Japan in 1844 (Kyōka 1, the year of the dragon) aboard either Vessel Number Four, Five, Six, or Seven. Only one copy of the text was brought to Japan at this time, and it was sold by the Chinese at a price of 25 *monme* of silver.⁷ This copy was then purchased by shogunal councilor Abe Ise no kami Masahiro 阿部伊勢守正弘 (1819-57). Another copy of the text was brought to Japan the next year aboard Vessel Number Three in the year of the serpent (1845, Kyōka 2), and this text came into the hands of shogunal councilor Makino Bizen no kami Tadamasa 牧野備前守忠雅. In the fourth month of Kyōka 3, it was delivered to Edo. Vessel Number Two in the year of the horse, Kyōka 3, brought two copies of the work to Japan, and these two copies of the *Shengwu ji* were bid upon in the first month of Kyōka 4 (1847), but they were subject to "the reserved use of government officials," were not forwarded for bidding, and were purchased by Aoyama Shimotsuke no kami Tadakata 青山下野守忠良 and Toda Yamashiro no kami Tadayoshi 戸田山城守忠溫. In this manner, four shogunal councilors each obtained a copy of Wei Yuan's work.

Eight copies of the work arrived in Japan in Kaei 1 (1848), and all underwent bidding and were sold. From this year the price rose to 35 *monme*. In the fourth month of Kaei 3 (1850), a work entitled *Seibu ki saiyo* 聖武記採要 (The Essentials of the *Shengwu ji*), edited by Washizu Kan 鶯津監 (Kidō 穀堂, 1825-82) of Owari [in present-

⁷ One *monme* is the equivalent of 3.75 grams.

day western Aichi prefecture], was published in three fascicles. It is a reprinting of a number of sections of the original text with the addition of Japanese reading punctuation: “Jōshū hen” 城守篇 (On City Garrisoning), “Suishū hen” 水守篇 (On the Protection of Waterways), “Bōbyō hen” 防苗篇 (On Defending the Fields), “Gunsei hen” 軍政篇 (On Military Administration), and “Guncho hen” 軍儲篇 (On Military Provisioning). This reprinting took place eight years after the work was first published, six years after it first was imported to Japan, and four years after it was sold openly. That year fascicles 11-14 of the *Shengwu ji* were summarized in the *Seibu ki furoku* 聖武記附錄 (*Shengwu ji* with Appendices) of Saitō Setsudō 斎藤拙堂 (1797-1865) and in fascicles 1-2 in the *Tazan no ishi* 他山之石 (Food for Thought) of Soekawa Kanpei 添川寛平. These were both printed with modern movable type. Thereafter, only a few copies of the *Shengwu ji* arrived in Japan. By the latter half of Kaei 2, the price had risen to 40 *monme*; in the bidding on the 25th day of the sixth month of Ansei 6 (1859), it reached 160.3 *monme* when a copy came into the possession of Motoya Keitarō 本屋啓太郎.

In his major work, *Seigaku tōzen to Chūgoku jijō* 西学東漸と中国事情 (The Eastern Spread of Western Learning and Conditions in China),⁸ Masuda Wataru 増田涉 (1903-77) describes the impact such men as Sakuma Shōzan 佐久間象山 (1811-64) and Yoshida Shōin 吉田松陰 (1830-59) received upon reading works such as the *Shengwu ji* and the *Haiguo tuzhi*, and he cites directly from their writings. They did not see the original texts but a Japanese printed edition. We know, for example, that Shōin borrowed and read a copy of the *Seibu ki furoku* from Hayama Sanai 萩山佐内 in Hirado. This is a clear indication of how great an influence Japanese editions of such Chinese texts had in Japan.

Haiguo tuzhi. The *Haiguo tuzhi* was written and published in 1842. It was first brought to Japan aboard Vessel Number Two in the year of the pig, Kaei 4 (1851). This ship's *Shoseki motochō* 書籍元帳 (Register of book prices), was probably drawn up about the fifth month of Kaei 5. At the time it first arrived in Japan, there were three copies, each in six parts, at a price of 130 *monme* each. There is a fascinating note about this in the register: “Because there is a proscribed phrase in this line, Mukai Geki 向井外記 sent a query to the government office. He was ordered to take all copies of these [books] out and place them [in the office]. He brought this query on the eighteenth day of the eleventh month of the year of the rat [Kaei 5], and a letter was affixed to the memorandum book concerning this incident.” By “line” the text is referring to an item on the register, and “Mukai Geki” refers to Mukai Kaneaki 向井兼哲 of the *Shomotsu aratameyaku* 書物改役 (Inspectorate of Books)⁹ at that time. We see that, as was the case before him, he carried out the inspection of books brought to Japan and because he found proscribed information about the West in them, he sent a report of such to the office of the Nagasaki Magistrate for an action to be taken. He was then ordered to deliver everything and he complied. Accordingly, he wrote a letter to the office of commercial affairs with a notice to the effect that there was no merchandise remaining. Kaneaki submitted a “Summary” of the case, and this would have been sent on to Edo for

⁸ Translated into English by Joshua A. Fogel as *Japan and China: Mutual Representations in the Modern Era* (London: Curzon Press, Ltd., 2000).

⁹ Concerned primarily with books making reference to Christianity and, secondarily, with writings making reference to Japan.

perusal. We can see from entries on the same book register that the three copies ended up in the Shogunal Library, the Gakumonjo 學問所, and in the hands of Senior Councilor Makino Bizen no kami.

Thereafter, a copy of the text was brought to Japan aboard Vessel Number Two in Kaei 5, but it was retained in the Nagasaki Commercial Hall—"this item is to be stored in the Commercial Hall," according to the register. There were twelve copies of this work among the cargo of one Tao Mei 陶梅 on board Vessel Number One in the year of the tiger which arrived in Japan in the ninth month of Kaei 7. The book register notes: "Aside from seven copies kept here, five remain." Another merchant by the name of Yao Hong 姚洪 also brought three copies. Bidding was then left to Tao's five copies and Yao's three. It seems clear then that the setting aside of seven copies was part of prearranged orders placed by the shogunate and other high officials. The price had risen as high as 180 *monme* at this time, but in the records of bidding for Ansei 6 (1859) Motoya Keitarô paid 436 *monme* for it. This stark increase affords a sense of just how much domestic need was felt for this work.

Japanese Editions of the *Haiguo tuzhi*. When I was first examining the *Shoseki motochō*, I found myself emotionally absorbed as I read the records of new arrivals of the *Haiguo tuzhi*. I still thought it was a proscribed text at the stage of the Nagasaki Inspectorate of Books. Yet, views had already changed in Edo, and suddenly it was being procured as a work for official shogunal business. In fact, there was a difference of information between the central authorities and the lower, local officials. It was undoubtedly a difference in perception of the state of affairs. The book registers were ledgers of commercial merchandise, and if the location of goods was clear, then the office of commercial affairs was free of any blame. Thus, although there was nothing to it, one cannot but sense the temporal background to this one account book when the register was written up in Kaei 5.

In Kaei 7, the two stringbound volumes entitled "Chouhai bian" 筹海編 (Coastal defense preparations) and the two stringbound volumes entitled "Molijia zhous" 墨利加州 (United States), both from the beginning of the *Haiguo tuzhi*, were published with Japanese reading punctuation provided by Shionoya Seikô 鹽谷世弘 (Tōin 宕陰, 1809-67) of Edo and notes on Western-language pronunciations by Mitsukuri Shôsei 箕作庠西 (Genpo 阮甫, 1799-1863). There is a note in the Japanese edition of the "Chouhai bian" to the effect that it was printed in the seventh month of Kaei 7 (1854) by Suwaraya Ihachi 須原屋伊八 and others; and in the Japanese edition of the "Molijia zhous" that it was printed in the fourth month of Kaei 7 by Izumoji Buntarô 出雲寺文太郎 among others. Inasmuch as both carried prefaces by Shionoya dated the sixth month of that year, perhaps the latter was also printed in the seventh month. At the beginning of Shionoya's preface he tells how moved he was after reading the *Shengwu ji*:

Last year this book was brought by ship [from China] by a Chinese merchant. Lord Kawaji Saemon no jô 川路左衛門尉 obtained a copy of it and said that it was quite a valuable text. He ordered that it be reprinted with alacrity. The original printing was highly unpolished, and the number of miswritten characters immense. He had me proofread and correct the text for errors. For the names of places and items in it, Mitsukuri Shôsei of Tsuyama 津山 added interlinear notes concerning their pronunciation.

We thus know that it was Kawaji Toshiakira 川路聖謨 (1801-68) who encouraged publication of this work in Japan.

On the front side of page one of the Japanese edition of the "Chouhai bian," it reads: "Summer, Daoguang 29 [1849], Guweitang 古微堂 reprint." Then, right after a preface by Wei Yuan, we read: "Originally published in only 50 fascicles, now increased to 60, printed in Daoguang 27 in Yangzhou." Thus, it was not the first edition that was imported to Japan, but the reprint edition in 60 fascicles.

Shionoya and Mitsukuri continued their work with publications in Japan of the following, all originally from Wei Yuan's text: "Roshia koku bu" 俄羅斯國部 (On Russia), two stringbound volumes, eighth month of Ansei 2; "Ingirisu koku bu" 英吉利國部 (On England), three stringbound volumes, eighth month of Ansei 3; and "Purosha koku bu" 普魯庄國部 (On Prussia), one stringbound volume, date unspecified. In addition, Rai Mikisaburô 賴三樹三郎 (1825-59) published "Indo koku bu" 印度國部 (On India) from the *Haiguo tuzhi* in three stringbound volumes in Ansei 4.

In short, the printed edition of 1847 was brought to Japan in 1851, entered Edo in 1852, and a part of it was reprinted there in 1854. In the midst of all this, in 1853 Commodore Perry arrived in Uraga Bay. Needless to say, the fact that Wei's section on the United States was the first part printed in Japan is a consequence of this occurrence. In the space between books' arrivals and their Japanese reprintings, one can feel here as well the sense of urgency in the *bakumatsu* period.

Zhapu jiyong. There is one further text I would like to discuss, the *Zhapu jiyong*乍浦集詠 (Collection of Poetry from Zhapu). Zhapu is a seaport in Pinghu county, Zhejiang province, and it was both the departure point for Ningbo vessels and a base for Japanese trade. This book in sixteen fascicles and four stringbound volumes was compiled and edited by Shen Jun 沈筠 (Shifu 實甫) from the village of Zhapu. He effectively collected poems by scholars from his hometown, and none of these poets was especially famous. It was a completely local work which scarcely circulated in China at all.

Zhapu, though, had been attacked by the British army at the time of the Opium War. The Hangzhou and Jiangning encampments of Manchu troops set up there in 1729 (Yongzheng 7) both fell at this time, and Chang Xi 長喜, the vice commander-in-chief of the naval forces [of the Green Standards] for Zhapu, and Wei Fengshen 翁逢申, the acting subprefectural magistrate for coastal defenses in Zhapu, and many other troops in the garrison force died in battle. Seventy-three elderly women and teenage girls committed suicide by drowning to protect their honor. This was also the time when the Chinese vessel Jinquansheng 金全勝 was set ablaze.

The *Zhapu jiyong* grieved for the many victims of 1842 and gathered together poetry which vented indignation against the outrages of the British ships. Publication of this work took place in the fourth month of Daoguang 26 (1846), four years after the end of the Opium War, and 24 copies of it were brought to Japan aboard Vessel Number Four that year, the year of the horse. It is recorded in the *Shoseki motochō* for the eighth month of Kyôka 4, the following year. At that point ten copies were being handled, with copies going to the Shogunal Library, the Gakumonjo, Abe Isei no kami, Makino Bizen no kami, Honjô Aki no kami 本庄安藝守, Honda Etchû no kami 本多越中守, and

Sakai Ukyōnosuke 酒井右京亮. When I examined the edition held in the Shōheizaka gakumonjo 昌平坂學問所, I noted that it was received in Kaei 2 (1849) which means that it was placed in this library in the third year after its initial publication. Also, in the eleventh month of that year, the *Saho shūei shō* 乍浦集詠鈔 (Extracts from the *Zhapu jiyyong*) was printed in Japan in four fascicles and two stringbound volumes. These excerpts were the work of Ono Kozan 小野湖山 (1814-1910). This instance probably represents for the Edo period the shortest time between the publication of a work in China and its arrival and reprinting in Japan. It is as well evidence of the extraordinary concern on the part of Japanese for the Opium War and the situation prevailing in East Asia.

Additional Significance. There is significance from another perspective in the transmission of the *Zhapu jiyyong*. It was, as noted above, an extremely local work with scarcely any copies circulating in China. In Japan, though, we find an extracted edition. If we were to attribute significance to the fact of the speed with which it made its way to Japan, coming in the very year it was published in China, to the anger of the *Zhapu* scholars at the time, and to the great anxiety it raised in Japan, we might be reading too much into it, like an agitprop speech of a hack politician. When Cheng Jiannan 程潤南 and Shen Jingdan 周敬丹 brought proscribed books to Japan, they claimed that they “had loaded all the books from their library” and arrived without having had the time to check their contents. An inspection was then required. This was conveyed quickly because the shipping port was the place of publication. If this was the only importance to be read from the situation, then, as we noted in an earlier segment of this work, it would constitute a significant example for, insofar as Nagasaki had developed strong ties with the Zhejiang-Jiangsu area in which the publishing industry flourished in China, we can surmise that the transmission and flow of books was far easier than from more westerly regions of China.

From Catholic to Protestant. When Japan began to open its ports in 1858, the inspection of books in Nagasaki all but ceased to have any meaning whatsoever. Furthermore, concern for events in the outside world was on the rise. Despite this rise, there had to be content to the vital matters that should be studied, but how was this to be supplied? Masuda Wataru’s aforementioned book, *Seigaku tōzen to Chūgoku jijō*, helps to answer this query, particular its sections dealing with the history of Sino-Japanese cultural interactions.

As Masuda notes, the cardinal point is that, with the repeated military defeats from the Opium War on, Chinese came to reflect seriously upon the deficiencies of their country. At the same time, Chinese-language translations of Western academic and cultural writings led many to envision reform of the state structure on an intellectual plane.¹⁰ Works of “Western learning” written in literary Chinese and published in China were imported to Japan, Japanese reading punctuation was added to the texts, and they were then reprinted. From the *bakumatsu* era through the Meiji period, these works played a major role in enlightening Japanese for the purpose of structural reforms. These were the books brought to Japan aboard Chinese vessels in the *bakumatsu* and early Meiji years.

¹⁰ *Seigaku tōzen to Chūgoku jijō* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1979), p. 4.

There is much of consuming interest here. First, because of the Tianjin and Beijing Treaties of the late Qing, the ban on Christianity was repealed, and foreign missionaries who thus had come to China were influential in the Chinese-language translations of works of “Western learning.” In particular, these were Protestant missionaries. This should remind us of the Catholic missionaries who came to China in the late Ming and were influential through their writings in introducing Western civilization at that time. These earlier books were the object of proscription in Japan. Masuda offers examples of how this translation project was passed from the Catholics to the Protestants. One such case would be Alexander Wylie (Weilieyali 偉烈亞力, 1815-87) who came to Shanghai in 1847 and continued work, together with Li Shanlan 李善蘭 (1810-82), on the *Jihe yuanben* 幾何原本 (Elements of Geometry) by Euclid which had begun to be translated jointly by Matteo Ricci and Xu Guangqi 徐光啓 (1562-1633) in the Wanli years of the Ming. Ricci had translated the first six volumes of the text from Latin, and Wylie completed the translation of volumes 7-15 from an English edition of the work. Zeng Guofan 曾國藩 (1811-72) saw to it that in 1856 this work was published in Nanjing.

Wanguo gongfa. Among the books Professor Masuda raises for discussion and one I would like to pay particular attention to is the *Wanguo gongfa* 萬國公法 (in 4 fascicles). This work is a Chinese translation of the American scholar Henry Wheaton’s (Huidun 惠頓, 1785-1848) *Elements of International Law*. The translator was W. A. P. Martin (Ding Weiliang 丁韙良, 1827-1916), an American missionary who came to China in 1850, became a teacher and later the dean of the Jingshi daxuetang 京師大學堂 (Metropolitan College, forerunner of Peking University]). The Chinese text dates to Tongzhi 3 (1864) and was “published by the Chongshiguan 崇實館 in the capital” or Beijing. Reading punctuation was added to this edition and pronunciational *kana* were affixed to personal and place names in a Japanese reprint (*Bankoku kōhō*) in six stringbound volumes published by the Shogunate’s Kaiseijo 開成所 in Keiō 1 (1865). Thereafter, numerous editions of this work appeared in Japan in translation and with annotations. This work seems to have been taken as a classic in the *bakumatsu*-early Meiji era when international law was critically needed. When university regulations were enacted in third year of Meiji (1870), we find “*Bankoku kōhō*” listed in the written curriculum. In schools throughout the land, *Bankoku kōhō* was used as a textbook and a reference work.¹¹ As Professor Masuda argues, this is a prime example of how “Western books” in Chinese translation exerted such an impact on Japan.

However, what is particularly interesting to me is the fact that the “Outline of the New Legal Code” (*Shin ritsu kōryō* 新律綱領 [in six fascicles]) of Meiji 3 and the “Statutes on Reform” (*Kaitei ritsurei* 改定律例 [in three fascicles]) of Meiji 6 were written up in consultation with the Taihō 大寶 Code,¹² the Ming code, and the Qing code. Just as the Meiji regime that overthrew the Edo Shogunate based the organization of its central governmental on the Council of State system (Dajōkan 太政官), in its legal system as well it did not follow the shogunate’s law codes but was fundamentally committed to nothing less than the ancient *ritsuryō* 律令 system. In fact, studies of the

¹¹ *Seigaku tōzen to Chūgoku jijō*, pp. 5-6.

¹² The Taihō Code in seventeen fascicles is the first collection of laws in Japan, enacted in 701, the inaugural year of the Taihō reign.

Ming codes in the Edo period—excluding a few examples in which they were partially incorporated into domainal law—remained largely within the scope of research for the purpose of research, intellectual scholarship, and references to explicate the law. Studies of the Ming codes in the Edo period were substantively revived at the beginning of the Meiji era. The laws which functioned in China since the Tang code as a living law were selected and consolidated in response to actual necessity and had undergone changes by the time one gets to the Ming and Qing codes. Japanese law had produced a code for the samurai households but it never achieved basic revision and development. Accordingly, the Ming and Qing codes never exceeded the bounds of being objects of conceptual research in Japan. With the demise of the *bakufu*, a unitary legal structure came into being which was supposed to be rooted in the new Meiji government. In this regard, international law in the Chinese legal system, and thus the *Wanguo gongfa*, was needed in China as well as in Japan. For these reasons I find the background in the early Meiji period in which such importance was attached to the *Wanguo gongfa* so intriguing.

Evaluation of Chinese Studies (Kangaku) in the Edo Period. The transmission of Western culture through “Western books” in Chinese-language translations became one of the bases for the flourishing of Kangaku 漢學 in the Edo period. Japanese modernization proceeded, because Kangaku was basic knowledge for Japanese intellectuals at the time. The Meiji man was a Kanbun 漢文, or literary Chinese, man. Because this was common sense in the Meiji era, it was simply taken for granted and has not been left to history. But we must not overlook this aspect of the question.

In studying Sino-Japanese relations in the Edo period, I have come to think that we have neglected the accomplishments of the Edo Shogunate and made that regime purveyors of evil beyond necessity. If—in history, “if” is usually forbidden terrain—if the Meiji Restoration had been carried out by men, such as those who forged a court-military alliance, who were the first to buy copies of the *Shengwu ji* and the *Haiguo tuzhi*, perhaps things would have turned out differently. Perhaps what we take for granted as Japanese history would have accepted uncritically the view of history centered on the two domains of Satsuma and Chōshū. The history that I have come to take for granted would be dangerous, and this is precisely what I have sought to study.

In any event, perhaps I have been able somewhat to break down what my readers have taken for granted about Sino-Japanese relations in the Edo period. Even if I have only achieved this in some small measure, then I will still find value in having written it.