

Knowledge of the Outside World in Modern China and the Development of Constitutional Thought

By Masaya SASAKI

Criticism in the *Ao-men hsin-wen chih* 澳門新聞紙.

The following item which Lin Tse-hsü 林則徐 had translated from English, appears in Volume III of *Ao-men hsin-wen chih* 澳門新聞紙 (The press at Macao) dated December 14, 1839 (the 9th day of the 11th month of the Chinese lunar calendar). This same item was later published in Wei Yuan 魏源 *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* 海國圖志 (Illustrated gazeteer of the maritime nations) (Volume 50, Chapter 49; Volume 60, Chapter 51; and Volume 100, Chapter 81); and in *Ao-men yueh-pao* 澳門月報 I (The Macao monthly—One). But in these later versions, deletions and amendments reduced the original to less than one-half its former length. In the following quote, the underlined portions indicate those sections expunged in the *Ao-men yueh-pao* version:

“Chinese officials know nothing of the political affairs of foreign countries. And there are few people to inform them about foreign matters. For this reason, the wisdom of Chinese officials is truly questionable. China, even today, as in ancient times, knows nothing of the Western regions, just as we [Westerners] still know nothing about the African interior. Strangest of all, this is totally unlike the situation in neighboring countries. Take the people of Japan, for example. Each year they receive a bundle of newspapers. All of the accounts carried in the papers are widely read by the various government officials, who distribute them for all to read. They seek out news on nations all over the globe and famous people throughout the world. Everyone pays a great deal of attention to these reports.”

After describing how even countries like Vietnam, Thailand and Burma were heedful of foreign affairs and not at all lax in their study, the article returned to China:

“Around the world, China is considered a governmentally civilized country, superior to its neighbors.. But to those of us in China, how do things look? Simply put, China lacks learning. If China truly wished to seek

genuine knowledge, it would be utterly simple. Interpreters and ship pilots really know very little. But Howqua [i.e., the Chinese foreign-trader Wu 伍, of the I-ho 怡和 *hong*] is considered a man of vast experience.

We fear that the local people still do not understand the fine points. Granted that some people know a little. But they are all lowly and humble, and without the encouragement of official rank. So in the end, even though they know more than other people, they are instead treated with disrespect because of their contact with foreigners.

For example, there are many high officials in Canton who hold major responsibilities and yet know nothing about the affairs of the British or the Americans . . . This is because they are haughty and self-satisfied, obviously look down on all foreigners, and make no effort to investigate them."

In other words, in spite of the fact that Chinese would have derived many benefits from studying foreign matters, no one encouraged this study. On the contrary, the few who knew anything about foreign countries were treated with contempt. Even officials in Canton were haughty and scornful of foreigners. The fact is that, in reality, they knew nothing about foreign matters.

But this foreign newspaper reporter felt Lin Tse-hsü was completely different from other high officials, describing him in the following terms:

"Lin's conduct, however, is totally different from the others. He himself first readied several of the best local translators then further instructed them in ways of gathering information surreptitiously. There are between twenty and thirty of these spies, interpreters for foreign traders, and ship pilots, who keep watch for [Chinese] officials in every quarter, and all of whom are very talented individuals. What they learn is recorded in daily logs, submitted on a regular basis, and entered into a register. There are several foreigners perfectly willing to help China expand its knowledge, and who sell good British books to China. These translators then translate their general meaning.

If such findings were brought together with [China's] other considerable knowledge, what fulfillment there would be. Lin Tse-hsü is a good and intelligent man. When something must be done, he does not shirk hardship, always applies himself to the problem, and takes it to heart.

Looking now at Lin's second letter of communication to the British monarch, its level of knowledge seems elementary, in effect. Although the knowledge in this letter is indeed limited, for China, it could be considered a most remarkable document. If it should reach the Yung shu yamen, it would be a topic of conversation for at least half a month.

Whether or not this letter has been translated and sent to them we do not know at present.”¹⁾

Though the translation into Chinese is very poor, this article describes quite candidly the disinterest and ignorance on the part of contemporary Chinese with regard to foreign matters, their haughty and contemptuous attitude, the scorn with which they held persons having dealings with foreigners or knowledge about foreign countries, as well as what contemporary Westerners considered the common faults of the Chinese. Lin Tse-hsü broke away from this mold and, by a variety of means, began gathering information about the West. And even though Lin's discernment in this respect deserves considerable praise, it must be pointed out that his international notions remained quite crude.

That someone charged with diplomacy and trade should conduct research about the relevant countries is no more than natural. It may thus seem a bit strange to attach such importance to the fact of Lin Tse-hsü initiating the collection of basic foreign information. But compared to the abnormal situation of contempt for all foreign countries as “barbarian 蠻夷” held up to that time even by the highest Canton officials, the real ignorance about foreign countries, and the lack of any attempt to learn about them, what Lin Tse-hsü attempted appears unprecedented and enlightened. And so Yang Kuo-chen 楊國楨, in his study of Lin Tse-hsü's knowledge of the West, found that Lin emerged in opposition to the “feudal reactionaries 封建頑固派,” and from the outset was met by their attacks and resistance. Yang goes on to say:

“Ch'i-shan 琦善, who during the Opium War advocated “caring for the myriads with benevolence” and “controlling the barbarians with wisdom,” ridiculed Lin Tse-hsü for purchasing “barbarian books 夷書” which were “not matters for official involvement” in the past. He further said that Lin had lost the dignity of being a “great official of the dynasty 天朝大吏,” and even that persons who vilely sought out information on foreigners and traitors were themselves “traitors 漢奸.”²⁾

The scholar Lai Hsin-hsia 來新夏 has also written:

“Lin Tse-hsü held the feudal period's most honorable rank, that of “Imperial Commissioner 欽差大臣.” Yet he openly had translated the Western books and reports of the foreign barbarians, and sought out new knowledge about “clever contrivances and artifices 奇技淫巧” from overseas. This was certainly a shocking activity in the self-enclosed mid-Ch'ing period, and constituted a type of behavior in contravention to the feudal order. Such activities prove that Lin Tse-hsü's thinking and level of awareness far surpassed those of his contemporaries.”³⁾

Both of these men praised Lin Tse-hsü's inquiries into Western knowledge particularly highly as an activity in opposition to the "feudal reactionaries" and to the "feudal order 封建體制." But if inquiry into Western knowledge is an activity in opposition to a feudal order, then "Dutch Learning 蘭學" in Japan's Edo Period could not have developed. Nor would we be able to explain such people as Kuchiki Masatsuna 朽木昌綱 (1750-1802), who, while lord of Fukuchiyama 福知山 in Kyoto, studied "Dutch Learning," engaged in research on world geography, and even wrote *Taisei yochi zusetsu* 泰西輿地圖說 (A pictorial explanation of Western geography; seventeen chapters in six volumes, published in 1789). The neglect of inquiry into Western knowledge in China had nothing to do with any feudal order. Rather, as pointed out in the previously cited article from the *Ao-men hsin-wen chih*, the most important factor was probably the contempt and disinterest of the Chinese people in so-called barbarians. Consequently, Yang Kuo-chen's depiction of Lin Tse-hsü's inquiries into Western knowledge as meeting with the "attacks and opposition" of "feudal reactionaries" from the outset, and of Ch'i-shan's "ridicule" of Lin Tse-hsü for "purchasing barbarian books," as well as Lai Hsin-hsia's depiction of Lin's inquiry into new knowledge as a kind of behavior in contravention to the feudal order were intended to exalt Lin's accomplishments and probably do not square with the facts.

Moreover, both scholars seemed to regard Lin's gathering of foreign information as a directly anti-establishment, progressive action. This point, too, is very strange. The "feudal reactionaries" described by Yang Kuo-chen as in opposition to Lin Tse-hsü refer to stubborn conservatives, which is to say, persons attempting to adhere strictly to the traditional order and its concepts. In point of fact, was not Lin Tse-hsü himself representative of just such people?

Prior to the Opium War and in comparison to the countries of the West, China was already remarkably backward in the arenas of government, economics, culture and the military. Chinese intellectuals were, on the whole, totally indifferent to this situation. That Westerners viewed Chinese as a semi-barbarian people was beyond their wildest imaginings. Lin Tse-hsü was of course no exception. He still believed that China occupied the highest place in the world, so that "the Celestial Dynasty 天朝 (China) reigns over all countries of the world" and should "pacify all peoples within and without." And he believed that countries like England were so completely dependent on China economically, they would always have to be submissive towards China, and there was no need to fear their military might. Underlining Lin's hardline policy toward Great Britain was this inadequate knowledge of the actual situation between China and the outside world, and the mistaken beliefs accompanying them. Precisely this is what should be labeled "feudal reaction."

Of course, the series of measures executed by Lin Tse-hsü to prohibit opium was probably undertaken upon direct orders of the Tao-kuang 道光

Emperor, as it is difficult to think of them as a result of Lin's own arbitrary decision. By this strict policy of prohibiting opium they also dreamed of making the foreign barbarians crouch in fear, and of reversing in a single stroke the foreigners' belief that Chinese control was on the verge of collapse. A great China "reigning over all countries of the world" would thereby reemerge. In other words, this was a reversion to and defense of the old posture toward the outside world.⁴⁾

Unfortunately, not one among China's leaders of the time possessed sufficient international understanding to be able to make a comparative assessment of the "internationalness" and rationality of China's old posture in the contemporary world, or to judge China's ability to defend this old posture against the pressures of the Western Powers. For these reasons, China pursued her self-righteous hardline policy based upon secret discussions between the Tao-kuang Emperor and Lin Tse-hsü, with the result of inviting British armed intervention. The maintenance of the opium prohibition policy itself became untenable, to say nothing of the reemergence of a great "Celestial Dynasty." This was the inevitable outcome of not knowing the enemy, as a consequence of which they became unable even to understand themselves.

In essence, Lin's policy of opium prohibition and his simultaneous pursuit of China's old hardline foreign posture was, for a time, brilliant in its audacity and courage. Yet it ended in complete failure. By contrast, the gathering of foreign information initiated by him was undertaken as strategically necessary in order to understand the enemy and thereby to control him. As the first instance of a government organ carrying out such an activity, which up to that time had been completely ignored, this was epoch-making. Moreover, it was an important touchstone in that, had the project developed smoothly, it held out the possibility of bringing beneficial reform and advances to many different Chinese fields.

The translations of Lin Tse-hsü 林則徐.

Lin's information gathering consisted of translations of newspapers published by Westerners at Macao and of books written by Westerners acquired at Canton, in addition to the news reaching the ears of his inquiring interpreters. Still surviving today are translations of newspapers and books.

With respect to newspaper translations, Lin wrote to Governor I-liang 怡良 of Kwangtung 廣東 province in March or April of 1839 (second lunar month of the 19th year of Tao-kuang 道光) saying, "Previous translations of newspaper items are scattered about. I am having them copied and collated into several volumes and will submit them. However, they contain many wild statements and cannot be accepted as the truth, so they are no more than a collection of foreign information."⁵⁾ Lin arrived in Canton in his capacity as Imperial Commissioner on March 10, 1839 (the 25th day of the first lunar month of the 19th year of Tao-kuang). Since one volume of translations was

sent to I-liang as early as the following month, Lin's translation work must have commenced immediately upon his arrival.

The principal newspapers Lin had translated were the *Canton Register* and the *Canton Press and Price Current*, plus the *Singapore Free Press*. Wu Ch'ien-tui 吳乾兌 and Ch'en K'uang-shih 陳匡時 have recently produced a detailed exegetical study of these.⁶⁾ The *Canton Register* (1827-1843) and the *Canton Press* (1835-1844) were both English language weeklies. The former was founded by the famous opium trader James William Matheson (1796-1878).⁷⁾ The *Canton Register* (in the collection of Tōyō Bunko in Tokyo) concentrated on the China trade reports, but also contained items on the politics and economy of China, and on the politics and trade of various countries of Southeast Asia and the West. I have not seen copies of the *Canton Press*, but am inclined to think that it too contained many China trade items.

In the previously cited letter, Lin Tse-hsü wrote that there were "many wild statements" in the translated newspaper items, and that they "cannot be accepted as the truth." After his dismissal in March of the following year, and when questioned by the Pacifying General I-shan 奕山, Lin urged in his six-point response the necessity of seeking out information about the barbarians and stated that newspapers were an effective means to that end:

"In recent years I have hired men for translation work, and they in turn are continually buying newspapers and secretly translating them. The news of barbarian countries obtained from them is not inconsiderable, and many of the methods for controlling the barbarians were based on that information. Even though some of the recent information was false, what is true can be distinguished from what is false, without hindrance to our listening and seeing."⁸⁾

It is evident from this that these newspapers were useful to Lin in devising his British policies.

The only newspaper translations arranged by Lin and still extant are those collected under the title of *Ao-men hsin-wen chih* 澳門新聞紙 which were preserved in the home of Teng T'ing chen 鄧廷楨. These cover the period from July 1839 through November 1840, with the issues prior to July 1839 missing. This entire run is reproduced in *Ya-p'ien chan-cheng* 鴉片戰爭 (The Opium War) of *Chung-kuo chin-tai-shih tzu-liao ts'ung-k'an* 中國近代史資料叢刊 (Collected materials on modern Chinese history), Volume 2, pages 365-521. This constitutes the largest single collection of Western materials translated by order of Lin Tse-hsü.

While the *Ao-men hsin-wen chih* primarily assembled news on current events, material on the geography and history of various foreign countries as well as on their political, economic, military, and cultural situation was contained in the book *Ssu-chou chih* 四洲志 (Geography of the four continents).

Momose Hiromu 百瀬弘 has written that the original source for *Ssu-chou chih* was the three-volume work by British geographer Hugh Murray, *The Encyclopaedia of Geography: comprising a Complete Description of the Earth, Physical, Civil, and Political: exhibiting its Relation to the Heavenly Bodies, its Physical Structure, the Natural History of Each Country, and the Industry, Commerce, Political Institutions, and Civil and Social State of All Nations.*⁹⁾ Originally published in London in 1834, it was revised and reprinted in Philadelphia, in the United States, in 1837. According to the preface of the revised edition, the account of Britain in the original edition took up more than one-third of the entire section on Europe, greater than the entire space given to the Americas. In the revised edition, therefore, the treatment of Britain was reduced somewhat as well as the statistical data updated. Sections pertaining to the Americas were expanded as much as possible and, due to the fact that the section on the United States in the first edition had been particularly incomplete and inaccurate, it was rewritten. Consequently, the treatment of the United States in the first edition and in the U.S. edition seem to be quite different.¹⁰⁾ It is unclear which edition Lin Tse-hsü had translated.

Besides this study, Hugh Murray authored many substantial works such as his history of navigational explorations of the Orient (1,586 pages of text in three volumes, published in 1820), a gazetteer of China (1,245 pages in three volumes, published in 1836), and works on the history and geography of the Americas, India and Africa. The most important of these can be found in the libraries of the University of Tokyo and at Tōyō Bunko. Only one was I unable to locate anywhere: *The Encyclopaedia of Geography*. Fortunately, Professor Noguchi Tetsurō 野口鐵郎 discovered a U.S. edition, published in Philadelphia in 1857, buried uncatalogued in the stacks of the Tsukuba University library, affording me the opportunity to examine it. Even though the third of three volumes was missing, it was still extremely useful, and I am most grateful.

This U.S. edition of *The Encyclopaedia of Geography* was published in eight-point type, with 67 lines to the page. Volume One contains the preface to the first edition, the preface to the U.S. edition, the table of contents, and the introduction. This is followed by Part One on the history of geographical studies (pages 10–79), Part Two on the principles of geography (pages 80–279), and Part Three on world geography, by region. Section One of Part Three is on Europe, with Chapter One being a general overview of Europe; Chapter Two, on England (pages 312–401); Chapter Three, on Scotland (pages 401–32); Chapter Four, on Ireland (pages 432–63); followed by treatments of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, Spain, and Portugal, for a total of 592 pages in all. Volume Two continues the treatment of Europe, including Italy, Switzerland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Russia, Greece, and [European] Turkey (pages 1–215). Section Two shifts to Asia. The coun-

tries of [Asian] Turkey, Arabia, Persia, India, Tibet, China (pages 401–26) and Japan (pages 481–92) are included. Section Three (pages 526–92) is devoted to Africa, treating Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia (Ethiopia). Volume Three probably covers the remainder of Africa, along with North and South America, with major emphasis on the United States.

The account of each country proceeds in the general order of 1) overview, 2) natural geography, 3) historical geography, 4) political geography, 5) products, 6) conditions of the people and society, and 7) geography by region, with detailed maps for each country along with generous illustrations.

On the whole, this work is most detailed in its treatment of Europe and of North and South America. Its accounts of Asia and Africa are rather brief. Among European countries, it is particularly detailed with respect to England, as it appears to be with respect to the United States on the American continent. It encompasses a tremendous amount of material which, no doubt, was an enormous task to summarize and translate in a brief period of time.

Ssu-chou chih was incorporated into Book 12 of *Hsiao-fang hu-chai yü-ti ts'ung-ch'ao tsai-pu-pien* 小方壺齋輿地叢鈔再補編 (Collected copies of works on geography from the *Hsiao-fang-hu* studio, second supplement) compiled by Wang Hsi-ch'i 王錫祺 during the Kuang-hsu 光緒 period (Shanghai: Chu-i-t'ang 著易堂) and also into Wei Yuan's 魏源 *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* 海國圖志 (Illustrated gazetteer of the maritime nations). Since the reports in the latter were re-edited by country, and supplemental material added, it is more convenient to use the former for locating only the original material from *Ssu-chou chih*. According to it, *Ssu-chou chih* consisted of 98 pages in 49 "leaves 丁" or double pages. If typeset in the same format as the *Ya-p'ien chan-cheng*, which contains the *Ao-men hsin-wen chih* as noted earlier, it would run to about 100 pages. Compared to the tremendous size of the original, it is clear that *Ssu-chou chih* was considerably abbreviated.

The arrangement of the accounts in *Ssu-chou chih* is completely different from that of the original. First is Annam 安南, Thailand 暹羅, Burma 緬甸, India 印度, Persia 巴社, Arabia 阿丹 and [Asian] Turkey 都魯機 (leaves one through eight), followed by such countries of Africa as Egypt 伊揖 and Abyssinia 阿邁司尼 (leaves eight through 18), then the European countries of Portugal 布路亞, Spain 大呂宋, Holland 荷蘭, France 佛蘭西, Italy 意大利亞, Germany 邪馬尼, Austria 歐塞特里, Norway 那威, Denmark 領墨, Sweden 瑞典, Prussia 普魯社 and [European] Turkey (25 pages; leaves 18 though 30), and finally England 英吉利 (7 pages; leaves 30 through 33), Russia 俄羅斯 (5 pages, leaves 33 through 36), and Siberia 悉畢釐阿 (3 pages, leaves 36 through 37). This is followed immediately by slightly less than twenty pages on the United States 育奈士迭 (leaves 37 though 47), with a state-by-state account (seven and a half leaves) inserted, so that the material on the United States is actually about 27 pages, far longer than those of other countries. Finally are accounts of Alaska (one page) and Canada (two pages) in North America.

and of Chile 智利 (slightly less than two pages) in South America. No accounts are given of countries like Mexico, Brazil, or Peru.

Thus, *Ssu-chou chih* provides descriptions of the world's major countries. But not only are these much abridged versions of the original; the summaries are not particularly good. Moreover, the many difficult place names mentioned frequently in the accounts are quite hard to understand without a very good map at hand. Furthermore, most common terms, such as official titles, titles of positions, and titles of government organizations, are for the most part transliterated, making it extremely difficult to understand the information. And translation errors abound. Consequently, there is a real question as to exactly how well these accounts could have been understood at the time.

Among the other works that Lin Tse-hsü had translated were *Hua-shih i-yen* 華事夷言 (A barbarian account of Chinese affairs), an extremely abridged translation of J. F. Davis, *The Chinese, A General Description of the Empire of China and its Inhabitants*, (two volumes, 1836), and *Ke-kuo lü-li* 各國律例 (Law of nations), a translation of one section of *Law of Nations* by the Dutch legal scholar, Emeric de Vattel. All of these are included in *Hai-kuo t'u-chih*. They are short and their contents not very important. But I intend to discuss *Ke-kuo lü-li* upon another occasion.

Chang Hsi-t'ang 張錫彤 has examined *The Chinese Repository* (中國叢報) and William C. Hunter's *Bits of Old China* (舊中國雜記) (1885) with regard to persons invited by Lin to undertake the translation of these works.¹¹⁾ For example, *The Chinese Repository* reported in June 1839 that when the American missionary E. C. Bridgman arrived at Hu-men 虎門 to witness the destruction of the opium confiscated by Lin, he was asked by Lin about British intentions to withdraw from Canton and about the best method of sending communications to the Queen of England and to other European sovereigns to seek their cooperation in banning the opium trade. Bridgman was also asked about maps, geographical works, and other foreign books, and particularly whether or not he had a complete set of Morrison's six-volume *Han-Ying tz'u-tien* 漢英辭典 (Chinese-English dictionary; 1815-1823).¹²⁾ A postscript to this account mentioned that Lin was utilizing the services of four Chinese who excelled in English. The first was a young man educated in Penang and Malacca, who had worked for a number of years in Peking government offices. The second was an old man who had received his education at a church in Serampore, India. Third was a youth who had spent time at the Cornwall School in the American state of Connecticut. Fourth was a young man educated in China, but able comfortably and accurately to read and translate passages dealing with ordinary matters.

The first man mentioned was Yuan Te-hui 袁德輝. William Hunter, noted above, had entered Malacca's Anglo-Chinese College 英華學堂 in about July 1825, in order to study Chinese. Not long after, Yuan also entered the school. For the next sixteen months until Hunter left for Canton at the end

of the following year, the two kept close company. According to Hunter, Yuan had been born in Szechuan 四川, had previously studied at a Catholic school in Penang, knew French and could also speak standard Peking Mandarin. Called Shaow Tih when he came to Malacca at the age of twenty-five, he specialized in English and made surprisingly rapid progress. In the fall of 1827, Yuan too went to Canton, where he visited Hunter, and the two saw each other frequently until 1829. Yuan was introduced by Hunter to Wu Hao-kuan 伍浩官 (Howqua) of the I-ho 怡和 *hong*, who in turn recommended Yuan to the governor-general. In the fall of that year, Yuan was appointed to translate in the Li-fan-yuan 理藩院, and went to Peking. He came back to Canton in the summer of 1830 and again at the beginning of 1838 in order to purchase foreign books. Then, in 1839, he accompanied Lin Tse-hsü to Canton to translate English. It is said that Lin had Yuan translate his letter to the Queen of England, and then, in order to check its accuracy, asked Hunter to translate it back into Chinese. Yuan remained in Canton until the end of 1839, and there is no word of him after his return to Peking.¹³⁾

Nothing is known about the second and third individuals. But the fourth had studied in Macao at the Morrison Education Society (a society established in 1836 to commemorate Robert Morrison). The *Third Report of the Morrison Education Society* (Sept. 1841) reported that in the spring of 1839, a young man educated by that society had, at the strong urging of Lin Tse-hsü, become an interpreter and translator for him, and that he had undertaken the translation of English language newspapers, Murray's *The Encyclopaedia of Geography*, and other works. The report went on to suggest that the great efforts on the part of Chinese authorities to secure the services of this young man even though he had completed only half the curriculum proved that those in the highest positions of government likewise recognized the value of understanding foreign languages and foreign conditions. The young man worked for Lin throughout Lin's tenure at Canton, and the various reports assembled by him (probably newspaper translations) were sent to the court at Peking. It was Lin's plan to publish the results of these surveys of foreign countries (probably *Ssu-chou chih*). The report went on to surmise that since Lin took all of these materials with him when he left Canton, they would probably be published before long.¹⁴⁾ From this account we know that foreigners knew of publication plans for *Ssu-chou chih* and other works.

In addition, Lai Hsin-hsia 來新夏 has noted that according to Ch'ing Hao-li 清浩理 in *Ma-li-sun hsiao-chuan* 馬禮遜小傳 (A short biography of Morrison) (Kuang-hsueh-hui 廣學會, 1948), Liang Chin-te 梁進德, an assistant of Morrison and son of Liang Fa 梁發, author of the famous *Ch'uan-shih liang-yen* 勸世良言 (Good words to exhort the age), had lived for eight years in the home of American missionary E. C. Bridgman, and that he, too, had served as an official English translator under Lin Tse-hsü.¹⁵⁾ The fourth person mentioned above is probably this Liang Chin-te.

These four are the only persons known to have been engaged in English translation work under Lin. Among them, Yuan Te-hui alone was a government employee with scholarly abilities. It is said that he translated Lin's letter to the Queen of England, in addition to a section of Vattel's *Law of Nations*. Furthermore, a proclamation issued jointly by the Imperial Commissioner, the Governor-General (總督) of Kwangtung 廣東 and Kwangsi 廣西, and the Governor (巡撫) of Kwangtung, and said to be a translation by Yuan, is extant. While the Chinese version of the letter to the Queen of England still exists, the English version does not. But the joint proclamation of the Imperial Commissioner 欽差大臣, the Governor-General, and the Governor, being the first English language proclamation issued by Chinese authorities, was so unusual that the *Chinese Repository* published it.¹⁶⁾ Reading it, one is able to follow its basic thrust, but the individual sentences are not really English. The syntax is that of Chinese, and, just as with Chinese language proclamations [of that time], there is absolutely no punctuation. For these reasons, the editor of the *Repository* decided to publish these curious sentences as a "document worthy of being put on record." Considering the fact that Yuan Te-hui who was in charge of the translators had such problems himself, one can well imagine the scholarly abilities of the other three.

Except for the one man who had studied at the Cornwall School, the other three had all received their English language education from missionaries or at missionary societies. This fact deserves special attention. Had it not been for English language training of the missionaries beginning with Robert Morrison, and Morrison's *Han-Ying tz'u-tien*, it would have been practically impossible to produce Lin Tse-hsü's "I-ch'ing ts'ai-fang" 「夷情采訪」 (An exploration of barbarian matters). The quest for Western knowledge was indispensable for China of the day, but for that purpose, language education was a prerequisite. The efforts of missionaries who promptly recognized this need, overcame numerous inconveniences and difficulties, and came to promote basic education, must be accorded great credit. Their enlightened activities in China did not of course stop at English language education. Branching out in many directions, they promoted such institutions as the previously mentioned Anglo-Chinese College, the Morrison Educational Society, and also the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. I am writing a separate article about these.

***Ssu-chou chih* 四洲志.**

As is well known, *Ssu-chou chih* was subsequently divided up into sections by Wei Yuan 魏源, supplemented and then issued as his *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* 海國圖志. The "original" material from *Ssu-chou chih*, as translated under Lin Tse-hsü 林則徐, appeared largely at the beginning of chapters. *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* was the very first world geography compiled in China, and was widely read in Japan as well. Up until now, few questions have been raised about its

contents. But anyone actually attempting to translate *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* and to read its "original" portions would first be dumbfounded by the clumsiness of its writings, and then utterly amazed at the number of entries thought difficult to understand or perhaps even erroneous. This naturally raises the question of whether the translation work was accurate or not. To date, *Ssu-chou chih* has not been compared to Murray's original to check for the accuracy of its translation. This is probably because while copies of Murray's original seem to be in most major American libraries, to the best of my knowledge, not one complete set exists anywhere in Japan, and so there has been no way to do a comparative study. But thanks to my recent opportunity to borrow volumes one and two held at the library of Tsukuba University, I was able by comparing these two works to ascertain for the first time exactly what kind of accounts were in *Ssu-chou chih*. I will try to provide a glimpse of the situation by means of the sections on England's "officials" and "political affairs" taken from *Ssu-chou chih*.

This section of *Ssu-chou chih* is an abridged translation of "Political Geography", which is the fourth section of Part Three, Section One, Chapter 2 on "England." In Murray, the constitution, position and authority of the monarch, and expenditures of the royal house are described first, followed, in order, by detailed descriptions of the upper house, lower house, Parliament, cabinet, prime minister, national finances, military expenditures, and court system. In *Ssu-chou chih*, however, as shown below, this order was changed considerably. This section of *Ssu-chou chih* was singled out simply because, as the earliest account of British parliamentary politics to appear in a Chinese work, it has been widely cited by scholars at home and abroad, and I believe it is widely known:

"There is a *lü-hao-ssu* 律好司 ("Lord House" or "House of Lords" [Upper House]). It manages the affairs of the various government offices, and judges major cases. Its membership consists of four *lo-ya-erh-lu-ssu* 羅壓爾錄司 ("royal dukes"); two *o-chih-mi-so-ssu* 厄治彌索司 ("archbishops"); one *ai-lun-o-chih-mi-so-ssu* 愛倫厄治彌索司 ("Ireland archbishops"); twenty-one *lu-ssu* 錄司 ("dukes"); nineteen *ma-kuei-ssu* 馬詭司 ("marquises"); 109 *erh-mi-ssu* 耳彌司 ("earls"); eighteen *wei-erh-kao-wen-ssu* 委爾高文司 ("viscounts"); twenty-four *mi-so-ssu* 彌索司 ("bishops"); three *ai-lun-mi-so-ssu* 愛倫彌索司 ("Ireland bishops"); 181 *ma-lun-ssu* 馬倫司 ("barons"); sixteen *ssu-ko-lan-pi-a-ssu* 斯葛蘭比阿司 ("Scotland peers" [Scottish aristocrats]), which is to say, persons selected from the land of *ssu-ko-lan* 斯葛蘭 ("Scotland"), who are replaced every three years; twenty-eight *ai-lun-pi-a-ssu* 愛倫比阿司 ("Ireland peers" [Irish aristocrats]), which is to say, persons selected from the land of *ai-lun* ("Ireland"). This totals 426 persons. When a member leaves office due to an emergency, he is permitted to recommend a person as his substitute. In all cases, if

a domestic 家人 (*chia-jen*) of a Lord violates the law, he is exempt from detention, unless it is a capital offense.

There is a *pa-li-man yamen* 巴里滿衙門 ("Parliament" office). Its membership consists of a *kan-mi-ti-a-fu-ch'e-pu-lai-shih* 甘彌底阿付撒布來士 ("Committee of Supplies") person, who solely governs army and naval troops; and a *kan-mi-ti-a-fu-wei-shih-an-mien-shih* 甘彌底阿付委士菴棉士 ("Committee of Ways and Means") person, who solely supervises taxation. In the event of a national emergency, the *kan-wen-hao-ssu* 甘文好司 ("Common House" or "House of Commons" [Lower House]) always assembles at this place.

There is a *kan-wen-hao-ssu* ("House of Commons"), which oversees the affairs of each locality (*pu-lo* 部落 [electoral district]), and also goes to the *pa-li-man* office to discuss government affairs. From *ying-chi-li* 英吉利 ("England"), 471 persons are selected. Of this number, 143 are sent out to govern large localities [counties], 324 to govern small localities ["cities" and "boroughs"], and four to govern educational and technical institutes [university electoral districts]. From *wei-erh-shih* 委爾士 ("Wales"), fifty-three persons are selected. Of this number, thirty are sent to govern large localities, and twenty-three to govern small localities. From *ai-lun* 愛倫 ("Ireland"), 105 persons are selected, and from this number, sixty-four are sent to govern large localities, thirty-nine to govern small localities, and two to govern educational and technical institutes. This totals 658 persons. From each locality persons who are wealthy, experienced and upright are selected to fill these positions. In the event of a national emergency, the members are summoned to meet at the *pa-li-man* in the national capital. Because not all people are able to attend, each locality selects one or two gentry to proceed to the capital to meet. When matters are completed, each person returns home. Later, it was further decided that the public persons selected should remain at the *kan-wen-hao-ssu* office to manage affairs. The country then provided them with a salary."

This *Ssu-chou chih* account is an abridged translation, which in the American edition runs from Volume One, page 344, line 10 through page 346, line 61, or a total of 184 lines. In *Ssu-chou chih*, this is recorded in a mere twelve lines, condensing the material into less than one-tenth its original space. Moreover, since the names of government offices and of titular ranks are entirely transliterated, they are extremely difficult to decipher.

Mizukuri Genpo 箕作阮甫, the first contemporary scholar of Dutch learning to undertake a commentary upon the Japanese woodblock edition of *Kaikoku zushi: Eikirikoku* 海國圖志·英吉利國 (Ch. *Hai-kuo t'u-chih: Ying-chi-li kuo* [Illustrated gazetteer of the maritime nations: England]) (Ansei 安政 3 [1856]), was almost completely unable to annotate its transliterations. Osatake Takeshi 尾佐竹猛, in the first edition of his *Ishin zengo ni okeru rikken shisō*

維新前後における立憲思想 (Constitutional thought before and after the Restoration) (Seikatsu bunka kenkyūkai 生活文化研究會, 1925; pp. 22-23), cited the *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* as the earliest work to have introduced constitutional thought into Japan and quoted the above passage as it appeared in the Japanese woodblock edition, but he offered no explanation or examination of the content of that account.

Asai Kiyoshi 浅井 清 utilized this same source in the first edition of his *Meiji rikken shisōshi ni okeru Eikoku gikai seido no eikyō* 明治立憲思想史における英國議會制度の影響 (The influence of the English parliamentary system on the history of Meiji constitutional thought). At the beginning of Chapter Two, Section Two, “Chūgoku no gensho ni yoru Iギリス kokkai seido no shōkai 中國の原書によるイギリス國會制度の紹介” (The introduction of the British parliamentary system based on Chinese works), he included the account cited above, giving punctuation and transliterations as in the Japanese woodblock edition. Noting that “there are many errors in this,” he not only explained the transliteration of eleven terms, but corrected a number of mistakes.¹⁷⁾

Asai made the same error as Osatake in saying that the original of *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* “was written by an American in Singapore. Translated into English by Lin Tse-hsü, it was further edited and supplemented from other sources by Wei Yuan, and published in Tao-kuang 道光 22 (1842).” But Asai’s research was far more advanced than that of Osatake, in his correct interpretation of transliterated terms in the above text and in pointing out erroneous and questionable points in the account.

Here I want to examine the questionable items in the previous quote from *Ssu-chou chih*, while at the same time introducing the points made by Asai.

In Hugh Murray’s original work, the treatment of the *lü-hao-ssu* 律好司 (“House of Lords”) or Upper House began with the composition of its membership and the method of their election. It went on to describe its function as the highest court in the land, and the special privileges its members. The *Ssu-chou chih* account slightly alters this order. It opens with the statement, “It manages the affairs of the various government offices.” The original, of course, had nothing corresponding to this. Next comes the statement, “It judges major cases.” This is a synopsis of the following: “When a civil suit is appealed, or a writ of retrial is received from a lower court, or when the trial of a criminal case is brought into the House of Lords in the form of impeachment by indictment in the House of Commons, then the House of Lords exercises its jurisdiction as the Supreme Court”.

The subsequent explanation concerning the composition and election of Lords is fairly close to the original. But the portion after “When a member leaves office due to an emergency . . .” is not correct. This is a statement that concerns the privileges of members of Parliament. Murray’s original work explains that “All members of parliament have the privilege for themselves

and their menial servants of being freed from arrests or imprisonment for debt or trespass; but not from arrests for treason, felony, or breach of the peace. The peers have other privileges peculiar to themselves. In all cases of treason, felony, or misprision of felony, a nobleman is tried by his peers; but in misdemeanours, he is tried like a commoner. In judicial proceedings, a peer gives his verdict not upon oath, but upon his honour; he answers also to bills in chancery upon his honour; but when examined as a witness in the inferior courts or in the high court of parliament, either in civil or criminal cases, he must be sworn. Slander against a peer subjects the offender to very heavy punishment, being branded by the law with the term *scandalum magnatum*. Every peer, by license from the king, may make a proxy to vote for him in his absence, a privilege which cannot be held by a member of the lower house."¹⁸)

Ssu-chou chih states that when a Lord "leaves office", he is "permitted to recommend a person as his substitute." This mistakes the original English wording of "absence" to mean to leave or to quit office, and seems to suggest that under such circumstances, a former Lord may recommend an appropriate replacement. The next sentence saying "if a domestic (*chia-jen*) of a Lord violates the law . . ." is written in such a way that it refers not to the member of Parliament at all, but to his domestic servants (*chia-p'u*), departing rather far from the intent of the original.

Ssu-chou chih next describes the *pa-li-man* 巴釐滿, that is to say, the Parliament. In the original, of course, the Upper House is followed immediately by the Lower House, after which comes Parliament. But for some reason, this sequence is altered in the *Ssu-chou chih*. Its explanations, moreover, are not only overly simplistic but completely wrong.

Murray's *Encyclopaedia* first describes the terms of office in Parliament and the length of parliamentary sessions. The term of office had previously been limited to three years, but more than a century earlier had been extended to seven years. Notwithstanding, the monarch had the authority to dissolve Parliament at any time, and could likewise adjourn Parliament at any time and for any length of time. When Parliament was so adjourned, all bills and proceedings under deliberation in either House were dropped, so that deliberations had to begin completely anew at the next session. In the event that either or both Houses recessed on their own initiative, however, deliberation of suspended bills could be resumed at the next session. Parliamentary sessions usually commenced in January or February, and extended into June or July.

Murray next describes committee of Parliament. All the committees had their seats filled at the beginning of each session. One of these was known as the Committee of Supply, which deliberated the monarch's request for funds for the army, navy, Munitions Ministry, and other government departments. Another was the Committee of Ways and Means, which deliberated methods of procuring the funds approved by Parliament through taxation or public

loans. The Minister of Finance sat in on the Committee of Ways and Means and explained the draft budget. In the event of an adjournment, the Lower House would have to rush through its bills, posting the important provisions approved by the Committee of Ways and Means, and indicating the disbursement of funds to government departments as specified and passed by the Committee of Supply.

Lastly, Murray describes the authority of Parliament. Parliament held sole authority within the kingdom to enact, amend and revise all laws. Taxes could be levied only with its approval. Moreover, a vote in the Lower House once each year was indispensable in order to maintain army and navy troop strength at levels set annually. Through these and other powers, and without statutory provision, it had come to pass that Parliament had to be convened each and every year. By votes of "nay" at its annual session, Parliament could express its dissatisfaction with government policies and could also press for replacement of government ministers. For such reasons, the principle that a minister who could not win the support of a majority of voters in Parliament could not manage the affairs of state, had by now become self-evident.¹⁹⁾

This section of Murray's original work is the most important of all sections for explaining British parliamentary politics. However, *Ssu-chou chih* gives only a very simple treatment of both the Committee of Supply and the Committee of Ways and Means. As previously pointed out by Asai Kiyoshi, the work mistakes both committees to be "individual" officials, and further misunderstands their duties. And then, the single most important power of Parliament is completely omitted. It appears from an examination of the committee accounts and from other things that the translator of *Ssu-chou chih* was barely able to understand this portion of the original.

Ssu-chou chih's explanation of the *kan-wen-hao-ssu* 甘文好司 or House of Commons, apart from being basically accurate on the number of parliamentary members in each election district, was likewise generally wrong. Murray provides a summary account of the House of Commons from its origins up to the "Revision of the Election Law" in 1832, along with a fairly detailed explanation of election districts, the set number of parliamentary members, the qualifications for candidates and for those with voting powers, and the actual election process, all under the new election law. In *Ssu-chou chih*, however, this is reduced to the House of Commons "oversees the affairs of each locality" and members are "sent out to govern large [or small] localities". This appears to result from the translator's inability to fully understand the status and official duties of members of Parliament, and to his thinking that the House of Commons was a government agency for administering local affairs, and that its members were gentry chosen from each locality to administer those areas.

As mentioned earlier, although Murray follows the order of House of Lords, House of Commons, and Parliament, *Ssu-chou chih* alters this order to

House of Lords, Parliament, and House of Commons. The translator ventured this change because he understood the House of Lords and Parliament to be separate government agencies supervising central government offices on the one hand, and administering the armed forces and state finances on the other, and by contrast he understood the House of Commons to be an agency for local administration and its members the administrators, going to Parliament and participating in parliamentary discourse only in emergencies.

As is commonly known, once into the eighteenth century, the House of Lords became little more than a collection of holders of honorary posts, as the center of parliamentary politics shifted to the House of Commons. Murray's work does not, however, specifically explain the relationship between the two Houses of Parliament or their relative importance. He may have thought this so self-evident as to obviate the need for an explanation. But to the translator of *Ssu-chou chih*, unable to understand the powers and functions of the House of Lords, House of Commons and Parliament, to say nothing of the relationship between the three or the importance of the House of Commons, the House of Commons was ultimately interpreted as a government office for local administration.

Ssu-chou chih next takes up the number of parliamentary members in the various election districts. In this section, only one place falls short. That is the section on Wales. Asai, who discerned an error here, revised the section by noting "Here Wales is an error for Scotland. The number of English members, including Wales, was 500 at that time. Of those, 162 came from county election districts, 334 from urban and town election districts, and four from university election districts."²⁰ But if we assume that the set number of members for England including Wales was 500, and that Wales is an error for Scotland, we must also correct the statement that "From England, 471 persons are selected." In point of fact, "Wales" was not a mistake, and following this, the number of Welsh members was omitted. In other words, one must insert the passage "[From Wales,] twenty-nine persons are selected, of whom fifteen are sent out to govern large localities and fourteen to govern small localities. And from Scotland, fifty-three persons are selected. . . ."

The section after the last "In the event of a national emergency . . ." in which Murray briefly recounts the history of the House of Commons at the very beginning of his account of that House, has already been summarized.

Looking just at this passage, the meaning comes across without there seeming to be any errors. Asai, too, in the first edition of his work wrote, "This section is without errors. The final sentence 'The country then provided them with a salary' is left hanging."²¹ But in his revised edition, Asai says "the sentence 'The country then provided them with a salary' apparently refers to the annual stipend of members of Parliament, but this is a very curious of putting it."²² However, the latter half of the account in *Ssu-chou chih* is a complete mistranslation, to say nothing of the first half.

Murray, after first saying that "The House of Commons, as a distinct branch of the legislature, is the peculiar boast of the British constitution," went on to give a general outline of its development as follows. Specifically, it seems that from earliest recorded time in British history, when major events would occur, a people's assemble would be called and policies discussed. However, the practice of the people sending representatives to a great council for fixed lengths of time so designated by the monarch was something that followed the overthrow of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester in 1266. Because the great council was not yet difficult to control like the later House of Commons, the monarch supported its development in order to check the excessive power of the great barons and, at the same time, to raise supplies of money from the continually expanding wealth of the people. The decline of the feudal system was propitious to this policy. Baronies were taken and broken up into smaller parts, so that thenceforth the class known as minor barons which held the position of knight made its appearance. As the knights were both too numerous and too poor for all to take seats in Parliament, only their representatives were granted seats, with each county allowed to send two representatives from among the knights. The Cinque Ports, or five special ports on England's southeast coast, sent a number of barons, and the cities and boroughs or autonomous cities sent citizen representatives. Initially, it seems that attending Parliament was more of a hardship for these representatives than a blessing. Attendance took money and because of lax public security there were many dangers. Moreover, since the convening of Parliament was usually a harbinger of the demand for money, it was definitely not welcomed. Nevertheless, funding approval was inevitably tied up with petitions, statements of complaint, and claims for protection. Because the monarch was always pressed by numerous urgent matters, he was never able to refuse these demands.

Comparing *Ssu-chou chih* with Murray's account, the first part, "In the event of a national emergency..." appears in the very first sentence of the original, and the part "Because not all people are able to attend..." seems to be a condensation of the original account concerning attendance by knights, barons and city representatives. The statement that "the public persons selected should remain at the *kan-wen-hao-ssu* office" is a misunderstanding. Furthermore, the statement, "The country then provided them with a salary," seems to be a convoluted interpretation of the original account in which the House of Commons extracted numerous rights as compensation for approval of funding for the monarch.

Thus, *Ssu-chou chih* not only contains many errors, but it over-condenses the original account so that major points are almost completely omitted. In particular, in describing the House of Lords, House of Commons, and Parliament, one is unable to find a single word about these being the sole legislative organs able to enact, amend, or revise laws, or their being the highest organs

to deliberate on affairs of state. This is because the translator of *Ssu-chou chih* was utterly unable to understand British parliamentary politics. This was due in part to inadequate linguistic ability, but more than anything else, it was because even reading the original, he was unable to grasp its meaning due to the fact that nothing like the British Parliament existed in China. He lacked the imagination to see the House of Lords, House of Commons, and Parliament as anything other than administrative agencies for controlling central and local government affairs. And so, while he translated the account of the British parliamentary system, the end result was no explanation of the parliamentary system at all.

Following treatment of the House of Commons, *Ssu-chou chih* briefly explains Britain's essential administrative organs:

"There is a *pu-lai-wu-kang-se-erh* 布來勿岡色爾 yamen 衙門 ("Privy Council" office) which handles confidential matters, and those holding office first swear an oath before taking up any matters. There is a *chia-mi-lieh-kang-se* 加密列岡色爾 yamen ("Cabinet Council" office) which has twelve members, each of whom manage separate matters. One is *fa-shih-lü-a-fu-li-t'e-li-sha-li* 法士律阿付釐特利沙利 ("First Lord of the Treasury" [Government Finance Committee Chairman and Prime Minister]) who controls the treasury. One is the *lü-chan-se-la* 律占色拉 ("Lord-Chancellor" [law officer]) who governs. One is the *lü-pu-lai-a-fu-hsi-erh* 律布來阿付西爾 ("Lord Privy of Seal" [high state official]) who controls the seal. One is the *pu-li-shih-tun-a-fu-kang-se-erh* 不利士頓阿付岡色爾 ("President of Council" [Chairman of the Privy Council]) who governs. One is *se-chi-li-ta-li-[a-fu]-shih-tieh-huo-li-huo-lun/li-pa-meng* 色吉力達釐[阿付]士迭火釐火倫·釐拔盟 ("Secretary of State for the Foreign, the Home" [Minister of Foreign Affairs/Home Affairs]) who governs. One is *se-chi-li-ta-li-a-fu-shih-tieh-huo-ke-lo-ni-shih-yen-wo* 色吉力達釐阿付士迭火哥羅尼士奄窩 ("Secretary of State for Colonies and War" [Minister of Colonies, War]) who governs. One is *chan-se-la-a-fu-li-shih-chih-chueh* 占色拉阿付釐士支厥 ("Chancellor of the Exchequer" [Minister of Finance]) who governs. One is the *fa-shih-lü-a-fu-ya-mi-la-erh-ti* 法士律阿付押彌拉爾底 ("First Lord of the Admiralty" [Navy Minister]) who governs. One is *ma-shih-ta-i-ni-lo-[a]-fu-li-ho-nan-shih* 馬士達依尼羅[阿]付釐曷南士 ("Master General of the Ordnance" [Head of Military Ordnance]) who governs. One is the *pu-li-shih-tun-a-fu-li-mo-a-fu-kuan-t'e-lo-erh* 布力士頓阿付離墨阿付觀得羅爾 ("President of the Board of Control" [Chairman of the Control Committee]) who governs. One is *chan-se-la-a-fu-li-lü-chih-a-fu-lan-chia-ssu-ta* 占色臘阿付離律治阿付加司達 ("Chancellor of the Dutchy of Lancaster" [Consul of Lancaster]) who governs."

Murray's original contains a fairly detailed explanation of the Privy Coun-

cil and the Cabinet Council, followed by a table of the twelve Ministers of State who sit on the Cabinet and the thirteen Ministers of State outside the Cabinet.²³⁾ Since the above account contains only a transliteration of the twelve Cabinet minister posts, it is unlikely that anyone reading this would understand it.

Ssu-chou chih next states that "a *chan-se-li* 占色利 yamen ("Chancery" office [high court]) exclusively administers trial deliberations. A *lü-hai-chan-se-la* 律海占色臘 ("Lord High Chancellor" [high judicial official]) presides over the office which keeps the seal and judges matters." This is followed by a description of various court officials such as the *wei-shih-chan-se-la* 委士占色臘 ("Vice Chancellor" [deputy high judicial official]) and *ma-shih-ta-a-fu-li-lo-shih* 馬士達阿付離羅士 ("Master of the Rolls" [director of records or Court of Appeal judge]). The next portion concerning the *ching-shih-mien-chih* 經士冕治 yamen ("King's Bench" office [throne court]), *kan-wen-pu-lieh* 甘文布列 yamen ("Common Police" office [civil lawsuit court]), *i-shih-chih-chia* 溢士知加 yamen ("Exchequer" office [financial court]), and *a-hsi-shih-yen-ni-pu-lai-a-shih* 阿西士菴尼士布來阿士 yamen (Assize and Nisi Prius [Circuit Court]) is similar to the account in Ch'en Feng-heng's 陳逢衡 *Ying-chi-li chi-lueh* 英吉利紀略 (A brief record of England), described in a separate article of mine."²⁴⁾

Ssu-chou chih then moves on to the Ministers of State outside the Cabinet. But its writing style differs from that used in the treatment of the Cabinet Ministers:

"There is also a *lü-chan-ma-lien* 律占麻連 ("Lord Chamberlain" [Minister of the Royal Household]) who resides within the palace guard. The *ma-shih-ta-a-fu-li-huo-shih* 馬士達阿付釐夥士 ("Master of the Horses" [horse master]) exclusively directs the care of horses. The *se-chi-li-ta-li-ya-wo* 色吉力達釐押窩 ("Secretary at War" [top official of the army]) exclusively presides over the collection and dispatch of documents. The *t'e-li-she-li-a-fu-li-ni-wei* 特里舍釐阿付利尼微 ("Treasurer of the Navy" [head paymaster of the navy]) manages naval ships. The *po-lieh-shih-tun-a-fu-li-mo-a-fu-t'e-lieh* 勃列士頓阿付釐墨阿付特列 ("President of the Board of Trade" [director of trade]) presides exclusively over trade. The *wei-shih-po-lieh-shih-tun-a-fu-li-mo-a-fu-t'e-lieh* 委士勃列士頓阿付釐墨阿付特列 ("Vice President of the Board of Trade" [assistant director of trade]) assists in the management of trade. The *pi-ma-shih-ta-a-fu-li-huo-shih* 比馬士達阿付釐夥士 ("Paymaster of the Forces" [head paymaster of the army]) exclusively presides over the disbursement of the revenue. The *p'o-shuai-ma-shih-ta-i-ni-la-erh* 波率馬士達依尼拉爾 ("Postmaster General" [Minister of Communications]) exclusively presides over the rapid delivery of public documents. The *liu-ti-nan-i-ni-la-erh-a-fu-li-ho-nan-shih* 流底南依尼拉爾阿付釐曷南士 ("Lieutenant General of the Ordnance" [assistant head of

military ordnance]) aids in the management of firearms. The *fa-shih-kan-mi-sun-na-a-fu-li-lan-lich-wei-nu* 法士甘靡孫拿阿付釐蘭利委奴 ("First Commissioner of the Land Revenue" [head of the tax office]) oversees the land tax. The *ya-to-ni-i-ni-la-erh* 押多尼依尼拉爾 ("Attorney General" [head of the judicial affairs]) is the general army officer, and the *shu-lich-hsi-to-i-[ni]-la-erh* 疏利西多依拉爾 ("Solicitor General" [deputy head of the judicial affairs]) is the assistant general army officer".

The translator of this section clearly seems to be different than the translator of the previous section on the Cabinet Ministers. When the two accounts are compared, not only are the Chinese characters used for the transliteration of official titles somewhat different, but for the Cabinet Ministers, only the notation *kuan kuan* 管官 meaning "governs," follows the transliteration of a title. In the case of the non-Cabinet Ministers, each official's duties are noted after the title. In the original account by Murray, ministerial titles were listed alone, without any separate mention of official duties. Consequently, the description of official duties following each non-Cabinet Minister's title was undoubtedly determined from the title itself, and added by the translator. While these additions are generally sound, errors such as calling the head and deputy head of the judicial affairs the general army officer and deputy general army officer, respectively, make the account as a whole not very accurate. Yet it is certainly more helpful than simply giving transliterations of titles.

As already mentioned, Murray's *Encyclopaedia* provides a table of Cabinet Ministers and a table of non-Cabinet Ministers next to each other on the same page; but *Ssu-chou chih* inserts an account of the courts in between these two. This is indeed strange. It may be due to an error on the part of the person assembling the translated manuscript for publication without really understanding either its contents or the connections between its parts.

Ssu-chou chih next provides the following account of the British army and navy:

"There are 150 naval warships, and 160 *kan-mi-sun* 甘彌孫 ("commission") men to direct those warships. There are 10,000 seamen and 22,000 sailors. British land forces number 81,271 men, of which 19,720 are posted in countries of Asia.

In this extremely brief report, the first part about warships is entirely wrong. The original reads "During the most active period of the last maritime war, the number of seamen in employment amounted to 140,000; and there were in commission 160 sail of the line and 150 frigates, with 30,000 marines. The estimate for 1831 comprehended 22,000 seamen and 10,000 marines."²⁵) With respect to the army, at the conclusion of the war with

France, there were 200,000 men in the regular army in addition to another 100,000 volunteers. But thereafter, these numbers were quickly reduced so that as of 1835, the numbers had come to equal those given in *Ssu-chou chih*.

Ssu-chou-chih next, under "political affairs", provides an account of the monarch's accession to the throne and sovereignty. In Murray's original, the monarch's position and sovereignty, and the expenses of the royal household, appear at the very beginning of the chapter on "political geography," which is to say, even earlier than the discussion of Parliament. But in *Ssu-chou chih*, for some reason, this was consigned to the very end:

"As a rule, when a monarch is about to ascend the throne, the officials and people gather at the Parliament for a meeting. The new monarch absolutely must disavow *chia-t'e-li* 加特力 ("Catholic") teaching and honor *po-lo-chiang-shih-tun* 波羅將士頓 ("Protestant") teaching and only then can he ascend the throne.

In the event of a national emergency, the monarch and the officials and the people all go to the Parliament where they publicly discuss [the matter] and then carry out [the decision]. In the case of an emergency, they meet once every third year.

In the event of an issue of war and peace requiring troops, although the monarch makes a decision, he must also obtain the deliberation and consent of Parliament.

If the actions of a monarch are improper, the person seeing that will communicate it to Parliament, which will deliberate a punishment.

As a general rule, the establishment and revision of laws, the appointment of government officials, the increase or decrease of levies, and the issuance of bank notes are all referred by the monarch to the Parliament, sent on to the House of Commons, and then implemented. But the appointment and dismissal of Ministers of State and judicial officers are prerogatives of the throne. The proper conduct of office of all officials, and their successes and failures, and diligence or negligence are reviewed in Parliament at the end of each year, and inefficient officials demoted".

This account is a summary of various passages from the original mixed together with superfluous information not in the original.

Murray first explains the foundations of the British form of government:

"The constitution of Great Britain centres in the laws by which the country is governed, and in the union of powers by which the laws are made and the government is administered. The legislative power is vested in the Parliament, consisting of the King, an hereditary sovereign; the Lords, an hereditary aristocracy; and the House of Commons, consisting of members chosen by the people from among themselves, and therefore

said to represent the commons of the realm. The executive power is entrusted to the king."²⁶⁾

Then, with respect to the position and powers of the monarch, Murray says:

"Of the three estates of the realm thus composing the legislature, the King is the highest: he is the head or chief of the parliament: and except in extreme cases, a parliament cannot be held unless convoked by him, nor can it except by him be dissolved or prorogued. His assent is requisite to give the force of law to any measure proposed by either of the two houses, and agreed upon by them. Propositions of laws, or bills as they are technically called, may be brought forward in either house; all money bills must take their origin in the House of Commons; but only in one instance can the king initiate an act of parliament, and that is, an act of grace, for the pardon of persons after a rebellion, or for the release of insolvent debtors."

Then, on the monarch's right to rule, Murray says:

"The King is not supposed to hold his throne by divine right, or in virtue of any indefeasible hereditary claim. The nation, by its supreme council, has dictated certain rules of exclusion with regard to the succession, of which the most important is, that the sovereign shall maintain the Protestant reformed religion, and, either at his coronation or on the first day of the first parliament, shall repeat and subscribe the declaration against popery."

Following this, the privileges of the monarch are enumerated. Taking only those items related to the *Ssu-chou chih* account, "He is the fountain of justice, and has an undoubted prerogative in creating officers of state, ministers, judges, and other functionaries. . . ." "The power of making war or peace is lodged singly in the king. He is held to be incapable of doing wrong, and if an unlawful act be done, the minister instrumental in that act is alone obnoxious to punishment."

The *Ssu-chou chih* account omits entire important sections from the first half. Moreover, those sections thought to be translated from the original account are remarkably inaccurate.

The first passage about the monarch's adherence to the state religion somehow comes across. But the next, "In the event of a national emergency . . ." is simply a repetition of the same sentence in the *Ssu-chou chih* account of "Parliament" and the "House of Commons." This indicates that the trans-

lator believed that Parliament was convened only in case of a national emergency, which is, of course, an error. Consequently, Asai, assuming that the word "no" had been omitted in the place which reads, "In the case of an emergency, they meet once every third year," amended it to read, "In the case of no emergency . . ." ²⁷⁾ But sired as already noted, the British Parliament convened annually, the translation is wrong with or without the "no." The parts about going to Parliament with "an issue of war and peace requiring troops," and "If the actions of a monarch are improper . . .," are each followed by statements about "Parliament," but these statements are superfluous.

Next comes the section on "the establishment and revision of laws" for which there is no corresponding account in the original. "Bank notes 楮幣" (paper money) is probably a mistranslation of the term "money bill." The following sentence on "the appointment and dismissal of Ministers of State and judicial officers" corresponds closely to the original. But the final section about "the proper conduct of office of all officials" has no corresponding account in the original. Even if it is thought to be based on another part of Murray's original, namely, the account describing the authority of Parliament, its contents are much too different.

Following this, *Ssu-chou chih*, under the heading of "Annual Outlays of the Royal Palace," presents several items on the expenditures of the royal household. I will omit those here.

Up to this point, we have examined the *Ssu-chou chih* account of British parliamentary government against the original by Murray. What is clear is that the *Ssu-chou chih* account is an extremely crude translation, that most of the important points of the original are omitted, and that most of the translation is from tables. To be specific, of the total twenty-nine line description concerning the House of Lords, Parliament, House of Commons, Cabinet and non-Cabinet Ministers, and the monarch, nineteen of those lines are in fact taken from tables in Murray's original. Moreover, official and noble titles were no more than written out vertically in Chinese characters that approximated their sound. The ten remaining lines are full of mistranslations. Furthermore, because the order of the original was changed and arranged wronggly, the whole account is incoherent. In short, one can only conclude that the translator himself almost completely misunderstand British parliamentary politics, let alone the general structure of her government.

Sun Hui-wen 孫會文 has already stated, with respect to one part of the *Ssu-chou chih* account on "Officials 職官" and to its account on "Government Affairs 政事," that making the House of Lords, House of Commons, and Parliament into three government offices is unacceptable, and that the description of the functions of the two Houses is too general and full of errors. He says that it is difficult to determine whether this is because the portrayal of the British parliamentary system in Murray's original work is itself too

general, or because of translation mistakes. In any case, Sun considers Lin Tse-hsü, who had *Ssu-chou chih* translated, "definitely the first person to introduce the organization and spirit of the British Parliament to the Chinese people."²⁸) And yet since even the translator did not really understand it, one would have to say that it would have taken a real miracle for anyone to understand "the organization and spirit of the British Parliament" from reading this account.

In *Ssu-chou chih* there is also an account of the republican political system of *yü-nai-shih-tieh-kuo* 育奈士迭國, that is, the United States of America. This is somewhat easier to understand than the account about Britain. And yet it is questionable whether one could really understand this account of U.S. congressional politics without some background knowledge.

Wei Yuan 魏源, who later compiled *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* 海國圖志 based on *Ssu-chou chih* with numerous added notes and comments, made no mention whatsoever of British parliamentary politics. And yet in his section *Mo-li-chia-chou tsung-shu* 墨利加洲總叙 on the United States, he praised its independence and pointed to the fact that its politics honored the will of the people, saying:

"The discussion of events, the hearing of disputes, the selection of officials, and the recommendation of worthies all start from below. If something is all right with the people, then it is all right; if it is not all right with the people, then it is not. If the people say something is good, then it is good; if they say it is bad, then it is bad. If two out of three support something, the rest give up their individual positions and follow along together. That is to say, even those on the losing side of an issue defer to the majority. How can this not be called whole?"

This shows that Wei Yuan had some understanding of the politics of a democratic representative assembly in a republic. This, however, is believed to have come not from *Ssu-chou chih* but from *Mei-li-ko ho-sheng-kuo chih-lueh* 美理哥合省國志略 (A brief account of the United States of America) by the American missionary E. C. Bridgman. Liang T'ing-nan 梁廷柅, likewise, gained an understanding of American democratic politics through this book, writing:

"I came to see that this nation was formed by melding together the American people, and that, although observing this carried out for some time without change, this still does not make false the belief that hereafter what is to be feared is not the people. Ever since the founding of this country, rewards and punishments, and prohibitions and orders of the nation have all, for the most part, been decided by deliberation of the people. Then later, they elected people to see that the laws were obeyed. Even before there were national leaders [like the president] there were

national laws. Laws are the people's will made manifest."²⁹)

Thus, it was easier for Chinese to understand a book written in Chinese by a foreign missionary than the *Ssu-chou chih*, translated into Chinese by a Chinese.

This was because in the China of that period, the basic preparations had not yet been made for seeking out and understanding Western knowledge and then broadly introducing it without outside aid. Recognizing the imperative to seek out Western knowledge, Lin Tse-hsü assembled the talent nurtured by missionaries, worked hard to collect information by relying on a dictionary prepared by a missionary, and even considered publishing that information. Yet he failed to see the need to go that extra step of training the talent to seek out the Western knowledge that China lacked so desperately. The small information gathering agency that he set up was dismantled with his own dismissal from office. Ultimately, only traces of the materials that he had gathered, much of it of poor quality, could be found in *Hai-kuo t'u-chih*. No one, either in or out of government, thought to further expand his project, nor was there anyone qualified to do so. In the end, the introduction of Western knowledge into China was again left to the exclusive efforts of missionaries. China had to wait more than twenty years before her government, gradually conscious of its own negligence, began to establish institutions for foreign language study and education in other areas of learning.

NOTES

- 1) Chung-kuo shih-hsueh-hui 中國史學會, ed. *Chung-kuo chin-tai-shih tzu-liao ts'ung-k'an* 中國近代史資料叢刊, ti-i-chung 第一種: *Ya-p'ien chan-cheng* 鴉片戰爭 (Collected materials on modern Chinese history, part one: The Opium War), (Shen-chou Kuo-kuang-she 神州國光社, 1954), Vol. 2, pp. 411-12.

The original work contained herein, *Ao-men hsin-wen chih* 澳門新聞紙 (The press at Macao), is an old manuscript copy in six volumes (now housed at the Nanking Library) previously stored in Ch'un-pi-lou 羣碧樓, the library of Teng Pang-shu 鄧邦述, the famous book collector and great-grandson of Teng T'ing-chen 鄧廷楨, Governor of Anhui 安徽 (1826-35), Governor-General of Kwangtung 廣東 and Kwangsi 廣西 (1835-40), and Governor-General of Fukien 福建 and Chekiang 浙江 (1840). (See bibliographic note in Volume Six of the above collection, p. 525.) Lin Tse-hsü 林則徐 had the English-language weekly newspapers published at Macao (Ao-men) translated into Chinese, and then distributed in order to his fellow officials. *Ao-men hsin-wen chih* is most likely those manuscript copies sent to Teng T'ing-chen, and preserved in a bundle by his family. The date of the first item in Volume One is July 16, 1838 (the 25th day of the fifth Chinese lunar month), and the second item is July 23, 1839. But the first item contains criticism of the earliest draft of Lin Tse-hsü's letter to the British monarch, so that 1838 is clearly a mistake for 1839. Consequently, this work records items beginning on July 16, 1839, and continuing about once each week up to November 7, 1840 (the 17th day of the tenth Chinese lunar month), that is, until right after Lin Tse-hsü's dismissal from office.

It is said that portions of *Ao-men hsin-wen chih* were sent by Lin Tse-hsü to the Tao-kuang 道光 Emperor, appended to memorials. A very small part, about one-twentieth, was extracted for *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* 海國圖志 under the title of *Ao-men yueh-pao* 澳門月報, and organized under the five headings of "On China; On Tea; On the Prohibition of Opium; On the Use of Troops; and On Barbarian Affairs in Various Countries." The note appearing at the very beginning of *Ao-men yueh-pao* —1 (the Macao monthly — One), reads, "On China. . . . Newspapers from the 19th and 20th years of Tao-kuang. . . . Translated by Lin Tse-hsü, Governor-General of Kwangtung and Kwangsi [sic]. . . . Including four items appended to memorials to the throne." The term "On China" in this note is a content explanation of *Ao-men yueh-pao* —1. But the part following "the 19th and 20th years of Tao-kuang" should be viewed as applying not only to *Ao-men yueh-pao* —1, but to the entire *Ao-men yueh-pao* series, One through Five. In that case, it must mean that *Ao-men yueh-pao* was compiled under Lin Tse-hsü, and that four parts (four items) had been appended to memorials to the throne.

As noted above, *Ao-men yueh-pao* consisted of extracts of a very small portion of *Ao-men hsin-wen chih*. Moreover, poorly written passages of the original were rewritten, verbose sections greatly condensed, and material containing harsh criticisms of the Chinese government and its people generally excised. As a consequence, if we make the assumption that *Ao-men yueh-pao* was indeed compiled under the direction of Lin Tse-hsü, then these changes were also made under Lin's direction. Those passages expunged from the rewritten portions are particularly eye catching. One may catch a glimpse of those sections by examining the underlined parts of the just-quoted passages. Material like the very last sentence has been particularly amended: "A glance at their second letter to the British monarch provides ample proof of their great strides in learning." In other words, only the early favorable sections are utilized after further embellishment, whereas the later sections about Lin's letter inviting foreign laughter as an historical anachronism and a product of inadequate international awareness were entirely deleted.

- 2) Yang Kuo-chen 楊國楨 *Lin Tse-hsü tui Hsi-fang chih-shih te t'an-ch'iu* 林則徐對西方知識的探求 (Lin Tse-hsü's pursuit of Western knowledge), *Hsia-men Ta-hsueh hsueh-pao* 廈門大學學報, No. 2 (1979), p. 88. This article was reprinted in Ning Ching, ed. *Ya-p'ien chan-cheng-shih lun-wen chuan-chi hsu-pien* 鴉片戰爭史論文專集續編 (Specialized articles on the history of the Opium War, Supplement), (Jen-min ch'u-pan-she 人民出版社, 1984).

Yang Kuo-chen writes that Ch'i-shan 琦善 ridiculed Lin Tse-hsü's purchase of "barbarian books" which "officials had never been concerned about," citing as his authority a memorial by Ch'i-shan contained in *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo* 籌辦夷務始末 (A complete account of our management of barbarian affairs), Vol. 18, as his authority. This would be a memorial of *kuai-hai* 癸亥 in the twelfth lunar month of the twentieth year of the Tao-kuang 道光 Emperor (page 13). However, this memorial contains no such description as the one cited by Yang.

This memorial from Ch'i-shan transmitted the reports of Chang Tien-yuan 張殿元 and others dispatched first as deputies by Ch'i-Shan to the British, for the purpose of contacting British plenipotentiary Elliot when Ch'i-shan went as Imperial Commissioner to Canton to negotiate with Elliot. It explains in detail how these deputies received the terms demanded by Elliot. One section of the memorial describes how when Elliot mentioned "repayment of foreign merchant debts and of losses of ships and goods over the past two years," the deputies countered that "the missing items are matters for the merchants' personal negotiation and not matters for official involvement. And as for the losses of ships and goods, no evidence exists of actual numbers, and therefore no basis for compensation." It seems that Yang Kuo-chen picked out the one phrase "not matters for official involvement" to produce his above account, a truly awesome feat of creativity.

- 3) Lai Hsin-hsia 來新夏, ed. *Lin Tse-hsü nien-p'ü* 林則徐年譜 (A chronological biography of Lin Tse-hsü) (Shang-hai Jen-min ch'u-pan-she 上海人民出版社, 1981), p. 198.
- 4) The instructions issued by Lin Tse-hsü to the hong merchants in March 1839, "On having foreign merchants compel the barbarians to turn over their opium 諭洋商責令夷人呈繳煙土稿," was a document instructing hong merchants to order foreign merchants to hand over the opium in their possession. One can readily see in it Lin's plan—simultaneous with the opium prohibition—to strengthen hong merchant control over foreign traders, and in turn, to realize the reestablishment and augmentation of China's old posture in relations with the outside world.

In these instructions, Lin first says, "Be it known that trade between China and barbarians has been conducted at Canton for more than 300 years. How is it that the barbarians are not able to carry out trade on their own? The reason for establishing foreign trading houses from the outset was to impede illicit trade and to guard against contraband." In other words, this says that the purpose of establishing the hong merchant [system] was to prevent smuggling. Next, he describes an edict of Chia-ch'ing 嘉慶 21 (1816) that in the event of confirmation that a foreign trading house vessel was importing opium, the vessel's entire cargo was to be rejected and trade prohibited, and the ship ordered back to its home country. Yet despite this edict, not one ship had been rejected by the hong merchants, so that opium had come to spread throughout the interior. This situation was censured as being the result of hong merchants forgetting their original duty, and taking a laissez-faire attitude toward the illegal activities of various Chinese traders and of banking houses in the vicinity of barbarian firms, which had dealings with barbarian merchants and firms engaged in opium smuggling. "Even though they say they have reached no mutual understanding nor secretly established shares (in the companies), who is to believe that? Then he writes, with respect to the recent clear and evident tendency among hong merchants to ingratiate themselves and behave subserviently toward barbarian merchants:

We have heard that formerly, even when foreign merchants with swords at their sides called at the offices of Chinese merchants, most Chinese merchants refused to see them. They would have them come back again before responding to them. But in recent years there are those who go all the way down to Macao to meet them, giving the excuse that they are helping them through customs. The Tung-yu 東裕 hong even sent a sedan chair to the office of the Taipan 大班 (*ta-pan*) for him to ride, but that Taipan refused even to allow the same hong merchant to enter his premises in a sedan chair. They engage in all manner of perverse and erroneous activities, yet where is their shame. Although all these things originated experimentally with merchants, there remain self-respecting local merchants who have not stooped to such things. But the fragrant and the fetid both stink, and the actions of some of you have verily brought shame to all. All you think about is your own enrichment though trade, and so you curry favor with the barbarians for the slightest gain. Do you not know that all profits of the barbarians are by grace of the Celestial Dynasty, and that if one day they should incur the Imperial wrath and trade be cut off and the borders closed, those countries would not be able to pursue the slightest profits. Then what would there be for you? Then again, without knowledge of the great beneficence of the Court's nourishment, you take traitors into your confidence. Not one move of our local government offices is unknown beforehand to the barbarians. But if one asks these same merchants about barbarian affairs, they by contrast conceal all manner of things, and dare not speak the truth.

Quoted in Chung-shan Ta-hsueh Li-shih-hsi 中山大學歷史系 Chung-kuo chin-tai chiao-yen-tsu yen-chiu-shih 中國近代現代教研組研究室 ed. *Lin Tse-hsü chi, kung-tu* 林則徐集·公牘 (The collected works of Lin Tse-hsü, with official documents) (Chung-hua shu-chü 中華書局, 1963), pp. 56-57.

Although hong merchants had formerly had an air of superiority toward foreign traders, their reversal to ingratiating themselves with those traders was viewed by Lin Tse-hsü as the source of numerous evils. But it appears that Lin was unable to understand the source of this subjective shift.

Canton's foreign trade from early on had been carried out utilizing the capital of foreign trading companies, because the capital base of China's hong merchants was so feeble. In other words, the hong merchants were largely dependent upon the foreign trading companies for capital, and as the scale of foreign trade expanded, so too did the extent of hong merchant dependency on those companies. To counter this, Lin Tse-hsü seems to have believed that he could restore the hong merchant to his lead position in the trade by promoting the suppression of foreign merchants and the self-awareness of the hong merchant. But the problem went much deeper than this. My own views on this question appear in "Shindai no Kanton Kōshō seido ni tsuite 清代の廣東行商制度について" (A Study of the Hong Merchants at Canton in the Ch'ing Period), *Sundai Shigaku 駿臺史學*, No. 66 (February 1986).

- 5) Yang Kuo-chen, ed. *Lin Tse-hsü shu-chien* 林則徐書簡 (The documents of Lin Tse-hsü) (Fu-chien jen-min ch'u-pan-she 福建人民出版社, 1981), p. 44.
 - 6) Wu Ch'ien-tui 吳乾兌 and Ch'en K'uang-shih 陳匡時, *Lin i 'Ao-men yueh-pao' chi ch'i-t'a* 林譯《澳門月報》及其他 (Lin [Tse-hsü]'s translation of the 'Ao-men yueh-pao' and other works), *Chin-tai-shih yen-chiu* 近代史研究 No. 3 (1980), pp. 264-77.
 - 7) Frank H. H. King, ed., with Prescott Clarke, *A Research Guide to China-Coast Newspapers, 1822-1911* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), pp. 41-48.
 - 8) Liang T'ing-nan 梁廷柅, *I-fen wen-chi* 夷氛聞記 (A record of noxious barbarian vapors), annotated by Shao Hsun-cheng 邵循正 (Chung-hua shu-chü, 1959), pp. 68-69.
 - 9) Momose Hiromu 百瀬弘, *Kaikoku zushi shōkō* 海國圖志小考 (A brief study of the "Hai-kuo t'u-chih"), "Iwai hakase koki kinen tenseki ronshū 岩井博士古稀記念典籍論集 (A collection of articles on classical books commemorating the seventieth birthday of Dr. Iwai) (1963), p. 92. The fact that Lin Tse-hsü had had Murray's *Encyclopaedia of Geography* translated can be learned from *The Chinese Repository*, Vol. X (1841), p. 577, and from S. Wells Williams, *The Middle Kingdom* (1883), Vol. I, p. 50. The latter work says that Lin published an abridged translation in twenty volumes in 1841, which is a mistake.
 - 10) American Library Association, *The National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints*, Vol. 402 (1975), pp. 410-11. According to this source, after first being issued in 1837, the U.S. edition was published each year thereafter up to 1848, after which it was reissued also in 1852 and 1853. While not listed in this catalog, the U.S. edition in the Tsukuba University library is dated 1857, so it seems that many, many copies of this work were published in the United States. Momose, in *Kaikoku zushi shōkō* (p. 695), and based upon information from the *Dictionary of National Biography*, writes that the 1843 U.S. edition circulated widely throughout Europe and the United States. Actually, the U.S. edition had probably entered Europe well before that time.
- The U.S. edition was not revised after its initial publication, but simply reprinted. The British edition, however, was published in a revised, second edition in 1844. The original consisted of three volumes, in 1,567 pages, while the revised edition was 1,576 pages in length. Since I have been unable to see the original, the extent of the revision is unclear.
- 11) Chang Hsi-t'ung, "The Earliest Phase of the Introduction of Western Political Science into China," *The Yenching Journal of Social Studies*, Vol. V, No. 1 (July 1950), pp. 14-15.
 - 12) *The Chinese Repository*, Vol. VIII (1840), p. 76.
 - 13) William C. Hunter, *Bits of Old China* (1855), pp. 260-63.
 - 14) *The Chinese Repository*, Vol. X (1841), pp. 576-77.
 - 15) Lai Hsin-hsia, pp. 195-96. A similar account is found in Geo. H. McNeur, *Liang Fa chuan* 梁發傳 (A biography of Liang Fa), trans. Hu Tsan-yun 胡贊雲 (Kuang-hsueh-hui

- 廣學會; reprinted by Hong Kong Chi-tu-chiao fu-chiao ch'u-pan-she 香港基督教輔教出版社), p. 86.
- 16) *The Chinese Repository*, Vol. VIII (1840), pp. 167-68.
 - 17) Asai Kiyoshi 淺井 清, *Meiji rikken shisōshi ni okeru Eikoku gikai seido no eikyō* 明治立憲思想史における英國議會制度の影響 (The influence of the English parliamentary system on the history of Meiji constitutional thought) (Ganshōdō, 巖松堂, 1935). This work was later revised and republished under the title *Meiji rikken shisōshi ni okeru Iギリス kokkai seido no eikyō* 明治立憲思想史におけるイギリス國會制度の影響 (The influence of the British parliamentary system on the history of Meiji constitutional thought), (Yūshindō 有信堂, 1968).
 - 18) Hugh Murray, *The Encyclopaedia of Geography* (Philadelphia, 1857), Vol. I, p. 344.
 - 19) *Ibid.*, p. 346.
 - 20) Asai, rev. ed. (1965), p. 65.
 - 21) Asai, first ed. (1935), p. 98.
 - 22) Asai, rev. ed. (1965), p. 65.
 - 23) Murray, pp. 346-47.
 - 24) Sasaki Masaya, *Kaikoku zushi yodan* 海國圖志餘談 (A digression on "Hai-kuo t'u-chih"), *Kindai Chūgoku* 近代中國, Vol. 17, pp. 175-76.
 - 25) Murray, pp. 340-41.
 - 26) *Ibid.*, p. 342.
 - 27) Asai, rev. ed. (1965), p. 66.
 - 28) Sun Hui-wen 孫會文 "Wan-Ch'ing ch'ien-ch'i pien-fa lun-che tui Hsi-fang i-hui chih-tu te t'ai-tu ho chün-chu li-hsien chu-chang te hsing-ch'eng 晚清前期變法論者對西方議會制度的態度和君主立憲主張的形成 (The attitude of reformers in the early part of the late Ch'ing toward the Western parliamentary system and the formation of proposals for a constitutional monarchy), *Kuo-li pien-i-kuan kuan-k'an* 國立編譯館館刊, Vol. 3, No. 2, (1974), p. 162.
 - 29) Hsi Yü-ch'ing 洗玉清, "Liang T'ing-nan chu-shu lu-yao 梁廷柟著述錄要 (Selected writings by Liang T'ing-nan), *Ling-nan hsueh-pao* 嶺南學報, Vol. 4, No. 1 (1935), p. 145.

Post Script.

The above is a translation of "Kindai Chūgoku ni okeru taigai ninshiki to rikken shisō no tenkai (2) 近代中國における對外認識と立憲思想の展開(二)" which first appeared in *Kindai Chūgoku* 近代中國, Vol. 17 (Gannandō shoten 巖南堂書店, 1985), pp. 185-217.