

The post called "Hsiang" 相, a key position for the administration of policies, was occupied in Wei now by a member of the royal house, now by a minister. This indicates both that it was a bone of contention between the two factions, and also that neither could decisively gain the upper hand. This tells us that the feudal order in Wei was still firm and that it had not yet been possible universally to draw the people out of the old communal structures to form that population of small farmers which was the basis for the King's authority.

On the 'Authors' of the *Shih Chi* 史記

by Harutsugu SAWAYA

It seems a popular thesis in post-war Japan the *Ssü-ma Ch'ien* 司馬遷 must have written the *Shih Chi* as an individual work after his "conversion" caused by his serious experiences through the *Li Ling* 李陵 trial. There was a long traditional background in Japan in which the *Shih Chi* had been thought a beautiful literary work.

However, judging from the historical point of view, we cannot support the thesis because of our present research of the *Autobiography of the Grand Historian* 太史公自序, especially through the analysis of the connection between the *Ch'un Ch'iu* 春秋 and Confucius as a historical forerunner. In 1951, Ku Chieh-kang 顧頡剛 published a brilliant article on *Ssü-ma T'an* 司馬談 as a founder of the main plan and editorial structure of the *Shih Chi*, and we can recognize Ku's assertions through comparative analysis on the *Biography of Ssü-ma Ch'ien of the Han Shu* 漢書司馬遷傳 with the *Shih Chi*.

Then, we can make some proposals about 'authors' of the *Shih Chi* as below.

1. On the 'authors' of the *Shih Chi*, we must point out *Ssü-ma T'an* as the first main planner and editor as well as *Ssü-ma Ch'ien*, who completed the work after his father's death.
2. Moreover, about the views of ancient Chinese history and Confucius's *Ch'un Ch'iu* in the *Shih Chi*, the 'authors' of the *Shih Chi* had fluctuated between '*Shu*' (述=recording for the glorifying of the past

and present period), and '*Tsuo*' (作=holy writing of the prospects for the future), and these fluctuating attitudes of the 'authors' were reflected in the contradictory passages in the *Autobiography of the Grand Historian*.

3. Finally, the traditional Chinese method of historical writings, used typically by the 'authors' of the *Shih Chi*, must have been called rather an annotated editing, 'mosaic' as Chavanne's term, than a historical writing in modern use.

The Taipings and the Western

Powers in 1853-54

by Tatsurô HAYASHI

In 1862, the Western Powers, headed by Great Britain, officially began to intervene in the civil war between the Taipings and the Manchongs (imperial government). Their intervention gave the Taipings a crushing blow, and because of this the Taipings were finally defeated.

In general, the Western Powers were neutral until then, but their "neutrality" was nothing but an accidental result of a few direct and sustained battles. Their "neutrality" was actually a policy of "anti-Taipings and pro-Manchongs." This policy was established through their four visits to Nanking from 1853-54. And consequently, the Western Powers felt it to be improbable that the Taipings would accept (the provisions of) the Treaty of Nanking. The Western Powers endeavoured to prevent the Taipings from advancing to Shanghai, which was considered a treasure house of advantages.

In reality, the Taipings were strong agents of national resistance. It is true that they were lacking in proper understanding of international relations at some points, but we should not attribute the fact that they regarded foreigners' visit as an act of tribute only to their *consciousness of national chauvinism*. Their way of thinking was an expression of national pride, and they used it as an effective counter means against the demand that they accept the Treaty of Nanking. They took quite an uncompromising