

Japanese Archives: Sources for the Study of Tokugawa Administrative and Diplomatic History¹

Louis CULLEN

Japanese record keeping contrasted starkly with more abundant Western archives. The poor state of shogunal records was compounded by losses in the Restoration and in the 1923 Tokyo earthquake. Domain records often fared much better, though they are often in runs of *nisshi* and *nikki* with information entered from documents later discarded. The papers of final decision making, and in general of *rōjū* and *bugyō*, were personal to the office holder. Survival of the records of daimyo who had served as *rōjū* depends on the integrity of han archives. Access to the private property of former daimyo was prompted by their wish to preserve a fair record of the role of the great domains in bakumatsu times. The survival of papers of *bugyō* and lesser officials, unless in domain archives, was only secured by retention by heirs or random passage through the hands of collectors, private copyists or booksellers. Administration functioned through the circulation of copies, in turn often copied into either official compilations such as the *Tsūkō ichiran*, or private ones. In the 1860s, a pressing need for access to recent and current records led to the compilation in two stages of the *Tsūshin zenran*. While the diffuse holding of papers had posed the initial problem, it also provided the solution. In Osaka, a floating mass of miscellaneous paper was the source base for two compilations in the late Meiji period, one published in 1911–1913, the other only sixty years later in the 1960s. The first printed compilations were four by Katsu Kaishū under official support in 1889–1893. The first volume of *Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei monjo* followed in 1911, itself in part made possible by the *Tsūshin zenran*. The *Dai Nihon ishin shiryō*, its origins traceable to daimyo commitment in the 1880s, and heavily dependent on han sources, finally appeared from 1938. A Ministry of Finance series, *Nihon zaisei keizai shiryō* (1921–1925), reveals how little material it had inherited in 1871.

¹ I am indebted to Professors Satō Osamu, Katsuta Shunsuke and Kuwajima Hideki for help on many occasions; to Professor Hoya Tōru of the Shiryō Hensanjo for photocopies of much of the two picture scrolls; over many years to Dr. Honma Sadao of the Nagasaki Kenritsu Toshokan; and to Professor Kasaya Kazuhiko of Nichibunken for advice. Two anonymous referees made important suggestions, and I was the beneficiary of many patient editorial criticisms from John Breen. I am indebted also to the late Kato Eileen in Tokyo, and to Tsukahara Sueko in Nagasaki for information and books, and for enquiries made on my behalf in archives in Kyushu.

Keywords: Archives (shogunal and han), *rōjū*, *kanjō bugyō*, *gaikoku bugyō*, Phaeton Incident, *Tsūkō ichiran*, *Tsūshin zenran*, Hayashi Akira, *tsūji*, Katsu Kaishū, Tokugawa Nariaki, Shimazu (Kagoshima), Nagasaki, Osaka, Shōheizaka Gakumonjo, Momijiyama Bunko, Ōkurashō, Gaimushō, *ishin*

1. The Archival Evidence of Tokugawa Japan

Despite gaps in surviving records, substantial administrative archives have been a feature of the state in Japan as in the West. Overall, archives in Western states have been more substantial, better defined and above all more continuous, and as an unbroken corpus go back farther in history. Kikuchi Mitsuoki 菊池光興, president of the Kokuritsu Kōbunshokan 国立公文書館, points out:

Japan has a history of placing relatively little importance on the concept of collecting documents and saving them for future generations . . . At first sight, the public archives in Japan are very much smaller than in the West. Despite the fact that Japan is such a unique nation, perhaps specifically because it is such a unique nation, recorded documents have been far from continuous.²

There are two issues. First, the restricted scale or extent of Japanese archives; secondly, discontinuity: records of high policy and decision making are a disjointed run of notebooks or *shabon* 写本, survivors from a high rate of loss over time. However, there is a further issue. These observations refer to shogunal or national archives. The han records, where they survive, are at times in long runs, though often they were discarded once detail was entered into diaries or registers. Nevertheless, the correspondence retained by a number of politically active han has proved key to the study of the story of the bakumatsu shogunate. Some of it, moreover, was the correspondence which daimyo serving as *rōjū* 老中 took with them when they returned to their home han.

Japanese administration during the Edo period was shared between the shogun and the daimyo. At the outset, no corpus of directly retained clerks for higher administrative tasks existed. Delicate issues of foreign relations were handled by Zen monks, first Saishō Shōtai 西笑承兌 and then Ishin Sūden 以心崇伝.³ These monks centered on Tenryūji 天龍寺 in Kyoto soon lost their central administrative role. Thereafter, they were retained by the shogunate solely as specialists in the Chinese language to oversee the Tsushima 津島 links with Korea. After the early prominence of Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583–1657) as adviser and drafter of documents, the Hayashi family likewise had a modest and merely scholarly role until the novel foreign crisis in the 1790s won them a new role. At that stage, Hayashi Jussai 林述齋 (1768–1841) was regularly consulted on policy issues, and Hayashi Akira 林樵 (1801–1859), directed the compilation in the late 1840s and 1850s of a huge collection of diplomatic precedents. As hereditary family head, he was titular leader of the team which negotiated with Commodore Perry in 1854.

The presence of dedicated permanent staff ensured that both within the shogunate and

² Enomoto 2004, p. 30

³ Toby 1991, p. 235. On the role of the Zen monks, see Nakao 1997 and Tanaka 1996.

in the han the routine functions of accounting, and of the legalities of relations between shogun and daimyo, acquired an archival existence. In contrast, great affairs of state had no permanent administrators. As a result, intimate administrative documents (correspondence between *rōjū* and daimyo, and of *rōjū* and *bugyō* 奉行 with immediate subordinates) were de facto personal working papers. Where they survived, they did so in the hands of descendants, and in the case of *rōjū* office holders, in the archives of former daimyo after 1868. Copies acquired a life of their own. W. G. Aston's account in 1873 of events in Ezo in 1806–1807 was based on access to “a collection... comprising the private correspondence of officials on duty in Hakodate, together with proclamations and other official documents.”⁴ Even more striking was the “little manuscript book” which later he purchased at a book stall in Tokyo, on which he based an account of the Phaeton Incident. While itself a copy of the official diary, it was actually the personal copy of the diary's compiler, Tokuzaeemon 徳左衛門, incorporating reflections of his own.⁵ Such *shahon* passed in random fashion through the hands of dealers in old papers, and have been acquired even by official purchase from booksellers. As recently as 1980, six documents with correspondence of the 1650s between the shogunate and a merchant on reopening trade with south east Asia were found in a junk shop.⁶

The concept of original is little used in Japan. The terms *teihon* 定本 (original or authentic text), *genkō* 原稿 (manuscript), *genpon* 原本 (original text), *gensho* 原書 (original document) are overlapping and ambiguous, referring to the quality or authenticity of the text rather than to status as a holograph. The term *shahon* (manuscript in the sense of copy-book) by definition signifies a copy. Likewise the phrase *tome* 留 or *tomesho* 留書, frequently used for a file, implies a copy (usually of a number of items entered into a single *shahon*). The English word *original* in its katakana version is the safest word to denote originating documents. Copies, by definition lacking signatures and seals and, frequently, names for the signatories or an indication of seals, are generally bereft of a date of copying and of a name for the copyist. Sometimes traced on paper resting on an earlier text, *tōsha* 謄写, they look earlier than they actually are.

Shahon, copied at the time, or recopied in subsequent generations, survived in a random sequence of passing through multiple hands. For example, a text by Hayashi Jussai, acquired by the Shiryō Hensanjo 史料編纂所 in 1910, is recorded, according to a very cursive note at the back of the *shahon*, as being first in *Ōkōchi bunsho* 大河内文書, before passing into other hands in a trail of later names.⁷ An acquisition in recent times by the Shiryō Hensanjo, *Roshiajin toriatsukai tedome* 露西亜人取扱手留 (a major source for Matsudaira Sadanobu 松平定信 and events in 1792), is said to be from the library of the Kuwana Matsudaira 桑名松平.⁸ However, according to the statement on the last page of the third of three copybooks, it was made in 1915 from a book said to have been in the possession in 1821 of Count Matsura Atsushi 松浦厚. The location of the work in 1821 and the description of a rank (non-existent in Tokugawa times) might imply that the 1915 copy was made from a more recent copy, which retained the date 1821, rather than from a copy actually made in 1821.

4 Aston 1874, p. 20.

5 Aston 1879, pp. 107–120.

6 Toby 1991, p. 10.

7 Shiryō Hensanjo (iii). 4171 08.

8 Shiryō Hensanjo (i). 2051.9/77. It contains a copy of Sadanobu's *Ezochi onsonae ikken* 蝦夷地御備一件, said by Fujita to be of first rate importance (Fujita 2005, pp. 188, 309. See also p. 167, and note 51).

A *shahon* entitled *On kakitsuke narabi ni hyōgi tome* 御書付並評議留 is a fascinating illustration of the ambiguous status of individual documents. It is a *shahon* into which were transcribed documents from 1791 to 1824, but it gains its real value from eight letters written in 1825 by officials on the debate over maintaining the *uchiharai* policy (of firing on foreign vessels approaching the coast). Held by three successive owners (the third seal that of the Meiji historian Naitō Chisō 内藤耻叟), it came into the possession of Tenri Central Library in 1931. Fujita speculates that the copybook may actually be that of the four *bugyō*, with whose letters it terminates.⁹ This he puts forward as “a high possibility,” but there is no way of telling. The opening line *Bunsei hachi toridoshi gogatsu itsuka shakuyō* 文政八酉年五月五日借用, untypically explicit for this period, states it is a copy of a borrowed document, hence made self-consciously and perhaps privately.

Fujita’s scholarly quest to enlarge the documentary basis for the policy and thought of Matsudaira Sadanobu (1759–1829) on the exclusion of contact with foreigners well illustrates the modest dimensions of the archival base. The relevant texts are all copies, transcribed into documents of widely different archival origin in four scattered locations: Tokyo, Kyoto and two libraries in Hokkaido.

(i) *Ezōchi ikken ikensho sōan* 蝦夷地一件意見書草案, Kitami Shiritsu Chūō Toshokan 北見市立中央図書館, acquired in 1976 from a second hand bookseller.¹⁰

(ii) *Roshiajin toriatsukai tedome* 露西亜人取扱手留, containing the text of *Ezochi onsonae ikken* 蝦夷地御備一件, now in the Shiryō Hensanjo, a copy from 1915 of an earlier *shahon* of 1821 (referred to above).¹¹

(iii) *San bugyō hyōgisho* 三奉行評議書, a *shahon* transcribing earlier documents, now in Hokkaidoritsu Toshokan 北海道立図書館, from the papers of the Fukuyama daimyo, Abe Seishō 阿部正精, *rōjū* in 1817–1823.¹²

(iv) *Ezo byōgi* 蝦夷廟議, a *shahon* in two volumes in Kyōto Daigaku Bungakubu 京都大学文学部, transcribing a *metsuke kakidome* 目付書留, containing reports by a *metsuke* and a *gakumonsho* official, sent to Matsumae on the arrival in Ezo in 1792 of Laxman. It also contains an account of the rebuttal by Sadanobu, *rōjū* leader at the time.¹³

The surviving corpus, such as it was at the end of the 1850s, was diminished by fires in 1859 and 1863 in the Momijiyama Bunko 紅葉山文庫 (the central shogunal repository), and much later in 1923 in the earthquake which destroyed the library of University of Tokyo, as well as the archives of several government ministries.¹⁴ Fortunately, the Shiryō Hensanjo, accommodated today in the University of Tokyo, was then situated at another site, and thus escaped fire or destruction. The papers of the Nagasaki Bugyōsho 奉行所, from the scale

9 Fujita 2005, pp. 240–41.

10 Fujita 2005, pp. 309–310.

11 Shiryō Hensanjo (i). 2051.9/77.

12 Fujita 2005, p. 25, note 5, and p. 51.

13 Fujita 2005, pp. 32, 188.

14 A further fire with destruction of records occurred in the imperial palace in 1875.

of the survivals, illustrate better than any other shogunal corpus the character of Japanese records. They are, to start with, remarkable because of the office's good fortune in escaping fire after 1663.¹⁵ This helps explain why the Nagasaki *hankachō* 犯科帳 (criminal department records), the greatest surviving run of judicial documents in Japan, is uninterrupted from 1666 to 1868.¹⁶

In Osaka, massive losses were partly offset by wholesale circulation of copied versions, the source in later times for the two great modern compilations of Osaka material, the *Ōsakashi shi* 大阪市史 in 1911–1914,¹⁷ and the *Ōsaka shōgyō shi shiryō* 大阪商業史資料, compiled by the Osaka Chamber of Commerce and Industry 大阪商工会議所 (OCCI) at the outset of the twentieth century (but published in 1963–1966).¹⁸ The copies on which these two collections drew are unaccounted for: the documents once copied were returned to their owners, and are not identified in the final published compendia.¹⁹

The abandonment in 1868 of the Nagasaki records and later protracted recovery of many of the papers of the huge office with 1,000 personnel underlines dramatically the uncertain fate records faced in 1868. The relative completeness of several categories of surviving records for the two decades preceding 1868 suggests that they may have been retained, by design or accident, in 1868. Other records, however, had a checkered career. Most famously the *hankachō*, handed over to the police in 1871, were later disposed of to a dealer in old papers.²⁰ They were recovered only in late Taishō years, after an alert from a collector of Tokugawa documents, and the intervention of the city librarian and the prefectural governor.²¹

Many records passed into private hands including those of booksellers before final rescue by serious collectors.²² A process of recovery began in the combination of two men with scholarly interests, Kanai Toshiyuki 金井俊行 (1850–1897), from 1886 head of a Nagasaki city ward, and Yakushiji Kumatarō 薬師寺熊太郎 (1863–1929).²³ The records, passing through the ward office (*kuyakusho* 区役所), finally reached the Nagasaki city museum. Kanai was the author of works on Nagasaki institutions, and Yakushiji personally donated 30 *satsu* of major interest. Post 1915, Koga Jūjirō 古賀十二郎 with high school teacher Mutō Chōzō 武藤長蔵, Fukuda Tadaaki 福田忠昭 (a disciple of Koga's), and a certain Watanabe 渡辺, were active collectors. Lodged in 1954 and 1964 respectively in the Nagasaki Kenritsu Toshokan, the Koga and Watanabe deposits accounted for 4,000 items. A donation of 17,000 items and 109 *satsu*, a huge haul of which little is known, had already been made in 1943 by the Fuji 藤 family (the items bearing the stamp *Fuji kizō* 藤寄贈).²⁴ The Koga, Watanabe and Fuji collections amount to 21,000 items, a sizeable

15 See Kizaki 2005, p. 51.

16 *Hankachō* (i). There are also three sets of supporting documents, though these are not complete, in *Hankachō* (ii), (iii) and (iv).

17 *Ōsakashi shi*.

18 OSSS 1963–1966. For the history of this project, OSSS, “Supplement 1966” is indispensable. See also Cullen 2009, pp. 190–91 and note 25.

19 The 400 notebooks of the editor of the *Ōsakashi shi*, Kōda Shigeru, are in the Ōsaka Hensanjo. See Cullen 2009, p. 197.

20 Yasutaka 2010, p. 152.

21 Honma 2000, p. 39.

22 E.g. NRBH (iii) *Igirisusen torai ikken* (4 November 1808) has several stamps, one that of a *shōya* 庄屋.

23 Harada 2007, pp. 269–71.

24 Honma 2000, pp. 40–43. On Kanai, see also Harada 2007, p. 270.

segment of the 48,000 items relating to foreign contacts in the Nagasaki Rekishi Bunka Hakubutsukan 長崎歴史文化博物館.²⁵ Material which found its way to the City Museum and the Kenritsu Toshokan included both items abandoned in the *bugyōsho* in 1868, and *shahon* already in private circulation from an earlier date.²⁶

The story of the Chinese interpreters' diary for the period 1663 to 1715 is instructive. The surviving documents, together with others, were held in early Meiji by the Nakashima Seidō 中島聖堂 and its hereditary presiding family, Mukai 向井. Kanai failed to acquire them, and in 1886–1889, they were simply transcribed and, for whatever reason, copies and originals alike were retained. Only after the conversion of the Seidō into a school in 1934 were two volumes (probably copies, and not originals) of the ten which it held, moved to the City Museum. Belatedly in 1960, the remaining eight volumes were acquired.²⁷ In other words, the entire set of ten volumes of copies made in the late 1880s was already missing in 1934. The present ten volumes are made up of eight undisputed originals, and two volumes once regarded as copies but now considered to be originals.

Documents still come to light from unsuspected locations such as the two great *emaki* recording the Rezanov embassy in 1804, of whose origins nothing is known.²⁸ Copies of two documents in relation to Ranald McDonald, a crew member of an American whaler detained in Nagasaki in 1848, acquired from an unknown source by a collector of old papers, are now deposited in the library of the Literature Department in Kyushu University in Fukuoka.²⁹

The survival of documents in the hands of officials' descendants is widespread. These were either working copies or the results of later transcribing. A small number are originals. Thus, the voluminous record in twelve *satsu* of the Rezanov mission by the officials in the Saga 佐賀 watch house in Nagasaki, in the family of the han elders, were deposited in modern times in the Isahaya 諫早 public library.³⁰ For the visit of the Phaeton, too, an official Saga account came down in family possession.³¹

2. Contemporary Efforts to Keep Track of Paper

Administrative cadres above the level of accounting clerks and paper keepers were few. Given reliance on a relatively fixed tax on land, absence of a system of indirect taxation, and the delicate relations between han and shogunate, the han made no contribution to shogunal expenses, occasional arbitrary demands apart. In other words, as a result of a confined revenue base, the shogunate could afford only rudimentary institutions, other than for collecting the rice levy and for audit, justice and ceremonial. In Europe by contrast, by the end of the sixteenth century, war on a grand scale had already necessitated heavy taxation, which radically changed the elementary administration of the monarch living off his

25 Ōhori 2007, Introduction. Unpaginated.

26 *Nagasaki chōsa hōkoku* 1997. Records from both locations were amalgamated from 2007 in the Nagasaki Rekishi Bunka Hakubutsukan.

27 *Tō tsūji nichiroku*, vol. 1, pp. 1–7; vol. 7, pp. 109–114.

28 *Roshia shisetsu Rezanofu raikō* 露西亜使節レザノフ来航. Shiryō Hensanjo (ii).

29 The two *shahon* lack signatures, precise dates and seals. They are summarized, in comparison with MacDonald's own later *Narrative*, in Schodt 2003, pp. 257–62. See also Schodt 2003, p. 395, note 17.

30 "Maegaki," *Roshia torai roku* 1994 (unpaginated).

31 An official account transmitted through the Kuramachi family of domain elders.

own resources into states in which soaring administrative costs were defrayed from taxation. European countries in the sixteenth century already had rapidly developing bureaucracies, headed by a council of ministers. While ministers constituted a cabinet or council in some form, they were substantially independent in the conduct of the affairs of their own ministry. Ministers did not necessarily hold office for long periods, but a new minister inherited already established procedures, and permanent subordinate officials. Under their guidance, the order determined for archives was faithfully followed. An obligation to maintain papers, both in ministries and within subordinate bodies, was taken seriously and deficiencies in the state of the papers—inadequate storage or space, poor state of preservation—merited reports, and a call for remedial action. When their duties ended, ministers took away with them much correspondence in which they had engaged, but they respected the integrity of the central administrative corpus of papers: the key documents of decision making.

Japan lacked designated archives intended to preserve systematically the paper record of administration. Survival depended on a wide diffusion of copies, which more than matched the attrition suffered over time by individually held paper. The *Ikoku nikki* 異国日記 with transcripts of correspondence is the sole source for the foreign policy of the early shogunate. Copies compiled later rested ultimately on transcripts first made by Ishin Sūden, a Gozan monk and adviser to the early shoguns. Sūden does not appear to have retained his originating copies, or at least they had already disappeared by the end of the century. Arai Hakuseki 新井白石, reviewing foreign policy, had a further copy made from Sūden's text in 1713, a copy that only in the 1790s entered the Momijiyama Bunko.³²

If retained archives were few, copied documents were the essential corpus in both the archival culture and office management of Tokugawa Japan. Contemporary accounts by foreigners of meetings with Japanese officials refer to secretaries sitting in the background taking notes. Officials made sketches also. This is particularly striking in the case of the mission of the Russian ambassador, Nikolai Rezanov (1764–1807), seeking in 1804 to open trade with Japan. Officers, men, ship, gifts for the shogun were sketched, and detail from them was reproduced in further copies, both contemporary and later.³³ These copies provided the source for the depiction of men and dress in the first of the two great *emaki* or scrolls made in Nagasaki in 1804–1805. The pattern of note taking by officials other than the principals themselves existed into the early 1860s when it was terminated in the interests of confidentiality: “It would have been all right if [the note taker] had simply kept notes, but it often happened that he would tell others and spread things secret around, which created problems.”³⁴ This urge to communicate information privately almost certainly refers to written rather than verbal communication, a fact itself accounting for the distinctive lack of identifying features, names or seals, and also for the often whimsical or vague titles of *shahon*. The *metsuke* were rather generously provided with clerks and copyists (some 100–200), but in a very loose framework: “Each would [make] use [of them] as he pleased.”³⁵

Resulting too from the existence of accessible copies, full-blown compendia were put

32 *Ikoku nikki*; and especially Nakamura et al. 1989.

33 See *shahon* in NRBH B. Rezanov Embassy 1804, and KBS C. Rezanov Embassy 1804, and also a very striking one in EDUN (iii) Rezanov Embassy 1804. This latter *shahon*, 407 M49, while mentioned on page 25 of *Nagasaki chōsa hōkoku* 1997, is missing from items listed in the same volume on pp. 187–88.

34 Beerens 2000, p. 388.

35 Beerens 2000, p. 381, also note 44. The higher graded among them seem also to have drafted documents (p. 382).

together by officials either serving or retired: two were compiled by men who had seen service in Nagasaki; a third was by an official in a small Kyushu han. The first is in the writings of 大田南畝 Ōta Nanpo (1749–1823), who before becoming a minor *bugyōsho* official, collected information on the Russian situation, to which he continued to add after retirement. He described his work ironically as that of *shokusan gaishi* 蜀山外史 (amateur or unofficial historian).³⁶ His surviving manuscripts on foreign relations, *Enkai ibun* 沿海異聞 and *Kaibō kiji* 海防記事, have little on 1804 itself, though as one of the officials overseeing the Russian residence ashore at Umegasaki 梅ヶ崎 (a tiny promontory close to Dejima and the Chinese *yashiki*), he made the acquaintance of Rezanov and developed a respect for him.³⁷ The thirteen volumes (originally fifteen) of *Enkai ibun* in the National Diet Library (from a private collection) and the less complete runs in four other archives, all lack volume 6, which must have held the data he had assembled for 1804.³⁸

The *Nagasaki kokon shūran* 長崎古今集覽, a very rich quarry of documents, was compiled on retirement in 1790 by Matsuura Tōkei 松浦東溪 (1752–1820), superintendent of the Chinese *yashiki*.³⁹ Only recently brought to light is a compilation of documents by Yoshida Hidefumi 吉田秀文 (1760–1832), a middle ranking Kurume 久留米 samurai, covering events in the years 1771–1812.⁴⁰ It was a private compilation, and the argument that descendants fearfully kept it secret is fanciful. The family later left Kurume for Nagasaki, which explains how it came into the possession of Fujiyama 藤山 primary school in 1915.

The Nagasaki *fūsetsugaki* 風説書 (documents with details received from the Dutch on external affairs) are few in Nagasaki, visibly copies of copies, and may even not have been among the documents dispersed in 1868. The most important single source is a volume of 244 folios for the years 1660–1763 compiled by the Nakayama 中山 interpreter family.⁴¹ Moreover, the *Tsūkō ichiran* 通航一覽 (hereafter TKIR), completed in 1853 and 1856, despite its status as a collection of diplomatic documents, contains very few. The preliminary wording preceding a run of *fūsetsugaki* from 1686 to 1703 suggests they were drawn from a single *shahon*.⁴² Texts continue for the Hōei 宝永 period (1704–1709). At the outset of the section, there is a warning that they are not complete from the Kyōhō period onwards. There are *fūsetsugaki* for only three Kyōhō years (1717, 1718, 1720). Thereafter, the sole *fūsetsugaki* are for 1781, 1783, 1805.⁴³ Despite this thin resource, and the alleged secrecy of the reports,

36 *Ōta Nanpo zenshū*, vol. 19, p. 685. See also Kutsukake 2007, p. 224. Kutsukake can be supplemented by Hamada 1986, pp. 195–97.

37 *Ōta Nanpo zenshū*, vol. 19; NDL C. *Enkai ibun* mss (i), (ii), (iii). The tone of exchanges between Rezanov and Japanese is well conveyed in his diary. See Ōshima 2000.

38 NDL C. *Enkai ibun* (iii). *Ōta Nanpo zenshū*, vol. 19, pp. 6–7, 9. For full details of the copies, see *Ōta Nanpo zenshū*, vol. 19, p. 666. As further proof of Ōta's interest in the Russians, *kan* 2 of the six *kan Kaibō kiji* 海防記事, copies of which are in University of Tsukuba 筑波大学 and Hakodate City Central Library 函館市中央図書館, depict Russian ships and dress for 1807.

39 *Kokon shūran* a, b. In the introductory remarks of the two volumes, there are contradictions in the dating of Matsuura's career.

40 Egoshi and Urakawa 2009.

41 See SMH (ii) 14-2-93. Though the catalogue gives the date of 1830, the entries are in several hands, suggesting they were made at various earlier dates. Another document, SMH (iii) 14-2-1, in both Japanese and Dutch, seems to represent the process of translating an individual *fūsetsugaki* from Dutch into Japanese. See also NRBH C. *Fūsetsugaki* (i) and (ii). No. (i) is a run of transcripts from 1827 to 1856 made by a single copyist. Matsukata (2007, pp. 300–303) lists details provided by the Dutch for the compilation by *tsūji* of *fūsetsugaki* and the original texts drawn up by the Dutch, of the *betsudan fūsetsugaki* 別段風説書 for 1834–1859.

42 TKIR, vol. 6, *kan* 247, pp. 264–88.

43 TKIR, vol. 6, pp. 286–302 (*kan* 248).

copies are scattered across Japan, and the number of known copies continues to grow.⁴⁴ The *Tōsen fūsetsugaki* 唐船風説書 fared somewhat better, in that several compilations, recopied among themselves, are now in the Kokuritsu Kōbunshokan and the Shimabara 島原 municipal library.⁴⁵

The great compilations of late Tokugawa and early Meiji times were themselves copied well into the Meiji era. There are eleven versions of the vast *Tsūkō ichiran*, surviving in whole or in part.⁴⁶ Another great bureaucratic exercise, two huge series of bakumatsu documents, *Tsūshin zenran* 通信全覽 (1864) and *Zoku Tsūshin zenran* 続通信全覽 (1879), were themselves recopied at later dates in the early twentieth century.⁴⁷ For a lesser institution, the reconstitution for a book published in 1912 of the lost or scattered records of the Osaka rice exchange, Ōsaka Dōjima Beikoku Torihikisho 大阪堂島米穀取引所, was based on papers in private possession, not now accounted for.⁴⁸ A startling detail in the trail of lost records is the story of the Osaka trade return for 1714. The three modern manuscripts rest on a copy made in 1903 for the University of Tokyo library, from the document of either an obscure copyist or collector, which no longer exists; the 1903 copy was destroyed in the 1923 earthquake.⁴⁹

The story of Tokugawa population figures (whether for Osaka, Edo or Japan) is no different. They rest on often scrappy and incomplete documents, themselves copies of uncertain origin, from earlier sources.⁵⁰ In many cases, the printed version alone now survives. A striking case is two censuses, the fullest surviving text of any Tokugawa census records, made by a later copyist, whose identity is obscure; the texts also contain easily identifiable transcribing errors.⁵¹ Population figures for Tokyo are few, largely from Katsu Kaishū's *Suijinroku* 吹塵録 and from Kōda Shigetomo's 幸田成友 work of modern times; for Osaka, none beyond 1862 are cited in Japanese sources, though Mitford, a young British diplomat in 1867, was given the figures for 1866.⁵²

A *hikitsugi mokuroku* 引継目録 (a catalogue prepared by an official for his successor) of 1850 for the Nagasaki *Obeyabu* 御部屋部 is the most complete guide to the contents of the *Obeyabu* of any Tokugawa office. The count is modest—a mere 1407 *satsu* and 659 *fukuro* 袋 (bags).⁵³ The fact that documents before 1780 are scattered through the listed records suggests the *Obeyabu* papers were an eclectic archive, relating primarily to relatively recent business, and perhaps kept together by bureaucratic inertia, once business was dispatched. The 1850 listing did not include the *fūsetsugaki*, *hankachō*, or the *shūmon aratamechō* 宗門改帳 (all of which survive in small or large numbers). While it has been suggested that there were other archival stores within the *bugyōsho*, they appear to have been in the direct possession of officers in the various administrative areas, and were administratively and physically removed from central management of records. That too might explain why the

44 Itazawa 1937; Iwao 1979. See especially “The leakage and transcription of *Oranda fūsetsugaki* and Public opinion,” in Iwao 1979, vol. 1, pp. 21–24.

45 Ishii 1998, pp. 6–7.

46 Kizaki 2005, pp. 173–76.

47 Tanaka 1998, pp. 145–71.

48 Cullen 2009, p. 206.

49 Cullen 2009, pp. 197, 208.

50 Cullen 2006, pp. 159–60, 162–63; Hayami 2008.

51 Sekiyama 1957. See also Cullen 2006, p. 161.

52 BPP, vol. 4, p. 273. See also Cullen 2010, p. 209.

53 *Nagasaki chōsa hōkoku* 1997, p. 14.

hankachō, by transfer to the police perhaps simply by decision of judicial officers in default of general action, escaped the chaos which affected most of the records in 1868. The absence of *fūsetsugaki* arises from the fact that the records were held by the Dutch interpreters. *Fūsetsugaki* in any number in a single location (together with documents in the original Dutch or in translation) survive only in two family collections. One is the huge Motoki collection in two separate locations.⁵⁴ The other is the Nakayama collection, now in *Shiboruto Kinenkan* シーボルト記念館 (SMH).⁵⁵ The Dutch and Chinese interpreters maintained their own series of annual *nikki*. *Nikki* survive for only two years for the Dutch, in contrast to the more substantial survival of Chinese.⁵⁶

Much less is known of papers in offices in Edo itself. A surviving summary count for 1723 of records in the *kanjōsho* 勘定書, the central accounting office, which had its store at Takebashi 竹橋, was 94,200 *satsu*.⁵⁷ But scarcely anything is known of the archives of the Hyōjōsho 評定所, with its legal and judicial functions and its own store at Ōtemon 大手門. The picture is blank also for the two offices of the *machi bugyō* 町奉行 with responsibility for civic administration, and the *jisha bugyō* 寺社奉行, in charge of the huge temple and shrine domains in Edo and beyond. Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666–1728), neo-Confucian scholar and critic of public issues in the 1720s, with the Hyōjōsho no doubt in mind, was highly critical of verbal precedents and failure to keep records:

No office should fail to keep records of business. At present, it is the general practice to deal with business on the basis of precedents committed to memory. It is entirely due to the lack of records of business that the officials are vague and ignorant of the duties of their offices.⁵⁸

In Meiji, a man who had served both as *metsuke* and *machi bugyō* in bakumatsu times recalled that rules had earlier been less detailed than they later became.⁵⁹

It seems in general true that the higher the matter, the more informal or casual the handling of the paperwork.⁶⁰ Two repositories, however, had some role for papers from the central administration: the Momijiyama Library within Edo Castle and the Hayashi

54 At some stage the papers were separated, and till recently the hope lingered that more might turn up. However, the fact that surviving documents in Dutch are almost all confined to the last two decades of the eighteenth century suggests the loss or separation began early. The papers now in Nagasaki were rescued in 1912 by a now unknown party following the intervention of a student or an apprentice of Motoki Shōzō 本木昌造. They then passed to an alumni group, were acquired by the city, and ultimately by the city museum (See a brief note in the printed catalogue of the former City Museum (“Shuroku bunsho shiryō narabi ni kakushu bunko (bunsho) no shōkai” 取録文書史料並びに各種文庫[文書]の紹介). The Kobe papers contain sixty seven catalogue entries of Japanese texts (from 1751 to 1856), and 131 entries of Dutch texts from the 1780s and 1790s (see *Kōbe mokuroku* 1997). Only eight of the seventeen sections in the Nagasaki papers are listed in *Nagasaki chōsa hōkoku* 1997, pp. 38–40, 245–62. They were at some stage crudely stitched together by someone who did not comprehend their content. Some further Motoki items entered the City Museum in Nagasaki (nos. 840-1, 840-2, 840-5, now in NRBH) through other channels.

55 SMH (i). The papers were presented to the Siebold Memorial Hall by a family descendant living in Kyoto in 1988 (*Nagasaki chōsa hōkoku* 1997, p. 27). They contain about 1000 items and are particularly significant since they relate to the Siebold Incident.

56 The *nikki* for one year has been published as *Ansei ninen* 2001.

57 Fukui 1980, p. 139. Observations made by Ōta Nanpo in 1800 on the archives are noted on the same page.

58 McEwan 1962, pp. 94–95.

59 Beerens 2002, p. 175.

60 Cullen 2003, p. 58.

Library Shōheikō 昌平校—located from 1690 at the Confucian temple in Yushima 湯島— from 1797 known as the Shōheizaka Gakumonjo 昌平坂学門所. Both the Momijiyama Archive and the Hayashi Library existed from the time of Tokugawa Ieyasu. The former became more directly identified with the shogunate, while the latter retained the character of an independent service provider.⁶¹ Momijiyama acted as a repository for records of the *goyōbeyā* 御用部屋 though as far as one can judge not as a general administrative archive. It was primarily a library of books in Japanese and Chinese, and its holdings were limited. Of 100,000 *satsu* in a count for the early Meiji period, 73,000 were texts in classical Chinese, only 26,000 in Japanese. Of the latter, moreover, half were in history.⁶² In addition, according to Fukui, it tended to avoid deposits other than Japanese woodblock books, and held only a small number of valuable items.⁶³ However, it had held early Tokugawa records, sensitive documents relating to Korea and to the Ryukyus, and the texts of treaties (though apparently not the Tokugawa *nikki*). Thus, to take two examples, the *Ikoku nikki*, preserved in the Hakuseki Shozōsho 白石所蔵所 entered it in the Kansei period; in 1858, the TKIR, soon after its completion, was lodged there. Most of the documents it held are now unaccounted for.⁶⁴ Its confined archival role is well illustrated in the fact that *rōjū* working papers did not enter it. The *shahon* made for or by *bugyō* and *metsuke*, and constituting the mass of paper in the higher reaches of shogunal administration, entered it haphazardly if at all. The papers of Kondō Jūzō 近藤重蔵 (1771–1829), for instance, highly sensitive because of the still unsettled frontier with Russia, were held not at one point but at several centers.⁶⁵

Remarkably obscure in the eighteenth century, the profile of the Hayashi family grew in the early nineteenth century. Its change of fortune was due to the reforms in the 1790s, which turned it into an official academy. As a result of the urgent need to understand novel foreign problems from the 1790s onwards, its scholarly role expanded and its library grew.⁶⁶ Its head for the early nineteenth century, Hayashi Jussai, enjoyed enormous prestige, and ranked on a par with *kanjō bugyō* for official consultation. By 1825, in the library there were more than 1300 *bu* and 7000 *kan*.⁶⁷ Its catalogues also make it possible to estimate the areas of new concern. Among forty three *bu* on more current matters, there were six *bu* on Russian relations, six on foreign relations from early to recent times, ten on Chinese vessels, and significantly in a further seven *bu* dealing with the arrival of foreign ships, the Phaeton Incident held the central place.⁶⁸

Books in the Momijiyama Bunko provided the nucleus of the Imperial Library and of the later Ueno Library (subsequently Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan 国立国会図書館). While in the Restoration foreign books are said to have been transferred to Momijiyama from the Bansho Shirabesho 蕃書調所 (founded in 1856 as successor to the Bansho Wage Goyō

61 The history of archival institutions is summarized in *Naikaku mokuroku* (iii), and in a chart in *Naikaku mokuroku* (ii), p. 7.

62 *Naikaku mokuroku* (iii), p. 4.

63 Fukui 1980, p. 137.

64 Fukui 1980, p. 137.

65 See *Kondō Jūzō kankei bunken kaidai* 近藤重蔵関係文献解題 in Fukui 1980, pp. 311–36. The published texts of his papers are in *Kondō Jūzō* (i), (ii).

66 Kizaki 2005, p. 106; Fukui 1980, p. 22. It had suffered from fires in 1657 and in 1772. *Naikaku mokuroku* (iii), p. 5.

67 Kizaki 2005, p. 107. For a breakdown of records, see Kizaki 2005, pp. 115–16.

68 Kizaki 2005, p. 122.

Kakari 蛮書和解御用掛 of 1811), the story is more complicated.⁶⁹ Some apparently passed into Tokugawa hands, and were taken to Shizuoka, where Yoshinobu, the last shogun, lived in retirement. That explains how at a later date they finally came to rest in the Shizuoka Kenritsu Toshokan 静岡県立図書館.⁷⁰

3. The Records of the Han

Han archives covered first and foremost the records of formal correspondence with the shogunate and other daimyo and a vast array of accounting records. The latter (some relating to samurai; others to tax details) to a degree furnished information on the size and composition of population. The archives of 17 han have been examined in detail by Kasaya Kazuhiko 笠谷和比古.⁷¹ Accounting categories apart, the formal correspondence with shogun and *rōjū*, in essence the records defining the legal relationship between individual han and the shogunate, was rich and well preserved. The formal correspondence had in effect the status of legal documents, some of it the counterpart to the now lost shogunal records, defining the very existence of the han in legal terms. Some categories were retained in the original, others discarded after detail was entered in *nikki* (diaries) or *nisshi* 日誌 (registers). The *shūmon aratamechō* were regularly discarded after a short interval (since they were voluminous), but summary details were entered into *nisshi*.⁷² Where actual copies survived, it was mostly in the hands of descendants of village headmen. The story of population returns for the han for the six year shogunal censuses is similar: the returns were not retained, but summary figures were, as in Okayama, entered in han registers.⁷³

The sheer number of han ensured that if misfortune befell the records of some, others enjoyed a kinder fate. Many years ago, John Whitney Hall conducted a seminal study of the archival records of the Ikeda 池田 family (daimyo of Okayama han), which had been presented to Okayama University in 1949.⁷⁴ More recently Kasaya Kazuhiko has shown that a large number of han retained a substantial corpus of records. Vicissitudes experienced in their history mean that they have been held in several locations, whether daimyo family descendants, city or prefectural archives, and on occasion Tokyo archives such as the Monbushō itself. Han archives are often impressive in scale. Okayama has 60,000 *satsu*, the small han of Matsushiro 松代 no less than 30,000. Equally impressive is the fact that individual series have long uninterrupted runs: Okayama from 1648, Hirosaki 弘前 from 1661, Morioka 盛岡 from 1664, Matsushiro from 1667 and 1686, and Fukui from 1686.⁷⁵

As noted by Hall for the Okayama records, “In nearly every case the mobile papers were copied in whole or in part in record books of one or another of the han officials. These record books, variously called *chō*, *tome* and *nikki*, are without question the most important of the operational records for the historian.”⁷⁶ Retention in the form of data entry into registers was

69 *Naikaku mokuroku* (iii), p. 4. On sources relating to Takahashi Kageyasu 高橋景保, *Bansho wage goyō* and the *Tenmonkata* 天文方, see Fukui 1983.

70 Shizuoka Kenritsu Chūō Toshokan 1970, 1996.

71 Kasaya 1998, pp. 40–145. Kasaya provides a full analysis of other formal documents.

72 Hayami 2001, pp. 79–80.

73 Hall 1968, p. 163.

74 Hall 1968.

75 Kasaya 1998, pp. 23–38.

76 Hall 1968, p. 156.

true even at the level of the papers of the office of daimyo and of the han Council. These registers could be voluminous. Thus, the *otemoto nikki* 御手許日記 contains a detailed record of the daimyo's private and public activities with 780 volumes covering the years 1663–1875.⁷⁷ For the Council “only a fraction of this paper work has been retained in its raw form.”⁷⁸ In addition, a summary record of han activities at large was made for each year, with 200 volumes covering the period from 1673 to 1894, “compilation having gone on even after the abolition of the han.”⁷⁹ There was, according to Hall, for each daimyo a collection of correspondence. He does not expand on this, though Kasaya gives a brief listing of the categories.⁸⁰

Han records have two striking characteristics: a widespread non-retention of originals and an ongoing process of copying detail from documents not retained into *nikki* and *nisshi*. Hall's study of Okayama is the story of han at large. Among the han, Tsushima 津島 holds a special position partly because it was charged by the shogunate with the supervision of relations with Korea; partly because survivals are substantial, originating in three administrative centers, Fuzhou 福州, Pusan and Edo, and in six actual locations.⁸¹ Some were held until recent times in the store house of the Sō 宗 family temple; others are in Korea. While the records illustrate the fragmentation and losses that are commonplace, they also provide evidence not available elsewhere. Thus, a letter from a shogunal minister in Edo to the Tsushima daimyo clarifying foreign policy exists only in uncatalogued papers in Seoul.⁸²

Han records in the main do not have extensive informal or political correspondence. However, han, whose daimyo had served as *rōjū*, took their papers with them at the end of their period of service. In addition, the politically conscious daimyo of Mito (a *sanke* house) and Satsuma (a *tozama* daimyo connected by marriage to Ienari 家齊, shogun from 1787 to 1837), compensated for their exclusion from office under Tokugawa convention by assertive policies: the result was a high degree of order in their policy papers and correspondence. In the dearth in Edo of records of high policy, Hagiwara Yutaka 萩原裕, archivist of the Gaimushō in the 1880s, drew on han records to create a more complete record of foreign affairs: the family papers of six daimyo families who had provided *rōjū* (including the heirs of Mizuno Tadakuni 水野忠邦, Abe Masahiro, Hotta Masayoshi 堀田正睦 and Ii Naosuke 井伊直弼), the archives of the Owari 尾張 Tokugawa house, the papers of the Shimazu family of Satsuma, and of twenty-five other daimyo houses. This work yielded correspondence with *metsuke*, *kanjō bugyō*, *gaikoku bugyō* and also with the *bugyō* for Hakodate, Uruga, Shimoda, Nagasaki.⁸³ Kasaya's survey has noted some evidence of political correspondence in han records, but survivals appear to constitute isolated sources rather than long runs. For Fukui han, he noted *Mito ke kankei shorui* 水戸家関係書類; for Hikone, *Bakumatsu kaibō kankei ikken shiryō* 幕末海防関係一件史料 and *fūbungaki* 風聞書; for Okayama, *Bakumatsu no shoka raikan* 幕末の諸家来翰; and for Uwajima, a large amount of incoming correspondence in the 1850s (more than 1000 items from Tokugawa Nariaki and Shimazu Nariakira, daimyo of Mito and Satsuma respectively).⁸⁴

77 Hall 1968, p. 158.

78 Hall 1968, p. 159.

79 Hall 1968, p. 166.

80 Hall 1968, p. 157; Kasaya 1998, p. 29.

81 Toby 1991, pp. 261–62.

82 Toby 1991, p. xxxi.

83 Tanaka 1998, pp. 384–86.

84 Kasaya 1998, pp. 27–29, 32.

The range of surviving informal correspondence in han records appears to have varied from little or none to substantial amounts. In the very extensive archives of the Sanada family of Matsushiro, the amount is small. However, more than 500 *satsu* of *nikki* recording correspondence with the Edo *karō*, from 1684 to 1871, illustrate an active connection.⁸⁵ There are also papers relating to the exercise of the office of *rōjū* by Sanada Yukitsura 真田幸貫 (1791–1852), the one daimyo of the han to serve in that role.⁸⁶ Otherwise, the only trace of political interest lies in eleven tracts on Ezo affairs and five for the years 1854–1858.⁸⁷

Han archives, in contrast to shogunal archives, include holograph correspondence. There is a dilemma in explaining how, amid good record keeping, “political” correspondence is often fragmented or confined to bakumatsu records. Given the practice of daimyo to store records in fireproof *kura*, the storage of these records can hardly have differed from han records at large. The contrast with cases such as Mito and Satsuma suggests that in less politically aware han, this category of record may have been isolated from the formal administrative records, and a pattern of benign neglect over time, or some degree of privacy, may have put their survival at risk. Mito is an outstanding case of large scale survival of records, many of them papers in Nariaki’s own hand. The Mito archives, held in a library run by family descendants, have a rich array of documents. As drawn on for the *Dai Nihon ishin shiryō* 大日本維新史料 (hereafter DNIS), they include the Mito daimyo proposal in 1854 for building large vessels and in 1858 papers on defence.⁸⁸ The latter source includes a letter of Nariaki to Hotta in 1858, the year of his resignation, which in turn was copied into two Hotta records.⁸⁹

Easy access by archivists at a relatively early date to the other great collection, the Shimazu records, is impressive, resulting from the interest of Shimazu Hisamitsu 島津久光 (1817–1887), regent to the last Satsuma daimyo, in vindicating Satsuma’s past political stance.⁹⁰ This culminated in the year after his death in the founding of the *Shidankai* 史談会 intended to ensure a fair account of han policy of bakumatsu times.⁹¹ As later catalogued when the records came into the possession of the Shiryō Hensanjo, they consist of 11,700 items in general papers, and 6,500 *shahon*. From 1720 to 1868, there are 1,732 letters of one or more sheets, not texts transferred into *shahon*.⁹² Shimazu records in the DNIS, may be summarized under three headings, correspondence of named daimyo, papers dealing with the Ryukyus (for Satsuma a very sensitive issue); and documents from successive *karō* of the Edo *yashiki* of the han under the style of *Kagoshima han Edozume karō jō* 鹿児島藩江戸詰家老状.

Mito and Satsuma apart, other collections held by immediate heirs of daimyo or their descendants in Meiji were important for the story of Japanese politics as recorded in DNIS. An example is the archives of the post 1868 head of the Kuroda family of Fukuoka, Kuroda

85 Kasaya 1998, p. 26.

86 Kasaya 1998, p. 26. It was highly unusual for a *tozama* daimyo to serve as *rōjū*.

87 *Sanada ke monjo mokuroku* 1979, pp. 373–79. It contains more than 30,000 items and 1,800 *satsu* of *nikki* from the 1730s onwards.

88 DNIS, 2nd series 2, vol. 4, pp. 298–300, and DNIS, 3rd series, vol. 6, pp. 479–81. Nariaki was a very active correspondent in 1858.

89 The titles of the two Hotta *shahon* are *Hotta Masatomo kaki* 堀田正論家記 and *Hotta Masayoshi gaikoku kakari chū shorui* 堀田正睦外国掛中書類.

90 Imaizumi 2011, pp. 148–49.

91 Imaizumi 2011, p. 149.

92 *Shimazu ke monjo mokuroku* (i), (ii).

Nagashige 黒田長成. They were the source of *Edo goyōjō* 江戸御用状 from which the *Fukuoka han zaifu karō shokan* 福岡藩在府家老書翰 in 1858 was reproduced.⁹³ Fukui han was one of the great dissident han of bakumatsu times. Its records include correspondence with Mito.⁹⁴ The *Gōdō haku nyūsō biki* 合同舶入相秘記 contains *Fukui Matsudaira Yoshinaga shuki* 福井松平慶永手記 with correspondence on daimyo views in 1854 on foreign vessels.⁹⁵

4. Foreign Policy as Seen in the Records

Except for bakumatsu times, when han records are often the source, policy in earlier times is elusive. There is a contrast for example between the comparatively well documented Phaeton Incident of 1808, and the thin record from all sources for other events. The interpretation of thought or policy poses problems, given the small amount of documentation of decision making individually and even more collectively. While the immediate purposes of foreign exclusion are clearly set out in the 1630s, doubt has been cast on its intended permanence. It has been suggested that the English monarch's marriage to a Portuguese princess accounted for the rejection of an English demarche in 1673. Access would have been open in later decades had the English sought it. On this telling, radical exclusion for all save the existing Dutch and Chinese dates only from the 1790s.⁹⁶

Analysis of the source basis may be more helpful in our moving to conclusions than somewhat speculative deductions based on slight evidence. The Japanese response on the occasion of the visit of the English vessel the *Return* in 1673 seemed to confirm the exclusion policy, and frequent later copying of the statement is consonant with an unchanged policy in the following century. In another instance, the sweeping *uchiharai* decree of 1825 may have been less a break in policy than a response to a new situation, arising from the helplessness revealed by the Phaeton visit to Nagasaki in 1808, and fear in the early 1820s of a recurrence. It does not appear to relate to the older problem of the Russian presence in the Ezo islands.

In regard to early seventeenth century foreign trade, TKIR has little information, Dutch and Portuguese trades apart. It noted that an earlier account, which the TKIR cited (*Koshūki* 古集記, *kan* 253, p. 354) lacked a list of vessels under license. Observing the want of records, it cites a document from 1614 with details of licences to Dutch vessels. The basic source remained the frequently copied *Ikoku nikki*. Relations with Spain or England for these years are obscure: the best documentation for the early English trade lies in letters by Englishmen who were servants of the English East India Company. The visit of the *Return* in 1673 is poorly documented in the TKIR, a single *kan* drawing on eight *shabon* and a Tokugawa *nikki*.⁹⁷ Two modern studies provide a wider appraisal.⁹⁸ Both were aware of

93 DNIS, 3rd series, vol. 7, pp. 598, 715, 785, 798.2.

94 *Mito ke kankei shorui* 水戸家関係書類. See Kasaya 1998, p. 27.

95 Some of the individual letters to and from Matsudaira Yoshinaga 松平慶永 in DNIS were gathered from other sources, illustrating how han records from several locations helped complete the surviving source base. See DNIS, 2nd series, vol. 4, pp. 38–82 and 498–99, 589–90.

96 Toby 1991, pp. 10–14, note; pp. 241–42; Fujita 2005, pp. 7–10. This interpretation originated in a rather forced argument by Iwao Seiichi in 1963. See Cullen 2003, p. 49.

97 TKIR, vol. 6 (*kan* no. 253).

98 Murakami 1899, vol. 2; Machin 1978. The Murakami volume also has the text of Delboe's diary of the visit of the *Return*.

the account in the *Kokon shūran* compiled by Matsuura, and reproduced its text. Machin's account provided three other texts on the visit, and details of two lesser recordings. There is, moreover, a little known document in the Nagasaki University Economics department library on the departure of the *Return*.⁹⁹ Meagre though the surviving sources are, reporting over the next century has significance beyond its purely archival dimension. As the account not only documented the English request for trade but also made clear in convoluted fashion that the question would not be reopened on the death of the Portuguese consort of Charles II, it amounted in fact to a confirmation of a *sakoku* or "closed country" policy.¹⁰⁰

For the visit of the English warship the *Phaeton* to Nagasaki in 1808, the Hayashi devoted five *kan* to the topic, citing nine sources.¹⁰¹ Moreover, they referred to a number of family records and letters from Nagasaki, none of which proved to add anything new.¹⁰² Untypically, Nagasaki is relatively rich in surviving documents of the episode. These include two long documents relating to the visit of the reforming *bugyō* dispatched to Nagasaki immediately after the debacle, the second one declared by Katagiri to be of fundamental importance.¹⁰³ There is also a document in the Nagasaki University Economics Department Library, descriptive of the events, starting with a letter of Henrik Doeff. This document, prepared for the *bugyō*, also provides a rare case of a name on the title page, Kure Tokutarō 吳徳太郎, presumably a copyist acting for the new *bugyō*.¹⁰⁴ In 1972, in a list of seven papers Katagiri had three bearing directly on the episode (including one from Kyushu Daigaku).¹⁰⁵ He also edited the fullest of these, primarily on the new defense arrangements for Nagasaki bay.¹⁰⁶ In recent times, eleven documents relating to the *Phaeton* (apparently originating with Nagasaki *bugyōsho* officials, interpreters, Kurume officials and private individuals in Nagasaki, or in communication with the Saga authorities) have come to light in a compendium by a Kurume official: the last two, *Ara'ara oboegaki* 粗々覚書 and *Nagasaki yadai zokuzokuhō* 長崎屋代続々報, are relatively long and detailed.¹⁰⁷

A document used briefly in the TKIR is the *Nagasaki ontsukai shoyōbeya nikki* 長崎御使所用部屋日記 from the Nagasaki *goyōbeya*, a text which would appear to correspond to a "copy of the official diary kept in the Government House at Nagasaki," purchased in the 1870s by Aston in Tokyo. The compiler's name is Tokuemmon according to Aston, or in Japanese sources 徳左衛門 *Tokuzaemon*.¹⁰⁸ It covers the three days of the *Phaeton*'s visit, highlighting indecision and ineffectiveness. It thus provides a direct account of the debacle, which led to the urgent dispatch of Magaribuchi Kai no kami to Nagasaki with a brief to

99 EDUN (i). See also above p. 33; *Nagasaki chōsa hōtoku* 1997, p. 187.

100 Cullen 2003, p. 49.

101 TKIR, vol. 6, *kan* nos. 256 to 259, plus *kan* no. 260 dealing with the new *bugyō*, Magaribuchi Kai no kami Kagetsugu 曲淵甲斐守景漸, who arrived in the ninth month.

102 TKIR, vol. 6, p. 409 (*kan* no. 256). See also p. 421 (*kan* no. 257), and pp. 438, 443, 445 (*kan* no. 259). *Ryakusho* 略書, a summary account by Takaki Sakuzaemon, is referred to explicitly in *kan* no. 259 (vol. 6, p. 445).

103 NRBH A. *Phaeton Incident* (i), (ii); Katagiri 1972, p. 11. The integral text of NRBH A. *Phaeton Incident* (ii) appears in Katagiri 1972, pp. 73–182. The introduction (pp. 10–17) should also be consulted. The name of the copyist recurs in one other document dealing with the episode (NRBH A. *Phaeton Incident* [vi]).

104 EDUN (ii).

105 Katagiri 1972, pp. 10–11.

106 Katagiri 1972, pp. 71–182.

107 Egoshi and Urakawa 2009, pp. 210–31.

108 TKIR, vol. 6 (*kan* no. 259), p. 436. There appears to be an error with 右 appearing in place of 左 in the surname.

reorder the defenses. This task, recorded largely by *daikan* 代官 Takagi Sakuzaemon 高木作左衛門 resulted in the new arrangements which were, in Katagiri's words, a radical reform of defense in Nagasaki.¹⁰⁹ In consultation with the Dutch, tighter procedures were introduced to reduce the risk of a vessel arriving under false colors. Direct supervision by the bakufu replaced complacent reliance on han responsibility for the overview of the defense arrangements, so inadequate in 1808. Basic decision-making was now firmly in the hands of the *bugyō* and his *daikan*.

The presence of English whalers on the coasts in the early 1820s raised questions as to the deeper significance of their appearance: the earlier 1808 incident is implied in the wording of the *uchiharai* decree in 1825. If so, debate over the significance of the whalers arises from the problem of distinguishing between whaling visits in general and more suspect sightings. These might imply exploration by foreigners (in these years exclusively English) in preparation for visits by hostile warships. The presence of whalers off Uruga and off Mito, south and north respectively of Edo Bay, underlined the vulnerability to attack of Edo and its vital supply routes. In other words, there was a material problem of real strategic significance in the mid-1820s. A lack of worry about a Russian menace is confirmed in the fact that Edo authorities restored the Matsumae family to their domain in 1822, leaving defense in their hands.

The archival detail on 1808 is conspicuous. By contrast, for the Rezanov incident 1804, there are sixteen miscellaneous *shahon* (in *kan* nos. 275–83). The Hayashi account drew heavily on *Nagasaki shi zokuhon* 長崎志続編, the second part of a detailed and well informed compendium (less likely than the first part to have been compiled on *bugyō* order).¹¹⁰ Reliance on the aforementioned *Kankai ibun* for Russian relations as a source is surprising.¹¹¹ While it has information on 1804, and illustrations drawn from sketches made at the time, it is entirely derivative. Its use is evidence of the poor information in Edo in the 1850s on the Russian visit.

With a total of nineteen *kan* (nos. 297–315), the information for the protracted Golownin Crisis (1811–1813) seems superficially very rich. However, the major single source is *Sōyaku Nihon kiji* 遭厄日本紀事, used extensively in fourteen of the nineteen *kan*.¹¹² In the closing lines in the first *kan* dealing with the incident, Golownin's journal is announced with the bald statement that in conjunction with Japanese sources it would be used in the rest of the account.¹¹³ It was reproduced virtually in its totality. The eighteen remaining sources, all *shahon*, were highly miscellaneous, and only *Ezochi hikki* 蝦夷地筆記 and *Seihokuroku* 靖北録 were cited frequently. The sources at large are thus uninformative on high policy. There is very brief recognition of the visit from Edo of Takahashi Kageyasu 高橋景保 on a fact finding mission, intended to inform decision making in Edo.¹¹⁴ He had been

109 Katagiri 1972, p. 12; NRBH A. Phaeton Incident 1808 (ii).

110 See Tsukuba University site for *Nagasaki shi zokuhon*, <http://www.tulips.tsukuba.ac.jp/limedio/dlam/B1132580/1/mokuji/3709.pdf> (accessed 17 March 2013). There are five versions in KBS A. *Nagasaki shi zokuhon*, (i) to (v); and a complete version also in NDL B. *Nagasaki shi zokuhon*.

111 *Kankai ibun* included maps, sketches of crew members, the two leaders, dress and the warship surrounded by Japanese craft. KBS B. *Kankai ibun* (i) to (v); NDL A. *Kankai ibun* mss (i), (ii), (iii). Much the superior one in artistic quality is KBS B. (i) 185-107. Sugimoto 1986 is the best modern edition. The text was edited by Shimura Hiroyuki 志村弘強, with an introduction and afterword by Sugimoto Tsutomu 杉本つとむ.

112 TKIR, vol. 7 contains *kan* nos. 297–306, and vol. 8, *kan* nos. 307–315.

113 TKIR, vol. 7, *kan* no. 297, p. 396.

114 TKIR, vol. 8, *kan* no. 315, p. 118.

accompanied by Baba Sajūrō 馬場佐十郎 who remained in Ezo (later translating the *Sōyaku Nihon kiji*). A mere two *kan* (nos. 313–14) contain texts in which Baba, or Murakami Teisuke 村上貞助 (so prominent in Golownin's account) feature among the signatories. The resolution of the crisis is not known in documents in Japan. Only in visits in recent times to the archives in Petrograd have researchers from the Shiryō Hensanjo obtained a copy of the formal reply supplied to the Russians, and which terminated the affair.¹¹⁵

How the Hayashi accessed information is not clear. The extent to which they relied on the Momijiyama Bunko, on their own records or on *shahon* accessible in the circle around them, cannot be determined. Hayashi Akira 林樵 and his team consulted the Momijiyama records. They edited a supplement *Jūtei goshoseki rairekisho* 重訂御書籍來歴志 to the catalogue *Jūtei goshoseki mokuroku* 重訂御書籍目錄, compiled between 1814 and 1836.¹¹⁶ However, given the limited range of material in the repository, they must have relied extensively on other sources. Thus while the *Nagasaki shi zokuhen* could well have been in the repository, for events in the 1830s they also consulted in the 1850s, a copy of that work possessed by the Togawa 戸川 family. As there is no Togawa material in the surviving manuscript versions of the *Nagasaki shi zokuhen*, Togawa Yasuzumi 戸川安清 (1787–1868) must have later transcribed into a personal copy the records of the delicate mission.¹¹⁷

Hayashi Akira's access to material is particularly interesting for 1854, the year of Perry's second visit, because TKIR was compiled by 1856 and on the Japanese side he had presided at the negotiations with the Americans. Some of the approximately fifty *shahon* the Hayashi drew on for their account of 1854 are obviously substantial items across the entire year; others were quoted more rarely, and the fact that as many as three *shahon* are sometimes cited together as a source suggest that there is much overlap. Hayashi's sources support the impression that at the time a great many *shahon* circulated, and that there was no central controlling record.

Rich cases like that of Togawa for the 1830s apart, the absence of sustained correspondence of *bugyō* or *rōjū* leaves the central issues obscure. There is evidence neither of the reasons for delay in 1804 in communicating decisions to Nagasaki, nor of the tortuous course of decision making in Edo. The same problem arises in the case of Golownin's captivity. Later in 1821–1822, remarkable though the reversal of policy was, there is no explicit evidence of the reasons behind the return of Matsumae in 1822. Until something is known of the advice on *uchiharai* given to *rōjū* in 1825, the reasons that influenced *rōjū* in their final decisions can only be guessed at.

5. *Rōjū*, Senior Bureaucrats and Their Paper Work

In the Edo period, the structure of Japanese administration had evolved little beyond the tradition of rulers living off their own estates. At the apex, the shogunal administration depended on the *rōjū*, selected from *fudai* daimyo, serving in monthly rotation. They had

115 Fujita 2005, pp. 140–42, 155.

116 Fukui 1980, pp. 315, 326–28. Fukui has some more general comment on p. 144.

117 TKIR *zokushū*, vol. I. First dispatched as a *metsuke* to Nagasaki in the 1820s to prevent smuggling, in 1836 he was promoted to *bugyō* rank. Togawa's copy is not included in the papers lodged in the Kunaichō by the Togawa family in the 1880s (see Kunaichō Shoryōbu [i] to [iv]). The deposit consists of office diaries and three *satsu* of largely topographical information on Kyushu. On Togawa's career in Kyushu, see also Cullen 2003, p. 48 and note 77.

neither a personal core of officials answerable to them individually, nor *a fortiori* the tangible features of separate buildings (ministries). The Hyōjōsho apart, narrow specialization was not envisaged. Problems as they arose were handled by ad hoc redeployment. This explains two striking features of Japanese bureaucracy: first, how officials were detached to carry out specific tasks and how several of the officials could be combined to make very delicate reports; second, the smallness of the staff resources explains also why officers of low rank on occasion exercised high responsibility. Kondō Jūzō, though holding the rank of *shihai kanjō* 支配勘定, was made responsible for surveying Ezo after a short period of service in Nagasaki.¹¹⁸ *Daikan* on occasion also found themselves in a defense role, as was famously the case with Egawa Tarōzaemon 江川太郎左衛門 (1801–1855).¹¹⁹

The *kanjō bugyō* themselves, no more than the *rōjū*, commanded workers who served permanently under them.¹²⁰ Officials at large were primarily low grade, underworked civil servants employed to collect revenue, supervising its expenditure, and as clerks maintaining the paperwork of these operations. In the Kanjōsho, the largest administrative arm with a total staff of about 700, senior figures were few. The number of *kanjō bugyō* was about eight, supplemented by two *kanjō ginmiyaku* 勘定吟味役 and ten to fourteen *kamigashira*.¹²¹ The *kanjō bugyō* were sometimes supplemented for special tasks by Hyōjōsho *metsuke* (who numbered sixteen to twenty).¹²²

Rōjū and officials worked in close proximity to one another. The *goyōbeya* was a complex of rooms rather than literally a central workspace. The *wakadoshiyori* room was in the central position within the *goyōbeya*. On one side were the offices of the *rōjū* and beside them the *kanjōsho*, *bugyō* point of contact with the *rōjū*; on the other side were offices of the *kanjō bugyō*, *machi bugyō*, *jisha bugyō* and *ometsuke*. There were also several spaces known as *osoba shū* 御側衆. The *metsuke* with no space allocation, individual or collective, may have met there on occasion or in the *wakadoshiyori beya*. For critical problems, the *rōjū* came to seek reports from the “three *bugyō*,” in effect groups for individual cases made up of one or more officials from *kanjō bugyō*, *machi bugyō* and *jisha bugyō*.

The involvement of several officials simultaneously added to the necessity of multiplying copies of relevant documents for briefing purposes. By the 1860s, growing pressures on officials’ time and attention meant they gradually acquired more autonomy. The *metsuke*, investigating officers exercising distinctive duties, supplemented the *kanjō bugyō* in general concerns of the shogunate. In very delicate negotiations (with foreigners), *metsuke* were automatically present. With the creation of the new office of *gaikoku bugyō*, the *metsuke* ceased to appear at negotiations in the 1860s.¹²³

The informal correspondence of *rōjū* (often with powerful daimyo) and of *kanjō bugyō* on non routine issues remained personal to the office holder. In other words papers, personal to the man, followed him. Toby in his pioneering study of the shogunate’s Korean diplomacy noted the problems caused by the fact that “the *rōjū* did not keep records of

118 Recognition of his service with promotion to the rank of *kanjō ginmiyaku* 勘定吟味役, came only in his fortieth year in 1810. Egawa’s later role in superintending defenses of Edo Bay is another instance of the pattern.

119 Nakada 1998, and Nakada 1985.

120 Sasama 1965 and Yamamura 1974 both provide useful background information.

121 Yamamura 1974, pp. 20–22; Kasaya 2000, p. 132.

122 The number of *metsuke* may at times have been higher. See Beerens 2000, p. 381, note 43.

123 Beerens 2002, p. 389.

its deliberations,” and that “the only evidence we have is inferential.”¹²⁴ For Abe Seishō, Fukuyama daimyo and *rōjū* from 1817 to 1823, surviving papers on the Russian question suggest how a *rōjū* was briefed.¹²⁵

As the Nagasaki *bugyō* spent every second year in Edo, the personal nature of their papers was if anything further enhanced. In their year in Edo, they effectively played for Nagasaki affairs the role of ambassador: they had long and usually cordial meetings with the Dutch during their regular Edo visits. The record of Izawa Masayoshi, formerly *bugyō* in Nagasaki (17 April 1842–8 March 1845) later a *metsuke* and an Edo *machi bugyō*, suggests the fate of documents. On his final departure from Nagasaki, he took with him letters from Edo he had received during his period of office. In 1891, Yamaguchi Naoki 山口直毅 (1830–1895), a retired official and an acquaintance of Izawa, recollected that they had included letters in the hand of Mizuno Tadakuni on important affairs of state: “He (Mizuno) sent him (Izawa) detailed instructions in his own hand. There was a bamboo basket full of these letters. Izawa showed them [to me].”¹²⁶

The contrasting pattern in the survival of records of Abe and Hotta, the senior *rōjū* between 1845 and 1857 shows how survival can vary. For Abe Masahiro, a *rōjū* of exceptional interest because he headed the administration from 1845 to 1853, the major survival is in Mito, in copies of correspondence made, it is said, by Tokugawa Nariaki in his own hand, into a series of five *shahon*, the *Shin Ise monogatari* 新伊勢物語. It contains the correspondence between Nariaki and Abe. It also has correspondence from Shimazu Nariakira. With Abe’s correspondence missing in Fukuyama, a copy was made in eight *satsu* for the family from the Mito record.¹²⁷ It now rests in the Seishikan Kinenkan 誠之館記念館 in Fukuyama.¹²⁸

By contrast, documents of Hotta Masayoshi enjoyed a happier fate. In early Meiji times, they were held by the family. The archives of Hotta’s son and heir, Hotta Masatomo 堀田正論, held Masayoshi’s diary. The han archives also held items such as *Sakura han tsuchi no e shū* 佐倉藩戊戌年集. Some copies were lodged later in the National Archives. One *shahon*, described as a Masatomo family record, *Hotta Masatomo kaki* 堀田正論家記, originally given to the history section of the Council of State (Dajōkan Sei’in Rekishika 太政官正院歴史課), later passed to the Naikaku Bunko.¹²⁹ Another, described as *Hotta Masayoshi kiroku* 堀田正睦記録, under the title *Jōyaku shokan wage* 條約書翰和解 contains a very substantial twelve *kan* dealing with the American negotiations, *Amerika shisetsu taiwasha* 亞米利加使節對話書 is also in the Naikaku Bunko.¹³⁰ Lacking an indication in the catalogue of a source, it may have reached the archives in a similar relay.

124 Toby 1991, p. 165.

125 See above p. 22.

126 Beerens 2002, p. 190.

127 <http://wp1.fuchu.jp/~sei-dou/rekisi-siryou/00246tokugawa-nariaki-shin-ise/00246tokugawa-nariaki-shin-ise.htm>. Accessed, 22 October 2011.

128 *Seishikan Kinenkan* 1993.

129 *Naikaku mokuroku*, vol. 1, p. 588. *Ansei nenkan bōfu Bitchū no kami bakufu rōjū gaikoku kakari kinyaku chū shodaimyō kenpakusho utsushi* 安政年間亡父備中守幕府老中外国掛勤役中諸大名建白書写. It is used in DNIS for a letter of Tokugawa Nariaki in 1854.

130 *Amerika shisetsu taiwasha*, *Naikaku mokuroku* (i), vol. 1, p. 590.

6. New Administrative Structures from 1858 and New Order in Record Keeping

The Hayashi account for 1854 is the first occasion for which there is a glimpse of the Japanese archival working record in detail. Administrative changes were sweeping from 1858 with a radical alteration of record keeping as a counterpart to the changes. The pace was set by the *gaikoku bugyō*, in charge of foreign affairs and also of defense matters, resulting in the biggest administrative change since the time of Ieyasu.¹³¹ In embryonic form, the posts were thus the first step not simply in creating a modern foreign office but Western style ministries in general.

The collective action of three grades of *bugyō* no longer existed. The role of *metsuke* also changed. They had regularly met as a group, and added their seals to documents. Informal consultation *Ozashiki hyōgi* 御座敷評議 of *metsuke* and *bugyō* also took place with the parties meeting in a room that happened to be empty.¹³² The older pattern of *bugyō* consulting *metsuke* thus continued. So entrenched was it that even *gaikoku bugyō* at first worked under this constraint.¹³³ But pressure of events meant that *metsuke* participation in foreign affairs declined.

Everyone was busy, and those in charge of foreign affairs couldn't look into other matters, because they had to travel back and forth to the capital and Kobe and Osaka to be present at receptions of the *bugyō*. They had hardly any spare time so general matters were left untouched. But at the time I [Yamaguchi Naoki] started as *metsuke* we did do such things.¹³⁴

Metsuke attendance at high level meetings with foreigners ceased two or three years before the Restoration in 1868.¹³⁵ There was concurrently a pressing two fold need: to recover copies of missing documents, and to keep order among current papers for the daily exchange of correspondence with diplomats in Edo, Kanagawa, Nagasaki and Hakodate. Much is obscure about the loss and recovery of paper. As early as 1864, the *gaikoku bugyō* had noted the need for order, and in 1865 efforts started to recover copies of missing documents.¹³⁶ As copies circulated, it appears that what was everybody's business had been nobody's business, and that the coincidence of fires and the demand for copies led to overstatement of actual loss. The diffusion of papers was the real problem, though equally it made possible a highly successful recovery operation.

The Hayashi were still relevant in the mid 1860s. At the end of 1864, *fūsetsugaki* and other documents were transferred to them.¹³⁷ But their specific proposals were rejected in 1867.¹³⁸ The Hayashi had a small staff; they were also cast more in the scholarly mode of storage and study than of actively dealing with current issues. Radical new thinking was already emerging. A *Gaikoku Goyōjo* 外国御用所, a proper office for the *gaikoku bugyō*, was

131 Tanaka 1998, p. 53. See also Doi 1997.

132 Beerens 2000, p. 389.

133 Beerens 2000, p. 389.

134 Beerens 2000, p. 382. See also p. 381.

135 Beerens 2000, p. 388.

136 Tanaka 1998, pp. 30–31.

137 Tanaka 1998, p. 33.

138 Relations with the Hayashi are summarized in Tanaka 1998, pp. 30–42.

established where monthly meetings took place.¹³⁹ In 1867, the *Shomotsu goyōshutsu yaku* 書物御用出役 with a small staff, completed copying of records for the years 1859–1863. In total, the compilation contained 320 *satsu*, stored in six boxes.¹⁴⁰ While the master copy *seihon* 正本 was placed in Momijiyama, another copy was lodged at Shōheizaka; a further one was retained by active officials in the field.¹⁴¹ Efforts to continue the process for the subsequent years collapsed, but were later undertaken between 1871 and 1879. They resulted in the *Zoku Tsūshin zenran* 続通信全覽 in 505 *kan* containing 1,869 *satsu*.¹⁴² We do not know from whom the compilers uncovered the documents or how the originals were disposed of. The overall exercise amounted to 200,000 manuscript pages.¹⁴³ This huge collection was published in printed form only in 1989.¹⁴⁴ The combined *Tsūshin zenran* (first and second series) is, if measured in terms of the modern printed page, four times the scale of the TKIR.

7. The post-1868 Transfer of Tokugawa Archives to the New Regime

The state of affairs in Edo in 1868 reveals that the Dajōkan 太政官 had no archival policy. The fact that in 1869 the Shōheizaka and the Momijiyama Bunko were envisaged as the nuclei of universities shows that two years after the Restoration archives were still not a foremost concern. While for Momijiyama the university idea was short-lived, its management under five successive sub-agencies of the Dajōkan, was at least close to the centre of government. Real clarity came only when a Dajōkan Bunkokan 太政官文庫館 was decreed in 1884 with responsibility for archives.¹⁴⁵ For Shōheizaka, the idea of a role as university endured till 1875. Lacking the protective mantle of the Dajōkan, changes had been less reassuring: it passed under the tutelage of the Monbushō, then two years later came briefly under the scrutiny of the Hakurankai Jimukyoku 博覧会事務局, before being transferred in 1876 to the Naimushō.

Though in early Meiji years new government institutions assumed responsibility for Tokugawa bodies, their discharge of that role was far from clear or reassuring. They took from the two existing archives records relating to their area of interest. The Gaikoku Jimukyoku 外国事務局, the last of several names for a new agency for foreign affairs preceding the Gaimushō, received records from the Tokugawa family in 1869.¹⁴⁶ In particular, papers relating to Korea and the Ryukyus were moved from Momijiyama to the Naimushō; also to the Kunaichō. The Tokugawa family took over books, but also some manuscripts, including a copy of the Japanese translation of Golownin's *Narrative*, which is not included in lists of known copies.¹⁴⁷ The Hayashi collections were dismembered, and went to the new ministries. Seals or internal evidence in records later deposited in 1885 in the Naikaku

139 Tanaka 1998, pp. 49–50, 54, 56–57, 60.

140 Tanaka 1998, p. 77. For details of the contents, see Tanaka 1998, pp. 135, 138–39.

141 Tanaka 1998, pp. 80, 144–45. For details, and an account of copies made of the compilation, see Tanaka 1998, pp. 143–79.

142 Tanaka 1998, pp. 231, 412.

143 “Maegaki,” p. 2, in *Tsūshin zenran* (ii).

144 *Tsūshin zenran* (i).

145 It was renamed a year later after the creation of cabinet government as Naikaku Bunko. *Naikaku mokuroku* (iii), p. 4; *Naikaku Bunko hyakunen shi* 1986, p. 30

146 Tanaka 1998, p. 66.

147 Cullen 2003, pp. 152 note, 196 note, 197. See also Shizuoka Kenritsu Chūō Toshokan 1970.

Bunko often reveal Hayashi origins.¹⁴⁸ The 1885 deposits were substantial but selective, the Naimushō continuing to regard Korea and the Ryukyus as sensitive, even retaining some pre-1868 material. Given the vulnerability of the Ryukyus to foreign incursion from the 1840s until formal annexation in 1879, many records, even pre-1868 ones, were transferred to the Kunaichō and Naimushō. An example from the Naimushō cited on a number of occasions in DNIS is *Izena Pechin unjō shokan* 伊是名親雲上書翰 for 1846 from *Ryūkyū Ōkoku Hyōjōsho nikki* 琉球王国評定所日記.¹⁴⁹ The Gaimushō deposited mostly older records or reports, often duplicates. Scarcely any correspondence featured in its deposits.

Storage added to the hazards of early survival. In 1875, the Naimushō opened a converted rice warehouse for Shōheizaka records in Asakusa 浅草. In 1884, they were moved to a site at the Wadakura mon 和田倉門; later, they were transferred to a repository in Ōtemon. Momijiyama records at this stage held, within a former bookstore in the precincts of the imperial palace in 1891, also were transferred to Wadakura mon.¹⁵⁰ The archives of other institutions were less fortunate. The Hyōjōsho records first went at least nominally to the Shihōshō 司法省; then, for a time after the creation of the new archive in 1884 to the Dajōkan Bunko; in 1895, to the Law Department of Tokyo Imperial University and, in 1904, to the Imperial University library.¹⁵¹ The *jisha bugyō* records were transferred successively to the Naimushō, and the Imperial University library. The *machi bugyō* papers, transferred to the city administration in Tokyo were ultimately moved also to the of the Imperial University library.¹⁵² All this material was lost in 1923.¹⁵³ The modern assumption is that significant quantities of pre-1868 records had been transferred to ministries at their establishment and, retained there, were lost along with like deposits in Tokyo University Library in 1923.¹⁵⁴ Even Fukui presumes that material was transferred to the Ōkurashō, and was then lost in 1923.¹⁵⁵

This view is not tenable for the Ōkurashō and the Naimushō, which covered a wide range of interests. The Ōkurashō, well run after 1880, was guilty in its early years of bureaucratic neglect of archives. Ōkuma Shigenobu 大隈重信 (1838–1922) gave serious attention from 1878 to collecting pre-1868 records. Little material from the Ōkurashō went to the Naikaku Bunko in 1884–1885, suggesting it had inherited little in 1868, and exercised limited responsibility. Its keeping of new records like foreign trade statistics from 1868 to 1876 was also poor.¹⁵⁶ Ōkuma’s decision to collect material was prompted by awareness of the absence within the ministry of earlier records. At Ōkuma’s direction, “necessary” work was undertaken on the finances and economy of Tokugawa times from the sources.¹⁵⁷ The history of Edo times, which the Ministry compiled, was published in part on the eve of the 1923 earthquake. The remaining volumes, already in final draft or in text with the printers escaped nemesis, appearing in the two years after the earthquake. The series amounted to some 13,000 pages in ten volumes (the first eight in two parts).¹⁵⁸

148 Cullen 2003, p. 319. See also Kizaki 2005, p. 135 and Fukui 1980, p. 142.

149 DNIS, 1st series, vol. 1, pp. 341, 557, 559.

150 *Naikaku mokuroku* (iii), pp. 4–5.

151 Fukui 1980, p. 138.

152 Fukui 1980, p. 140.

153 However, a small amount of material from all these institutions, some 6,000 items, found its way to the National Diet library; about 70 percent are *machi bugyō* records.

154 See, for example, Kasaya 1998, p. 22.

155 Fukui 1980, p. 140.

156 Cullen 2010.

157 *Nihon zaisei keizai shiryō*, vol. 1, p. 1.

158 *Nihon zaisei keizai shiryō*.

The lack of material in the Ōkurashō is shown also in the fact that, though Katsu Kaishū worked in the 1880s with Okuma's successor Matsukata Masayoshi 松方正義, his famous *Suijinroku* was drawn from miscellaneous and inferior sources. Because of their political sensitivity, the Naimushō held some material beyond 1885. It does not appear, however, to have been substantial, and it too was lost in 1923. What survives does so in the form of transcripts made in yet another great copying exercise, launched under the aegis of the Monbushō from 1911, and in the DNIS published some three decades later.

8. Conclusion

Publication in modern printed form of records began with Katsu's pioneering work in the 1880s. Apart from the unique and irreplaceable *Suijinroku*, his other works were volumes on army, navy and foreign policy respectively.¹⁵⁹ For foreign policy his *Kaikoku kigen* 開国起原 with documents from the 1840s reflects the wide diffusion of copies in the senior circle of active or retired officials.¹⁶⁰ But it is little cited in modern calendars of records.

The source base in records surviving into Meiji was poor for the years prior to 1859. The first volume of the *Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei monjo* 幕末外国関係文書 (BGKM) for Kaei 6 (1853), 6th and 7th months for instance, cites the TKIR on 71 occasions, reflecting the thin source base. As in TKIR's use of Golownin's account, the Japanese record in the BGKM was interspersed with Hawk's official account of the Perry expedition. But for the years from 1860, the twentieth century compilers of the BGKM were able to rely principally on the Gaimushō together with material relating to the *bugyōsho* of Kanagawa, Nagasaki and Hakodate.¹⁶¹ The BGKM contrasts with the DNIS, intended to be the political history of the Restoration and which, for want of central shogunal records, perforce relied heavily on the rich but uneven han record. That venture grew out of the politically inspired proposal in 1890 by Kaneko Kentarō 金子堅太郎 for an editorial board of national history. The compilation of the DNIS, a task launched in 1911, could count on the good will of daimyo descendants. Publication (of the 4,215 *kan* of copied materials) was not envisaged until, in 1935, the government decided for political reasons to publish it.¹⁶² By way of contrast, for the years from 1859 the Gaimushō series became increasingly close to a Western style series of diplomatic documents. The records reconstituted from transcribed copies in the hands of individual officers cover both high policy, and the daily humdrum interaction of officials and foreigners. It provides a remarkable tribute to the vitality of Japanese administration. The response to the challenge presented by a permanent and unwanted foreign presence supports Kasaya's observation that Japanese officials "possessed the facility to discern quickly the most suitable way to overcome problems, and were therefore able to respond to the perilous situations they faced by reforming themselves through a process of trial and error."¹⁶³

159 Katsu 1890.

160 Katsu 1893. Biographies afford only a brief glimpse of his research even in the case of the fullest account (Matsuura 2010, pp. 669–75). See also Ishii 1974. For diplomatic reasons, the Gaimushō was not involved in the publication of this volume.

161 See editorial statement in BGKM, vol. 43 (1991), editing letters for 1860. Apart from Hakodate, reestablished in 1854 as a *bugyōsho*, the survival into modern times of archives from the newly opened offices is negligible.

162 Imaizumi 2011, pp. 146–48, 150.

163 Kasaya 2000, p. 166. Others too have commented on Japanese success in negotiations: Katō 2000; Katō 2004; Cullen 2004, p. 21; and Auslin 2004.

REFERENCES

- Ansei ninen* 2001
Ansei ninen yorozukichō 安政二年萬記帳. Nagasaki Kenritsu Toshokan, 2001.
- Aston 1874
 W.G. Aston. “Russian descents in Saghalin and Itorup in the years 1806 and 1807.” Reprinted in *Collected Works of William George Aston*, vol. 1. Ganesha Publishing, 1997, pp. 20–29.
- Aston 1879
 W.G. Aston. “H.M.S. ‘Phaeton’ at Nagasaki in 1808.” Reprinted in *Collected Works of William George Aston*, vol. 1. Ganesha Publishing, 1997, pp. 107–120.
- Auslin 2004
 Michael R. Auslin. *Negotiating with Imperialism: The Unequal Treaties and the Culture of Japanese Diplomacy*. Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Beerens 2000
 Anna Beerens. “Interview with a bakumatsu official: a translation from *Kyūji shimonroku*.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 55:3 (2000), pp. 369–98.
- Beerens 2002
 Anna Beerens. “Interview with a bakumatsu official: a translation from *Kyūji shimonroku* (2).” *Monumenta Nipponica* 57:2 (2002), pp. 173–204.
- BGKM
Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei monjo 幕末外国関係文書 1855–1860. *Dai Nihon komonjo* 大日本古文書, 43 vols. Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjō 東京大学史料編纂所, 1910–1991.
- BPP
 British Parliamentary Papers. In *Area studies: Parliamentary Papers, Japan*, ed. W.G. Beasley. Irish University Press, 1971–1972.
- Cullen 2003
 Louis Michael Cullen. *A History of Japan, 1582–1941: Internal and External Worlds*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Cullen 2004
 Louis Michael Cullen. “‘Sakoku,’ Tokugawa policy, and the interpretation of Japanese history.” *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, 4th series, vol. 18 (2004), pp. 17–31.
- Cullen 2006
 Louis Michael Cullen. “Tokugawa Population: The Archival Issues.” *Japan Review*, no. 18 (2006), pp. 129–80.
- Cullen 2009
 Louis Michael Cullen. “Statistics of Tokugawa Coastal Trade and Bakumatsu and Early Meiji Foreign Trade, Part 1: Coastal Trade in Tokugawa Times.” *Japan Review*, no. 21 (2009), pp. 183–223.
- Cullen 2010
 Louis Michael Cullen. “Statistics of Tokugawa Coastal Trade and Bakumatsu and Early Meiji Foreign Trade, Part 2: Trade in Bakumatsu and Early Meiji Times.” *Japan Review*, no. 22 (2010), pp. 59–102.

DNIS

Dai Nihon ishin shiryō 大日本維新史料 1840–1858, 1st series 7 vols; 2nd series 5 vols; 3rd series 7 vols. Ishin Shiryō Hensan Jimusho, 1938–1943.

Doi 1997

Doi Ryōzō 土居良三. *Bakumatsu gonin no gaikoku būgyō: kaikoku o jitsugen sasete bushi* 幕末五人の外国奉行: 開国を実現させた武士. Chūō Kōronsha, 1997.

EDUN

Library of Economics Department, University of Nagasaki

(i) Visit of the *Return* (under the date Enpō 1.6.28)

511M181 *Enpō gan'nen ushi rokugatsu nijūhachi nichi Nagasaki bugyō Okano Magokurō dono... egeresusen junpū shidai defune ōsetsukerare sōrō ni tsuki men onwatashi sōrō kōjōgaki*. 延宝元年丑六月二十八日長崎御奉行岡野孫九郎殿. . . えけれど船順風次第出船被仰付候ニ付面御渡候口上書.

(ii) Phaeton Incident 1808

511M157 *Ikokusen nyūtsū ikken ni tsuki oyakusho e Oranda meshidasare Magaribuchi Kai no kami sama ontazune no utsushi Kure Tokutarō* 異国船入通一件二付御役所江阿蘭陀被召出曲淵曲甲斐守様御尋の写呉徳太郎
(October 1808).¹⁶⁴

(iii) Rezanov Embassy 1804

407 M49 *Roshia shisetsu torai hottan* 露西亜使節渡来発端.

Egoshi and Urakawa 2009

Egoshi Hiroto 江越弘人 and Urakawa Kazuo 浦川和男. *Ikokusen torai zakki* 異国船渡来雑記. Nagasaki Bunkensha, 2009.

Enomoto 2004

Enomoto, Maki. “Just for the Record.” *The Japan Journal* (November 2004).

Fujita 2005

Fujita Satoru 藤田覚. *Kinsei kōki seijishi to taigai kankei* 近世後期政治史と対外関係. Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2005.

Fukui 1980

Fukui Tamotsu 福井保. *Naikaku Bunko shoshi no kenkyū: Edo bakufu Momijiyama Bunko bon no kōshō* 内閣文庫書誌の研究: 江戸幕府紅葉山文庫本の考証. Seishōdō Shoten, 1980.

Fukui 1983

Fukui Tamotsu. “Kaisetsu” 解説 in *Edo bakufu hensanbutsu* 江戸幕府編纂物. Yūshōdō Shoten, 1983.

Hall 1968

J.W. Hall. “Materials for the Study of Local History in Japan Pre-Meiji Daimyo Records.” In *Studies in the Institutional History of Early Modern Japan*, ed. J.W. Hall and M.B. Jansen. Princeton University Press, 1968, pp. 143–68.

Hamada 1986

Hamada Giichirō. 浜田義一郎. *Ōta Nanpo* 大田南畝. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1986 (revised 1963 edition).

164 Modern protective cover of document errors in giving 9th year in place of 5th year.

Hankachō

(i) *Hankachō: Nagasaki bugyōsho hanketsu kiroku* 犯科帳: 長崎奉行所判決記録 1666–1867, 11 vols, ed. Morinaga Taneo 森永種夫. Hankachō Kankōkai, 1958–1961.

(ii) *Oshioki ukagai shū: Nagasaki bugyōsho kiroku* 御仕置伺集: 長崎奉行所記録, 2 vols., ed. Morinaga Taneo. Hankachō Kankōkai, 1962.

(iii) *Nagasaki bugyōsho kiroku kuchigaki shū* 長崎奉行所記録口書集, 3 vols., ed. Morinaga Taneo. Hankachō Kankōkai, 1963–1964.

(iv) *Nagasaki daikan kirokushū* 長崎代官記録集, 3 vols., ed. Morinaga Taneo. Hankachō Kankōkai, 1968.

Harada 2007

Harada Hiroji 原田博仁. “Kaidai” 解題 in *Nagasaki bugyōsho kankei shiryō* 長崎奉行所関係資料, no. 1. Nagasaki Rekishi Bunka Hakubutuskan, 2007, pp. 269–80.

Hayami 2001

Hayami, Akira. *The Historical Demography of Pre-Modern Japan*. University of Tokyo Press, 2001.

Hayami 2008

Hayami Akira 速水融. “Kinsei Nihon no jinkō kōzō to hendō” 近世日本の人口構造と変動. *Nihon Gakushiin Kiyō* 日本学士院紀要 62:3 (2008).

Honma 2000

Honma Sadao 本間貞夫. *Kenritsu Nagasaki Toshokan kyōdō shiryō ni tsuite* 県立長崎図書館郷土資料について. *Kiyō* 崎陽 (2000), pp. 39–45.

Ikeda 1973

Ikeda Shirō 池田史郎. “Phaeton gō jiken to Saga han” フェートン号事件と佐賀藩. *Rekishi* 歴史 305 (1973), pp. 120–25.

Ikoku nikki

Nakamura Tadashi 中村質 et al. *Eiinbon Ikoku nikki: Konchiin Sūden gaikō bunsho shūsei* 影印本 異国日記: 金地院崇伝外交文書集成. Tōkyō Bijutsu, 1989.

Imaizumi 2011

Imaizumi Yoshiko. “The Making of a Mnemonic Space: Meiji Shrine Memorial Art Gallery 1912–1936.” *Japan Review*, no. 23 (2011), pp. 143–76.

Ishii 1974

Ishii Takashi 石井孝. *Katsu Kaishū* 勝海舟. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1974.

Ishii 1998

Ishii, Yoneo. *The Junk Trade from Southeast Asia: Translations from the Tōsen Fusetsugaki, 1674–1723*. Institute of South East Asian Studies, 1998.

Itazawa 1937

Itazawa Takeo 板沢健夫. *Oranda fūsetsugaki no kenkyū* 阿蘭陀風説書の研究. Nihon Kobunka Kenkyūjo, 1937.

Iwao 1979

Iwao Seiichi. *Oranda fusetsugaki shūsei, a Collection of the World News Presented Annually by the Dutch Factory at Deshima to the Tokugawa Shogunate, 1641–1858*, 2 vols. Japan-Netherlands Institute and Hōsei Rangaku Kenkyūkai, 1979.

Kasaya 1998

Kasaya Kazuhiko 笠谷和比古. *Kinsei buke monjo no kenkyū* 近世武家文書の研究. Hosei University Press, 1998.

Kasaya 2000

Kasaya, Kazuhiko. *The Origins and Development of Japanese-Style Organization*. International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2000.

Katagiri 1972

Katagiri Kazuo 片桐一男. *Sakoku jidai taigai ōsetsu kankei shiryō* 鎖国時代対外応接関係史料. Kondō Shuppansha, 1972.

Katō 2000

Katō, Yūzō. "The opening of Japan and the Meiji restoration, 1837–72." In *The History of Anglo-Japanese Relations*, vol. I. Palgrave, 2000, pp. 60–86.

Katō 2004

Katō Yūzō 加藤祐三. *Bakumatsu gaikō to kaikoku* 幕末外交と開国. Chikuma Shobō, 2004.

Katsu 1890

Katsu Kaishū 勝海舟. *Suijinroku* 吹塵録, parts 1–5. Ōkurashō, 1890. In *Katsu Kaishū zenshū* 勝海舟全集, vols. 6–10. Keisō Shobō, 1974–1978.

Katsu 1893

Katsu Kaishū. *Kaikoku kigen* 開国起原, 4 parts. 1893. In *Katsu Kaishū zenshū* 勝海舟全集, vols. 15–18. Kōdansha, 1973–1975.

KBS

Kokuritsu Kōbunshokan 国立公文書館 National Archives (formerly Naikaku Bunko 内閣文庫)

A. *Nagasaki shi zokuben* 長崎志続編 (1780s to 1839)

(i) 176-95; (ii) 176-97; (iii) 176-96; (iv) 176-113; (v) 176-103

B. *Kankai ibun* 環海異聞 (i) 185-107 (16 *satsu*); (ii) 185-113 (10 *satsu*); (iii) 185-130 (16 *satsu*); (iv) 271-7 (16 *satsu*); (v) 271-5 (6 *satsu*)

C. Rezanov Embassy 1804

(i) 185-227 *Hyōryū jin Roshia wa* 漂流人露西亜話; (ii) 185-274 *Garakisen no ki* 俄羅斯船之記; (iii) 185-261 *Roshia torai ikken* 露西亜渡来一件

Kizaki 2005

Kizaki Hiroyoshi 木崎弘美. *Kinsei gaikō shiryō to kokusai kankei* 近世外交史料と国際関係. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2005.

Kōbe mokuroku 1997

Kōbe Shiritsu Hakubutsukan kanzōhin mokuroku: Bijutsu no bu 神戸市立博物館館蔵品目録: 美術の部 13; *monjo* 文書 V. 1997.

Kokon shūran

a. *Nagasaki kokon shūran meishō zue* 長崎古今集覧名勝図絵 (compiler Matsuura Tōkei 松浦東溪, 1752–1820). Nagasaki Bunkensha, 1975.

b. *Nagasaki kokon shūran* 長崎古今集覧 (compiler Matsuura Tōkei). Nagasaki Bunkensha, 1976.

Kondō Jūzō

Kondō Jūzō 近藤重蔵.

(i) *Kondō Jūzō Ezochi kankei shiryō* 近藤重蔵蝦夷地関係資料. 3 vols. Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1984–1989.

(ii) *Kondō Jūzō Ezochi kankei shiryō: fuzu bessatsu* 近藤重蔵蝦夷地関係資料付図別冊. Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai. 1993.

Kunaichō Shoryōbu

Kunaichō Shoryōbu 宮内庁書陵部.

(i) *Togawa ke nikki kiroku* 戸川家日記記録. vols. 4–10 (1827–1839).

(ii) *Kiyō Nagasaki* 紀要長崎 (vol. 14, 1837).

(iii) *Nagasaki tochūki* 長崎途中記 (vol. 15, 1838).

(iv) *Nagasaki tochū zakki* 長崎途中雜記 (vol. 16, 1838).

Kutsukake 2007

Kutsukake Yoshihiko 香掛良彦. *Ōta Nanpo* 大田南畝. Minerva Shobō, 2007.

MacDonald 1848

Ranald MacDonald, interrogation of, in 1848. *Shahon* nos. 139 and 140 in Matsuki Collection. Center for the Study of Kyushu Cultural History, Department of Literature, Kyushu University.

Machin 1978

Roger Machin. *Experiment and Return: Documents concerning the Japan Voyage of the East India Company, 1771–3*. Richard Cocks Society, 1978.

Matsukata 2007

Matsukata Fuyuko 松方冬子. *Oranda fūsetsugaki to kinsei Nihon* オランダ風説書と近世日本. Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2007

Matsuura 2010

Matsuura Rei 松浦玲. *Katsu Kaishū* 勝海舟. Chikuma Shobō, 2010.

McEwan 1962

J.R. McEwan. *The Political Writings of Ogyū Sorai*. Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Murakami 1899

N. Murakami. *Diary of Richard Cocks, cape-merchant in the English factory in Japan, Tokyo*, vol. 2. Sankōsha, 1899.

Nagasaki chōsa hōkoku 1997

Nagasaki Ken Kyōiku Iinkai 長崎県教育委員会, ed. *Nagasaki bugyōsho kankei monjo chōsa hōkokusho* 長崎奉行所関係文書調査報告書. *Nagasaki ken bunkazai hōkokusho* 長崎県文化財報告書, no. 131. Nagasaki Ken Kyōiku Iinkai, 1997.

Nagasaki shi seihen 1973

Nagasaki shi seihen 長崎志正編 (also styled *Nagasaki jitsuroku taisei: Seihen* 長崎實録大成: 正編), ed. Morinaga Taneo 森永種夫. Nagasaki Bunkensha, 1973.

Nagasaki shi zokuhēn 1974

Nagasaki shi zokuhēn 長崎志統編 (also styled *Zoku Nagasaki jitsuroku taisei* 続長崎實録大成), ed. Morinaga Taneo. Nagasaki Bunkensha, 1974. Ms versions; see under KBS and NDL.

Naikaku Bunko hyakunen shi 1986

Kokuritsu Kōbunshokan 国立公文書館, ed. *Naikaku Bunko hyakunen shi* 内閣文庫百年史. Kyūko Shoin, 1986.

Naikaku mokuroku

(i) *Naikaku Bunko kokusho bunrui mokuroku* 内閣文庫国書分類目録, 3 vols. Naikaku Bunko, 1961–1962 (2 vols. plus index vol. Revised version, 1974–1976).

(ii) *Bunsetsu* 文節, vol. 1.

(iii) *Naikaku Bunko shōshi* 内閣文庫小史, vol. 2.

Nakada 1985

Nakada Masayuki 仲田正之. *Egawa Tan'an* 江川坦庵. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1985.

Nakada 1998

Nakada Masayuki. *Nirayama daikan Egawa shi no kenkyū* 葦山代官江川氏の研究. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998.

Nakamura et al. 1989

Nakamura Tadashi et al., eds. *Eibun Ikoku nikki: Konchi'in Sūden gaikō bunsho shūsei* 影印本異国日記: 金地院崇伝外交文書集成. "The ikoku nikki: Konchiin Sūden's Compilation of Foreign Correspondence." Translated by James B. Lewis, in *Ikoku nikki* 1989.

Nakao 1997

Nakao Hiroshi 仲尾宏. *Chōsen tsūshinshi to Tokugawa bakufu* 朝鮮通信史と徳川幕府. Akashi Shoten, 1997.

NDL

National Diet Library 国立国会図書館.

A. *Kankai ibun* 環海異聞 MSS

(i) 862-1; (ii) 130-27; (iii) W338N2.

B. *Nagasaki shi zokuhon* 長崎志続編 MSS
319-3 (4 *satsu*).

C. *Enkai ibun* 沿海異聞 MSS (Ōta Nanpo MSS)

(i) ms no. 181-54, 4 *satsu* containing *kan* nos. 3, 7, 9, 13.

(ii) ms no. 83-10, 1 *satsu* containing *kan* no. 2.

(iii) ms no. 14-8, 15 *satsu* containing 13 of the original 15 *kan*.

Nihon zaisei keizai shiryō

Nihon zaisei keizai shiryō 日本財政経済史料, 10 volumes. Ōkurashō Zaisei Keizai Gakai, 1921–1925.

NRBH

Nagasaki Rekishi Bunka Hakubutsukan 長崎歴史文化博物館 (Nagasaki Museum of History and Culture).

A. Phaeton Incident 1808

(i) 16-1-3 *Ikokusen torai no setsu onsonae muki ikken ni tsuki ryōke tasshi ukagai tome: Magaribuchi Kai no kami sama ni gozaikin* 異国船渡来之節御備向一件に付両家達伺留: 曲淵甲斐守様式御在勤 (14 February–July 1809, 365 folios). *Bunka gonen shōgatsu to Bunka rokunen rokugatsu*.

(ii) Fushi 14-186 *Ikokusen torai no setsu onsonae taii onkakitsuke: Magaribuchi Kai no kami sama ni gozaikin* 異国船渡来之節御備大意御書付: 曲淵甲斐守様式御在勤 (July 1809). (See Katagiri 1972 for edited version.)

(iii) Watanabe 14-245 *Igirisusen torai ikken* イギリス船渡来一件 (4 November 1808, 7 folios).

(iv) Fuji 14-126 *Shobasho shohō ninzū warikae sōrō omomuki mōshiwatashi onkakitsuke* 諸場所諸方人数割替候趣申渡御書付 (July 1809, 17 folios).

(v) 13-392 *Tasshigaki Fueton gō jiken Matsudaira Hizen no kami naikan den no in* 達書フエトン号事件松平肥前守内閣伝之允 (14 November 1808).

(vi) 390-20 *Nagasaki bugyōsho Matsudaira zusho no kami sama onwatarima hissha kakidome no utsushi* 長崎奉行所松平図書頭様御度間筆者書留之写.

(vii) 310-63 *Ikoku torai no ki. Nagasaki bugyōsho Matsudaira zusho no kami sama onwatarima kakidome no utsushi* 異国渡来之記 (長崎奉行松平図書頭様御度間書留写) (1808).

B. Rezanov Embassy 1804

(i) 13-579 *Bunka gan'nen Roshia sen Nagasaki e raichō ikken* 文化元年ロシア船長崎え来朝一件.

(ii) 14-2-3 *Roshia sen nyūshin yori shuppan made no kiroku Bunka gan'nen ninen* 露西亜船入津ヨリ出帆迄記録文化元年弐年 (1804-5, 156 folios).

(iii) Fuji 13-84 *Bunka gan'nen ne no kugatsu muika nyūshin Oroshia sen ikken* 文化元年子九月六日入津おろしあ船一件 (17 folios).

(iv) 13-244 *Roshia sen fūsetsugaki* 露西亜船風説書 (9.10.1804, 88 pages).

C. *Fūsetsugaki*

(i) 14-119-1 *Oranda fūsetsugaki* 阿蘭陀風説書 (1827-1856, 144 pages).

(ii) Fukuda 14-116 *Fūsetsugaki* 風説書 (1843-1845).

OCCI

See OSSS 1963-1966.

Ōhori 2007

Ōhori Satoshi 大堀哲. "Goaisatsu" ごあいさつ. In *Nagasaki bugyōsho kankei shiryō* 長崎奉行所関係資料, no. 1. Nagasaki Rekishi Bunka Hakubutsukan, 2007.

Ōsaka Dōjima beishō enkaku 1903

Ōsaka Dōjima beishō enkaku 大阪堂島米商沿革. Ōsaka Dōjima Beikoku Torihikisho, 1903.

Ōsakashi shi

Ōsakashi shi 大阪市史, 5 vols. Ōsakashi Sanjikai, 1911-1914.

Ōshima 2000

Rezānofu and trans. Ōshima Mikio 大島幹雄. *Nihon taizai nikki 1804-1805* 日本滞在日記 1804-1805. Iwanami Shoten, 2000.

OSSS 1963-1966

Ōsaka Shōkō Kaigisho 大阪商工会議所, ed. *Ōsaka shōgyōshi shiryō* 大阪商業史資料, vols. 1-35. Ōsaka Shōkō Kaigisho, 1963-1966.

OSSS supplement 1966

Ōsaka Shōkō Kaigisho, ed. *Ōsaka shōgyōshi shiryō: Bekkan kaisetsu-hen sōmokuji* 大阪商業史資料: 別巻解説編総目次. Ōsaka Shōkō Kaigisho, 1966.

Ōta Nanpo zenshū

Hamada Giichirō 濱田義一郎, ed. *Ōta Nanpo zenshū* 大田南畝全集, vol. 19. Iwanami Shoten, 1985.

Roshia torai roku 1994

Roshia torai roku 露西亜渡来録. *Isahaya kyōdo shiryō sōsho* 諫早郷土史料叢書 III. Isahaya Kyōdo Shiryō Kankōkai, 1994.

Sanada ke monjo mokuroku 1979

Sanada ke monjo mokuroku 真田家文書目録. In *Shiryōkan shozō shiryō mokuroku* 史料館所蔵史料目録, no. 28, pp. 373-400. Tōkyō Kokuritsu Shiryōkan, 1979.

Sasama 1965

Sasama Yoshihiko 笹間良彦. *Edo bakufu yakushoku shūsei* 江戸幕府役職集成. Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1965.

Schodt 2003

Frederik L. Schodt. *Native American in the Land of the Shogun*. Stone Bridge Press, 2003.

Seishikan Kinenkan 1993

Seishikan Kinenkan shozōhin zuroku 誠之館記念館所蔵品図録. Alumni Association, 1993.

Sekiyama 1957

Sekiyama Naotarō 関山直太郎. “Kansei jūnen oyobi Bunsei gonon no kunibetsu jinkō: Shin shiryō no hakken.” 寛政十年及文政五年の国別人口: 新史料の発見. *Keizai riron* 経済理論 37 (1957), pp. 61–74.

Shimazu ke monjo mokuroku

(i) *Shimazu ke monjo mokuroku: Kurourushi nuribako* 島津家文書目録: 黒漆塗箱. Shiryō Hensanjo, 1997.

(ii) *Shimazu ke monjo mokuroku* 島津家文書目録 II (*Shiraki monjo tō zen* 白木文書等全, 4,511 *ten*). Shiryō Hensanjo, 1999.

Shiryō Hensanjo

(i) 2051.9/77. *Roshiajin toriatsukai tedome* 露西亜人取扱手留. “Shahon,” 3 *satsu*.

(ii) S0051-1. *Roshia shisetsu Rezanofu raikō* 露西亜使節レザノフ来航 (2 picture scrolls).

(iii) 4171.08-14. *Hayashi Jussai shokan* 林述斎書簡. (“Shahon” from *Ōkōchi bunsho* 大河内文書).

Shizuoka Kenritsu Chūō Toshokan 1970

Shizuoka Kenritsu Chūō Toshokan Aoi Bunko 静岡県立中央図書館葵文庫. *Edo bakufu kyūzō yōsho mokuroku* 江戸幕府旧蔵洋書目録. Shizuoka Kenritsu Chūō Toshokan Aoi Bunko, 1970.

Shizuoka Kenritsu Chūō Toshokan 1996

Onko chishin: Shizuoka Kenritsu Chūō Toshokan shozō no kichōsho shōkai 温故知新: 静岡県立中央図書館所蔵の貴重書紹介. Shizuoka Kenritsu Chūō Toshokan, 1996.

SMH

Shiboruto Kinenkan シーボルト記念館 (Siebold Memorial Hall).

(i) *Roshia senchū nikki* 露西亜船中日記 (October 1804–April 1805, ed. Orita Takeshi 織田毅 in *Narutaki kiyō* 鳴滝紀要).

(ii) 14-2-93. *Fūsetsugaki* 風説書. 1660–1763.

(iii) 14-2-91. *Fūsetsugaki* 風説書. 1830.

Sugimoto 1986

Sugimoto Tsutomu 杉本つとむ (with Shimura Hiroyuki 志村弘強). *Kankai ibun: Honbun to kenkyū* 環海異聞: 本文と研究. Yasaka Shobō, 1986.

Tanaka 1998

Tanaka Masahiro 田中正弘. *Kindai Nihon to bakumatsu gaikō bunsho hensan no kenkyū* 近代日本と幕末外文書編纂の研究. Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1998.

Tanaka 1996

Tanaka Takeo 田中健夫. *Zenkindai no kokusai kōryū to gaikō bunsho* 前近代の国際交流と外交文書. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1996.

TKIR

Tsūkō ichiran 通航一覽 (1566–1825), 8 vols. Kokusho Kankōkai, 1912–1913.

TKIR *zokushū*

Tsūkō ichiran zokushū 通航一覽続輯 (1825–1856), 5 vols. Seibundō, 1968–1972.

Toby 1991

Ronald P. Toby. *State and Diplomacy in Early Modern Japan: Asia in the Development of the Tokugawa Bakufu*. Stanford University Press, 1991.

Tō tsūji nichiroku

Tō tsūji kaisho nichiroku 唐通事会所日録, 7 vols. *Dainihon kinsei shiryō* 大日本近世史料. Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1984.

Tsūshin zenran

(i) Tsūshin Zenran Henshū Iinkai 通信全覽編集委員会, ed. *Tsūshin zenran*, first and second series 通信全覽 正・続編, 60 vols. Yūshōdō Shoten, 1983–1988.

(ii) Tsūshin Zenran Henshū Iinkai 通信全覽編集委員会, ed. *Tsūshin zenran: sōmoku-roku, kaisetsu* 通信全覽総目録・解説. Yūshōdō Shoten, 1989.

Yamamura 1974

Kozo Yamamura. *A Study of Samurai Income and Entrepreneurship: Quantitative Analyses of Economic and Social Aspects of the Samurai in Tokugawa and Meiji, Japan (East Asian)*. Harvard University Press, 1974.

Yasutaka 2010

Yasutaka Hiroaki 安高啓明. *Kinsei Nagasaki shihō seido no kenkyū* 近世長崎司法制度の研究. Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2010.