There is a ‘work entitled Kairiku senbō roku (An Account of Military Defenses on Sea and Land) by Satō Chin’en’ mentioned in Katsu Kaishū’s Kaikoku kigen (Origins of the Opening of the Country; preface dated 1891, copyrighted by the Imperial Household Ministry) as an ‘outline of the uprising in China.’ In it as well the story of the capture of the English princess is recorded. I have not seen an original edition (or even a manuscript copy) of this work and know of it only through Katsu’s work. The author, Satō Chin’en is best known as Satō Nobuhiro (1769–1850), Chin’en being his style. In the bakumatsu years, a variety of fragmentary news about the Opium War circulated in Japan, but Satō’s work was probably noted in the Kaikoku kigen because it was seen as a relatively coherent chronicle of information and perhaps a representative work.

The chronicle begins: ‘In the seventeenth year of the Daoguang reign period [1837], the English transported 27,000 chests of opium [to China]…. Huang Juewen, a civil official of Shandong province, memorialized requesting that it be banned.’ Lin Zexu (1785–1850) henceforth proceeded to his new appointment in Guangdong, had the English opium brought before him, and burned it entirely. It goes on to note that in the end war broke out between the two countries, and it records the movements in the battle situations by month and year. It concludes that in Daoguang 22 or 1842 a ‘peace treaty was concluded’ in Nanjing and a celebration banquet was held aboard an English vessel to commemorate the conclusion of the peace negotiations.

There is no mention in the Kairiku senbō roku as to when it recorded these events, and thus we do not know precisely when it was written. It occasionally makes use of the same phraseology as does the Ahen shimatsu – for example, both works in describing the tale of the English princess’s fighting refer to her as ‘brave and superb’ (gyōyō zetsurin) – but one is in Japanese and the other in Kanbun, and there is a difference in the manner in which the same sorts of things are expressed in the respective texts. Although we do not know which of the two was composed first, possibly Satō wrote his work with the Ahen shimatsu as a
referent. His work merely notes: ‘This woman general was the younger sister of the English king, and she docked at Ningbo.’

Early in the text, it mentions that ‘Huang Juewen, a civil official from Shandong province, memorialized’ the throne to ban opium; the *Ahen shimatsu* reads that ‘Huang Juezhi, a civil official from Shandong, memorialized.’ This would seem merely to be a copyist’s error as the characters wen and zhi are similar. However, both wen and zhi are errors; it should be Huang Juezi (1793–1853, jinshi of 1823). Inasmuch as Huang hailed from Guangxi province, it is interesting that the text mentions Shandong.’ Reference to him as ‘a civil official from Shandong’ probably indicates the time when he served as the presiding official at the Shandong provincial examinations in 1837. Yet, the appointment as provincial examiner was a temporary post, and were the text to mention the name of his position it should have referred to him as honglu si qing or ‘Chief Minister of the Court of State Ceremonials’.1

In terms of size, the *Kairiku senbō roku* is a slightly longer work; that is, when comparing the aforementioned Japanese edition of the *Ahen shimatsu* with it, not comparing the Kanbun text of the latter with the Japanese *Kairiku senbō roku*. Satō’s work, of necessity, combines pieces from the Dutch *füsetsugaki* or official ‘reports’ as well as Qing government sources, and there is no uniformity in style or prose through the text; indeed, there is a manufactured quality about the work. For example, there are occasional conflicting ways of writing the same term: Shanghai is occasionally produces in *kana* as ‘Sanhai’ and sometimes in Chinese characters; the Yangzi River (Yangzijiang) is rendered both in Chinese characters and sometimes phonetically in *kana* as ‘Yassekian.’ ‘Yassekian’ may be an error on the part of the original Dutch translator, but it remains unclear how such an error arose. In other Dutch *füsetsugaki*, we find it rendered ‘Yansékian,’ but from that point forward it would seem that ‘Yangzijiang’ is rendered phonetically (in the local dialect). Perhaps, the *Kairiku senbō roku* mistakenly transcribed a *kana* syllabary *n* as a *tsu*.

Furthermore, the *Kairiku senbō roku* notes that ‘the Dutch for Zhenjiang fu’ is ‘Shinkyanfuoi.’ This is merely [a Japanese rendition of] the Chinese pronunciation of Zhenjiang fu, though ‘Dutch’ should probably be altered to ‘Dutch pronunciation.’ Yet, in saying that it is ‘the Dutch for’ the Chinese term, this indicates that they used as a historical resource the *füsetsugaki* which were translated from the Dutch.

By the same token, though, in describing Chen Huacheng, the text reads: ‘The English heard of his renown and did not recklessly approach Shanghai. Hence the English had the expression, “Do not fear a million troops in Jiangnan, Fear only Chen Huacheng in Wusong.”’ Elsewhere it notes: ‘When the English attacked Dinghai [a second time] they exchanged the princess for land returned to the Qing.’ The latter instance would indicate literal use having been made of reports from the Qing. Later in the text, we read: ‘Imperial Commissioner Yuqian [1793–1841] died a martyr and lost the territory under his command, and the English acquired the walled city of “Teinhei.”’ Earlier the text used the