Western historians. As a consequence, the volume enables the reader not only to immerse him or herself in the detailed story of the political, social and economic changes of nineteenth century Japan but also to understand how subsequent twentieth century generations of historians, inevitably looking at these changes through their contemporary attitudes, have interpreted them differently. Without losing a coherent sense of history, therefore, one is happily left with a strong and sensible awareness of its mutability.

Because of space limitations, this review will comment only on two of the chapters, both of which focus essentially on the bakumatsu period. The first of these chapters by W.G. Beasley treats the foreign threat and the opening of the treaty ports. Placing these phenomena within the context of European expansion and the treaty port system in China, Beasley argues persuasively that Britain was less eager than the United States to open Japan because Japan was peripheral to British foreign policy while it was central to United States relations with China. The rest—and the bulk—of the chapter presents a detailed analysis of how time and time again in the 1850s and 1860s the bakufu’s realistic policies toward the foreigners were inhibited by domestic political forces. One comes away with a fresh appreciation of the extraordinary difficulties the bakufu had, caught as it was between foreign demands and court loyalists, in concluding and enforcing treaties it felt essential to the preservation of Japan.

Perhaps the most interesting point among many that emerge in the chapter by Marius B. Jansen on “The Meiji Restoration,” which focuses on the Restoration itself and not the Meiji period, is the conclusion that in the 1860s “the bakufu leaders were launching a modernization program—perhaps a “Tokugawa restoration”—that would in time have emulated at many points the programs adopted by their successors in the Meiji government” (p. 352). The question was not “whether Tokugawa feudalism would survive but whether its demise would be presided over by Tokugawa or anti-Tokugawa leaders” (p. 352). What is striking is “the convergence of planning between bakufu and Restoration leaders in that last decade of Tokugawa history” (p. 365).

This volume will remain the standard reference in English for nineteenth century Japanese history for decades to come.

Schenectady, N.Y. DONALD R. THURSTON


In 1967, while building some pig pens in a commune in Jiading County near Shanghai, Chinese workers unearthed a Ming dynasty tomb. In this tomb were found fourteen previously unknown works of early popular Chinese literature. Gail Oman King has now given us a complete translation of one of these works, the Hua Guan Suo zhuan (translated as The Story of Hua Guan Suo). In addition to the translation King also provides a fine introduction to the work, a bibliography of sources cited in the introduction and notes, a copy of the complete Chinese text, and the customary acknowledgements and information on the translator.

The Introduction is of special importance given the fact that the Hua Guan Suo zhuan is virtually unknown. Those familiar with the standard modern version of the

famous novel *Sanguo yanyi (The Three Kingdoms)* may recall that one of the generals who helps Zhuge Liang pacify the southwest is a certain Guan Suo, identified as a son of Guan Yu, one of the three sworn brothers around whom much of the plot of the novel revolves. Although playing a very minor role in the standard modern text, in a group of earlier versions of the novel, Guan Suo assumes a prominent place as one of Liu Bei’s most active and successful generals. Although the earliest extant edition of the *Sanguo yanyi*, that published in 1522, omits any reference to Guan Suo, it seems that by as early as 1592, editions began to appear with the expanded Guan Suo episodes included. The following questions naturally arise: Where did all of this Guan Suo material come from and why did it appear in the *Sanguo* tradition just at this time?

King’s work with the *Hua Guan Suo zhuan* may now provide some answers. It seems that the Guan Suo stories were derived, at least in part, from the *Hua Guan Suo zhuan*, which King believes was first printed in the mid-fourteenth century. The text from which the present translation is made is a reprint dated 1478. In addition to this translation King has also written a Ph.D dissertation (“A Study of *Hua Guan Suo zhuan*: A Prosimetric Narrative Printed in 1478”, University of Chicago, 1982) and two articles (“The Discovery and Restoration of the Texts in the Ming Chenghua Collection”, in *Ming Studies* 20 [Spring 1985], pp. 21-34; and “A Few Textual Notes Regarding Guan Suo and the *Sanguo yanyi*,” in *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 9 [July 1987], pp. 89-92) on this work.

The story is told in four parts. Part One gives a detailed (but not always accurate) account of Chinese history up until the Three Kingdoms period (A.D. 220-264), presents the birth and early life of Hua Guan Suo, and introduces the first major theme which is the hero’s call to find his parents. Once Hua Guan Suo finds his mother and learns his true identity, he takes a name which is the combination of the surnames of his teacher (Hua), his natural father (Guan), and his adoptive father (Suo). In Part Two he claims his patrimony by first distinguishing himself in battle, then raising an army, and finally by presenting himself to his father, Guan Yu, who only with great reluctance acknowledges a paternal relationship. In Parts Three and Four the narrative shifts from the theme of Hua Guan Suo’s identity to the theme of his destiny. As King points out, “The remainder of the story is about how Hua Guan Suo, having sought and found his parents, works it out” (p. 11). Here the focus is on combat and the narrative takes us through “no fewer than twenty-four occasions of swordplay, most of which are individual combat” (p. 11). King shows us that there is an overall narrative pattern to these battle scenes, a pattern which clearly suggests, at least to this reviewer, a formulaic approach to story-telling consistent with oral performances. In Part Three Hua Guan Suo, having been enlisted into the cause of the brotherhood, now helps Liu Bei Subdue Xichuan. In Part Four Hua Guan Suo is first demoted and sent away to Yunnan, and then, after the death of Guan Yu, is chosen by Liu Bei to avenge his father’s death. He does this by bravely and heroically vanquishing his father’s enemies at Jingzhou. The story then tells of Hua Guan Suo’s triumphal return to Shu and ends with an account of his death, caused (appropriately for a hero) not by his enemies but by grief over the loss of his sovereign, Liu Bei.

The *Hua Guan Suo zhuan* is a long narrative presented in alternating passages of prose and verse. Although produced for a reading audience, this is clearly a work very close to an oral, performing tradition. In the Chinese text prose sections are labeled as either *bai* (plain) or *shuo* (spoken) parts and verse sections as *chang* (sung) parts. King believes the work is “our earliest extant example of prosimetric *cihua*” (p. 7), a kind of chantefable literature. As King points out, although the term *cihua* was used with