"It would be interesting to get a really reliable Chinese account of Palace doings and Peking doings during 1900".


In a recent issue of *Monumenta Serica* Mr. William Lewisohn has attempted to prove that the *Diary of His Excellency Chingshan*, first made known by Messrs. Bland and Backhouse in their *China under the Empress Dowager* and afterwards published by me in Chinese text and translation, is not what it purports to be, but should be regarded "as a compilation, probably by more than one person, some time after the actual events" so that "firstly it is not a genuine diary, and secondly not by Ching Shan".

The majority of Mr. Lewisohn's arguments are based on points to which, in my edition of the Diary, I drew attention and, either explicitly or implicitly, gave due consideration. I did not then, nor do I now, consider them conclusive or strong enough to outweigh the arguments in favour of the Diary's authenticity. To these Mr. L. added a few discrepancies of the same order for which, so long as one's faith in the Diary is not shaken for more
fundamental reasons, an explanation may be found. Some other criticisms of Mr. L.'s are without relevance 1).

If therefore I consider M. L.'s arguments inadequate as a basis for the serious charge against the diary which he proffers, I am obliged to him for having reopened the discussion, because it induced me to undertake a fresh examination of the evidence. This renewed study, (largely with the aid of Chinese material that was not at my disposal in 1924,) has compelled me to the conclusion that the diary, as presented to the world, is not authentic.

This conclusion, reached exclusively by philological methods, must be upheld in the face of very strong external and internal evidence to the contrary. There is, in the first place, the word of the first translator and discoverer of the diary which nothing short of absolute proof justifies one to call in question. I have, moreover, been privileged to read a most circumstantial account of the finding of the diary, which

---

4) Mr. L.'s criticisms about the "material on which the Diary is written" (p. 193) and the "strange marginal notes" (p. 194), are unfounded. Of the seven "intelligent anticipations", listed on pp. 194—195, the third, contending that there were no large numbers of Boxers in Peking before June 13th, is invalidated by the proclamation of the Governor of Peking (no date), enclosed in letter of Tsung-li Yamen to the Dean of the Diplom. Body of May 27th (cf. Reports, etc.; China, No. 4, 1900, p. 11) and by a remark in Smith, China in Convention, p. 230, where, just before June 13th, the presence of Boxers in Duke Lau's palace is mentioned. The difficulty of point four and five (which form in reality one question), as well as that of the first, would disappear, if an error of one day in the dating of the Diary might be granted. The seventh is no anticipation at all, for in Yüan Ch'ang's second memorial (see infra), four days earlier than this entry, mention is made of the Empress's orders to present the legations with fruit etc., which words are literally quoted in the Diary. The remark on p. 197, that the diarist erroneously calls Wen-lien by the "wrong" name Wen-kan, is ill-founded, since this may conceivably have been the man's "style", which for his friend it would be more correct to use than his personal name. The criticism on pp. 201—202 about "two clearly spurious entries" is almost entirely the result of a misunderstanding of this passage which attempts to explain the connection of Yü-hsien's action and his correspondence with his son-in-law. The expression "international law" (the use of which is criticised on p. 198) is put into Jung-Ju's mouth by the diarist, and recurs frequently in various memorials of that time. I refrain from further criticism of Mr. L.'s remarks, although there are other cases where I differ with him.