

Japanese Ceremonial for Western Diplomats Attending Shogunal Castle Audiences, 1857–1867

Mayuko Sano

*Translated by Dylan L. Toda
and James C. Baxter*

Amsterdam
University
Press

A
U
P

Japanese Ceremonial for Western Diplomats Attending
Shogunal Castle Audiences, 1857-1867



Amsterdam
University
Press



Amsterdam
University
Press

Japanese Ceremonial for Western Diplomats Attending Shogunal Castle Audiences, 1857-1867

Mayuko Sano

*Translated by
Dylan L. Toda and
James C. Baxter*

Nichibunken Monograph Series No. 22

Amsterdam University Press



Amsterdam
University
Press

This book is published in cooperation with the International Research Center for Japanese Studies, Kyoto. 3-2 Goryo Oeyama-cho, Nishikyo-ku, Kyoto 610-1192 Japan.
<https://www.nichibun.ac.jp/>



NICHIBUNKEN

Nichibunken Monograph Series No.22

ISBN (paper): 978-4-910171-15-9

ISBN (electronic): 978-4-910171-16-6

ISSN (paper): 1344-4972

ISSN (electronic): 2434-3137

Translation: Dylan L. Toda and James C. Baxter

Cover illustration: 'First audience of a British Minister with the Tycoon of Japan at Jedo. – From a sketch by S. J. Gower.' First published in *The Illustrated London News*, 15 December 1860.

Cover design: Coördesign, Leiden

Lay-out: Crius Group, Hulshout

ISBN 9789463725194

e-ISBN 9789048557646 (pdf)

DOI 10.5117/9789463725194

NUR 697

© Mayuko Sano / International Research Center for Japanese Studies 2024

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. Nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.



Table of Contents

Foreword to the English Edition	11
Introduction	17
(1) The Scope and Aims of this Book: An Alternative History of Bakumatsu Foreign Relations	18
(2) How This Book Differs from Previous Research: The Importance of Examining Overlooked Issues of Ceremonial	21
(3) Research Methodology and the Organization of this Book	29
I The Background of Bakumatsu Diplomatic Ceremonial	
1 The Ceremonial and Foreign Relations of the Tokugawa Shogunate	33
Part 1. Palace Ceremonial of the Tokugawa Shogunate	33
(1) Regular Observances throughout the Calendar Year	34
(2) The Ceremonial of the Shogun and His Retainers	39
(3) Ceremonial for Receiving Emissaries from Outside the Shogunate	43
(4) Foreign Relations Ceremonial	45
Part 2. Ceremonial for Receiving Korean Missions in Practice	52
(1) From Departure from the Lodging Hall to the Waiting Room in Edo Castle	53
(2) Attendees and Dress Code	57
(3) The Program of the Audience	60
(4) Banquet	63
Part 3. The Accumulation of Diplomatic Experience: Shogunate Retainer Tsutsui Masanori	67
(1) Tsutsui Masanori and the 1811 Embassy from Korea	69
(2) Tsutsui Masanori's Experience in Nagasaki	71
(3) Diplomacy in the Bakumatsu Era and Tsutsui Masanori	80
2 Diplomatic Ceremonial in Western Nations	87
Part 1. Standards of Diplomatic Business	87
(1) Customary Practice in Ceremonies for Presentation of Credentials	87
(2) What Does Diplomatic Ceremonial Signify?	94



Part 2. Advances into Non-Western Areas and Views of Ceremonial	98
(1) “The Local Etiquette”	98
(2) Responses to Different Cultures: The Cases of Neighboring Asian Nations	102
Column/Diplomats and Consuls	109

II The Unfolding of Bakumatsu Diplomatic Ceremonial

3 United States Consul General Harris’s Audience with the Shogun (1857)	113
Part 1. How the Audience Came to Be Agreed Upon	113
(1) Harris’s Request to Visit Edo and the Shogunate’s Response	113
(2) Internal Debate in the Shogunate Leading up to Harris’s Appearance in Edo	120
(3) The Position of Tsutsui Masanori in the Debate over Harris’s Visit to Edo	127
(4) Tsutsui’s Views and “The Manner in which Embassies from Korea Were Treated”	131
Part 2. The Day Townsend Harris Appeared at Edo Castle: The Twenty-First Day of the Tenth Month of Ansei 4 (1857)	137
(1) From Departure from the Lodging Hall to the Waiting Room in Edo Castle	140
(2) Attendees and Dress Code	147
(3) The Program of the Audience	156
(4) Banquet	167
Part 3. Conclusion: Continuity from the Early Modern to Modern Era	176
4 The Evolution of Bakumatsu Ceremonial through Trial and Error	181
Part 1. Shogunal Audiences for the Representatives of the Netherlands and Russia (1858)	182
(1) The Shogunal Audience of Consul of the Netherlands Donker Curtius (The Fourth Month of Ansei 5 [1858])	182
(2) The Shogunal Audience of the Russian Envoy Admiral Putjatin (The Seventh Month of Ansei 5 [1858])	192
Part 2. Townsend Harris’s Second Audience (1859) with the Shogun and Its Aftermath	199
(1) The Background to and Day of Harris’s Second Audience	199

(2) The Controversy over a Redoing of the Audience	203
(3) From Harris's Third Audience to the Audiences for the British and French Ministers (1860)	214
Part 3. Conclusion: Towards Sustainable Diplomacy	220
5 The Establishment of Ceremonial Forms	225
Part 1. Developments Based on the "Permanent Ceremonial that Will Endure Unchanged"	225
(1) Townsend Harris's Fourth and Fifth Audiences with the Shogun (1861)	225
(2) Difficulties with British Minister Alcock	232
Part 2. Arriving at a Stable Diplomatic Ceremonial Regime	241
(1) Shogunal Audiences Granted to U.S. Minister Harris, His Successor Pruyn, and French Minister de Bellecourt (Third to Fifth Month of Bunkyū 2 [1862])	241
(2) The Audience of Russian Consul Goshkevich (The Inter-calary Eighth Month of Bunkyū 2 [1862]) and Its Aftermath	247
Part 3. Conclusion: Diplomatic Ceremonial Taking Root and Significance of the Ceremonial "Void"	254
6 Tokugawa Yoshinobu's Audiences for Representatives of Four Western Nations (1867)	259
Part 1. The Background of, and Preparations for, the Osaka Audiences	259
(1) The Accession of a New Shogun and His Audiences with Foreign Ministers	259
(2) Old and New Ceremonial Programs	265
(3) Toward Implementation	274
(4) Mitford Appears on the Scene	281
(5) Osaka on the Eve of the Audiences	291
Part 2. Osaka Castle on the Days of the Audiences	295
(1) The Informal Audiences	295
(2) The Formal Audiences	307
Part 3. Developments after the Osaka Audiences	319
(1) "To Make Relations with These Nations Permanent . . ."	319
(2) From the Shogunate's Demise to the Emperor's Diplomatic Ceremonial	326
Part 4. Conclusion: The Further Unfolding of Bakumatsu Diplomatic Ceremonial	334



Conclusion: How Bakumatsu Diplomatic Ceremonial Brought About “Diplomacy between Equals”	339
Sources	347
Afterword	367
Timeline	373
List of Figures	381
Index	385

Translators' Notes

1. Japanese calendar dates are written as, for example, “the first day of the first month of Ansei 5 (1858).” (“Ansei 5” is the Japanese era name and its year. The year in parentheses is the approximately corresponding Western calendar year.) On the other hand, Western (Gregorian) calendar dates are referenced as, for example, “January 1, 1867” or (in citations) “1 January 1867.”
2. Notes are numbered beginning with “1” for each chapter.
3. In this book, “ceremonial” has generally been used as a translation of the Japanese *girei*, which does not have an exact equivalent in English, and depending on the context can also refer to “protocol” and/or “etiquette.” In a limited number of cases, however, one of the latter two terms has been used when required by the context.
4. The order of East Asian names appearing in the text follows standard practice, with the family name followed by the given name. For authors' names in citations of English-language works, Anglosphere standard practice is followed, with the given name followed by the family name. In this book's bibliographical information, the author's name also follows Anglosphere standard practice (Mayuko Sano). (All other instances of the name of this book's author follow East Asian standard practice.)





Amsterdam
University
Press

Foreword to the English Edition

This is an English translation of my book *Bakumatsu gaikō girei no kenkyū: Ōbei gaikōkan tachi no shōgun haietsu*, which was released by the Japanese publisher Shibunkaku Shuppan in July 2016. The decision was made to issue an English translation as preparations were made to publish the original, and much time has passed since then. Many factors led to the lengthy process, the biggest of which was the difficulty of translation. Of course, today, many history monographs from Japan have been translated into foreign languages. However, as readers may well imagine when reading this book—the Japanese version of which already required the careful and sensitive use of terminology due to the nature of the subject—the challenge facing its English translation was considerable.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deep gratitude to Dylan L. Toda. As a translator, he got the translation process back on track after it had stalled and then, with skillfulness and true perseverance, made it possible for this work to overcome the language barrier. In addition, I would like to thank not only the first translator, James C. Baxter, but also the International Research Center for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken), where I was an associate professor from 2010 to 2018, for choosing this book for its important Nichibunken Monograph Series and funding publication in English. The series' Editorial Committee deserves special mention, in particular Patricia Fister (now Professor Emeritus), who headed the monograph program until her retirement in 2019 and has contributed to the internationalization of Japanese studies throughout her long career. In addition, I would like to thank the Nichibunken Publication Office's Matsuo Akiko, who supported this project for a long time under the supervision of the committee, and her successor Nakada Ayako, whom I relied on greatly as publication drew near.

Also, Amsterdam University Press Editor Paul Norbury was the most patient and provided encouragement until the English translation was finally published. John Breen, my senior colleague at Nichibunken (currently Professor Emeritus), introduced us when Mr. Norbury was still at Brill, before I had finished the original 2016 publication. Although I myself had not considered the possibility of an English translation, his interest in the book's topic greatly encouraged me in my research. After that, he took on the task of publishing an English translation without hesitation, and I cannot thank him enough for accepting all the twists and turns of this project and bringing it to this point. I would like to again thank Professor Breen for connecting us.



Amsterdam
University
Press

Countless other people have helped me with the publication of this English edition. I can only name a very limited number of people here, but there are two more whom I cannot omit. One person, who also appears in the Afterword, which describes the circumstances of my research's development, is Tanaka Mineto. He was in charge of the original book's publication at Shibunkaku Shuppan and provided support through thick and thin on the difficult path to English publication. He is an important partner in my research life with whom I have worked on more than a few other projects. The other person is Yano Marimi. During the long time it took to translate this book into English, I switched jobs from Nichibunken to Kyoto University. She is my secretary at the latter, and has been indispensable in my day-to-day tasks. I am immensely grateful for her adept handling of the enormous amount of work related to illustration copyrights while I concentrated on the final steps of preparing the English translation for publication.

In this Foreword, I will refrain from providing an (inevitably incomplete) discussion of the content of the book and leave everything to the main text. I also wish to emphasize that the text is a straight translation of the Japanese original published in July 2016. To maintain overall coherence, I decided not to attempt any updates, including the reference list. Fortunately or unfortunately, there has been no major progress in the study of diplomatic ceremonial itself since then, so I am confident that this publication (even in 2023) has not lost its novelty.

Nevertheless, there is no doubt that over the past decade, there has been a growing movement to reevaluate the building of relations between nations, especially encounters between so-called Western powers and non-Western nations, more carefully as contact between different cultural systems, a contrast to the traditional interpretation that understands historical phenomena primarily in terms of pressure exerted by the West on the East. In this context, ceremonial emerges as an important focus point. Two important pieces of scholarship that I could not refer to at the time of the publication of my book are *The Journal of Early Modern History's* special issue "Diplomacy and Cultural Translation in the Early Modern World" (20:4), which was released in the same month (July 2016), as well as *The International History Review's* 2019 special issue "Transformations of Intercultural Diplomacies: Comparative Views on Asia and Europe (1700 to 1850)" (guest editors: Nadine Amsler, Henrietta Harrison, and Christian Windler). The first deals with a somewhat different period, and Japan is not included in the scope of either. Also, in 2019 *The Routledge History of Monarchy* (Elena Woodacre, Lucinda H. S. Dean, Chris Jones, et al., eds., Routledge, 2019) was published. I found



Amsterdam
University
Press

much that resonated with my own research and it inspired me, particularly in Part II, “Ritual and Representation,” overseen by Lucinda H. S. Dean. (The book includes one article on Japan, but it is not based on Japanese-language primary sources and, perhaps because of this, follows the old framework that sees the period of modern diplomacy’s development as being after the Meiji Restoration.)

A clear parallel international research trend places the course of Japan’s Meiji Restoration in the context of global history, rather than the political history of a single country. In the course of writing my book, I participated in the international conference that provided one of the initial impetuses for this trend: “Global History and the Meiji Restoration,” held at Heidelberg University from 3 to 5 July 2015 and organized by Professor Harald Fuess. My presentation was entitled “Diplomatic Ceremonial of the Tokugawa Shōgunate.” A more recent endeavor that has further advanced this trend, in which I was not involved, is the 2022 publication *Revisiting Japan’s Restoration: New Approaches to the Study of the Meiji Transformation* (Timothy Amos and Akiko Ishii, eds., Routledge, 2022).

However, despite the diversification of research on the Meiji Restoration, it still firmly occupies a position as a historical “break,” largely due to the division in accumulated scholarship. We still do not find a fully developed approach to research that focuses on or takes for granted the continuity from the Tokugawa period to the Meiji Restoration and then into what has usually been considered the “modern period.” It is only by looking at this continuity that modern diplomacy’s formation process can be reconsidered as contact between different cultural systems and that the significance of opening up the study of the Meiji Restoration to global perspectives will become clearer. Hopefully, this book will be a step in that direction.

As for recent research in Japan, Shimamura Motohiro’s 2022 paper “Bakumatsu ni okeru gaikoku shisetsu e no setsugū to manazashi: Amerika Perī shisetsu to Harisu shisetsu o chūshin ni” (The reception of and gaze toward foreign envoys at the end of the Edo period: The American envoys Perry and Harris; *Kanagawa Kenritsu Hakubutsukan kenkyū hōkoku: Jinbun kagaku*, 49), adopts my book as the direct basis for its research, and Kawasaki Hana’s “Bakumatsu gaikō girei ni okeru shōzōga” (Portraits in late Edo period diplomatic ceremonial; in *Kindai Nihon seiritsuki no kenkyū: Seiji, gaikō hen*, ed. Matsuo Masahito),” consciously uses the term *bakumatsu gaikō girei*, which I had worked out as a category in my book.

Through the long process of producing this English translation, I became even more aware of the difficulties surrounding translating scholarship.



I do not simply say “the difficulty *of* translating scholarship” because that difficulty—including not only the historical terminology but also the various nuances of the original—is obvious, and, as I mentioned above, that itself was overcome by the help of translators. What I would like to highlight here is the pain that comes from the act of translating (especially into English)—in other words, from opening up the Humanities fields globally, and, going further, the reality is that the route has to be via English translation.

As a researcher, I am honored that my research has been translated into English and made available to the international academic community, and I would be very happy not only if, of course, people learn about the facts described in this book but also if it makes a small contribution to the understanding of Japan and its international relations, as well as world history. That is precisely why I endured years of arduous work in order to make it happen. At the same time, however, this process also brought to light the reality that my findings, which had been published in 2016 in my native language, were as a matter of course “non-existent” in the supposed “international” academic community until this English translation was completed. And, what an immense amount of time, money, and labor has been required in order to share this “internationally.”

Speaking from a slightly different point of view, I know that much of the “latest research” in Japanese—which, like this book, uses many important primary sources—has not had the chance to be translated into English and therefore internationally been non-existent. One can imagine that a similar situation exists in various other languages. We must reflect on how much academic literature in the world is actually overlooked by not only researchers whose native language is English but also those who learn English or other “major” languages as a foreign language and consider it a basic part of the academic research process to refer to studies published in those languages, as I myself usually do. Even if this problem cannot be solved immediately, to leave it undiscussed and overlooked is to reject a global mindset.

In August 2019, Professor Shimazu Naoko convened the workshop “Rethinking Asian Diplomacy: New Methodological and Thematic Interventions” at the National University of Singapore. (I myself presented my research on diplomatic ceremonial in the last decade of the Edo period.) It was an extremely stimulating effort to bring together historians from Asian countries and connect scholarship that had not been visible to each other. In addition, since the 2020 academic year I have been invited to lecture on diplomatic ceremonial for the Kyoto Summer (Spring) Program (coordinated by Professor Kawai Junko, Institute for Liberal Arts and Sciences, Kyoto



University), held annually by Kyoto University. It has been particularly meaningful for me to have the opportunity to present my research for the consideration of the program's diverse groups of students that come together each year from about a dozen countries in various regions of the world.

Nevertheless, at present, even these endeavors cannot be realized without the medium of English. What I am saying here may sound like a clichéd complaint about English as an “international language,” that is, a commonplace criticism of linguistic imperialism. Or perhaps what I am trying to say, in the first place, is hard for native English speakers to grasp. However, as a researcher of the period in world history that brought about this inequality and imbalance, and as someone who is also involved in the study of cultural policy in contemporary society, I have an interest, which goes beyond my personal concerns, in this still-remaining issue—both as world cultural history and in terms of the state of academia in the world today.

To my surprise, the original Japanese version of this book won the 23rd Japan Comparative Literature Association Prize (2018). This academic organization covers not only literary studies in a narrow sense, but also various aspects of cross-cultural contact more broadly. I believe that continuing to think about this issue, which has been vividly etched in my mind by the translation process ongoing around that time, is a way that I can give back after having received this accolade. And, of course, I would be more than happy if this English translation is used for a wide range of research and leads to new discussions.

Sano Mayuko
May 2023



Amsterdam
University
Press



Amsterdam
University
Press

Introduction

In the final decades of the Edo period, the major Western nations sent envoys to Japan and demanded, in various ways, that the island nation “open” itself to foreign relations. For over two centuries, the shogunate had closed Japan with only limited exceptions for trade and some diplomatic exchange with neighboring peoples as well as Holland. That the arrival of these envoys brought about a new era of international relations for Japan hardly needs comment. Mostly overlooked by historians, however, are the concrete everyday workings of diplomatic business that were necessary to manage these new relationships. In situation after situation, Japanese decision makers and administrators—the senior officials and samurai retainers of the Tokugawa regime—were forced to absorb new knowledge very quickly and to carry out the business of state.

In fact a considerable proportion of the everyday jobs of the late-Tokugawa bureaucrats who dealt with foreign representatives had to do with the observance of diplomatic ceremonial. Particularly when Western envoys started residing in Japan, it was unavoidably necessary to create opportunities for those diplomats to meet the shogun as official representatives of foreign states. And to manage their audiences with the shogun in Edo castle, this ceremonial had to be determined.

In this book I elucidate the ins and outs of these audiences in the late Edo period by tracking transitions in ceremonial, beginning with the very first example, which was the culmination of a lengthy debate, and continuing with gradual refinements that were adopted by the shogunate (always with reference to precedent) in response to changing situations. Modifications of ceremonial paralleled, and were intertwined with, political processes such as treaty negotiations. As a matter for evaluation, however, the rules of diplomatic ceremonial always existed in a different dimension from them. In these pages I seek to analyze the more symbolic and cultural aspects of changes of the diplomatic praxis of the Tokugawa

Sano, M., *Japanese Ceremonial for Western Diplomats Attending Shogunal Castle Audiences, 1857-1867*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2024

DOI: 10.5117/9789463725194_INTRO



Amsterdam
University
Press

shogunate—changes that reveal a transformation of their understanding of foreign relations.¹

(1) The Scope and Aims of this Book: An Alternative History of Bakumatsu Foreign Relations

The direct objects of attention of this book are the seventeen ceremonies in which Western diplomats were granted audiences with the shogun between 1857 and 1867 and the chain-like relationships between them. The first resident representative of a Western nation in Japan, Townsend Harris, who had arrived in 1856 as Consul General of the United States, made his initial call at Edo castle on the twenty-first day of the tenth month of Ansei 4 (December 7, 1857). He was received in audience by the thirteenth Tokugawa shogun, Iesada, and he presented a letter from U.S. President Franklin Pierce. At the end of the period examined here, between the twenty-fifth day of the third month and the first of the fourth month of Keiō 3 (April 28 to May 4, 1867), British Minister Harry Smith Parkes, Dutch Consul General Dirk de Graf van Polsbroek, French Minister Leon Roches, and American Minister Robert Bruce Van Valkenburgh were each individually received by the last shogun, Yoshinobu, at his temporary residence in Osaka castle. These were the final audiences for foreign diplomats under the Tokugawa regime.

Preparations for Harris's initial audience with Iesada took more than a year, with shogunate officials first debating whether or not it was permissible for the American to meet the shogun and then working out the exact details of the audience ceremony. Taking the timing of these preparations into account, this study focuses mainly on the twelve years from 1856 to 1867,

1 I have incorporated into this book some of my earlier writings on related subjects (as listed below). In some passages of this book, I have used them with almost no changes, but in many instances I have either added revisions to take into account subsequent research or combined parts of these articles together.

- “Bakushin Tsutsui Masanori ni okeru Tokugawa no gaikō: Beikoku sōryōji shuppu mondai e no taiō o chūshin ni,” *Nihon kenkyū* 39 (2009), pp. 29–64.
- “Bakumatsu no tai-ōbei gaikō o junbi shita Chōsen tsūshinshi: Kakkoku gaikōkan ni yoru Edokō no mondai o chūshin ni,” in *Zenkindai ni okeru higashi Ajia sangoku no bunka kōryū to hyōshō: Chōsen tsūshinshi to Enkōshi o chūshin ni*, ed. Liu Jianhui/Ryū Kenki (Kokusai Nihon Bunka Kenkyū Sentā, 2011), pp. 190–210.
- “Hikitsugareta gaikō girei: Chōsen tsūshinshi kara Beikoku sōryōji e,” in Kasaya Kazuhiko, ed., *18-seiki Nihon no bunka jōkyō to kokusai kankyō* (Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2011), pp. 535–64.
- “Jizoku kanō na gaikō o mezashite: Bakumatsu no gaikō girei o meguru kentō kara,” *Nihon kenkyū* 48 (2013), pp. 101–27.
- “Bakumatsu saishūshō no gaikō girei,” in Kasaya Kazuhiko, ed., *Tokugawa shakai to Nihon no kindaiika* (Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2015), pp. 647–79.

years when the shogunate undertook to directly manage the ceremonial of encounters with diplomatic missions sent by Western nations.

Immediately after arriving in Japan in 1856 with the letter from the U.S. President, Townsend Harris expressed his strong desire to present the letter personally to Iesada, seeing it as a very important part of his duties. In the body of this book I will treat in detail the internal debate that ensued among shogunate officials, and the concrete preparations they made. However, here let me note that while the first audience of Harris with the shogun raised the curtain on a new act in Japan's diplomatic relations in accord with an accepted practice of Western international law—namely, inaugurating such relations with the envoy's presentation of a letter of credence issued by his head of state—this was not at all unimaginable for the shogunate. The shogunate conceived of this audience based on the ceremonial adopted during its long experience with receiving Korean missions. In doing so, officials on the ground did not simply refer to precedent but also convinced themselves that their decision to open new relations with the US by receiving Harris was a reasonable extension of the traditionally maintained formal relations with a neighboring state.

Operating by trial and error, the shogunate then conducted four more audience ceremonies, but by the sixth and seventh audiences with foreign envoys, those for the British minister Rutherford Alcock on the ninth day of the seventh month of the Man'en 1 (25 August 1860) and the French chargé d'affaires Gustave Duchesne de Bellecourt on the twenty-first of the same month (9 September 1860), what we can call "the diplomatic ceremonial of late-Tokugawa (bakumatsu) Japan" had been standardized. (The incumbent shogun from the fourth of these audiences was Iemochi, the fourteenth Tokugawa shogun.) In this process we find *continuity* between Japan's earlier inter-Asiatic exchange and the country's new diplomacy with Western nations. It will become clear in the following pages that it was through shogunate policymakers' actual experience, rather than on a conceptual level, that a new understanding of diplomacy developed in this way.

Once this ceremonial had been stabilized, another six audiences with the shogun took place. Then at the very end of the Edo period, the four audiences held one after another were conducted "entirely according to European fashion,"² according to Ernest Mason Satow, who was present as a member of the British legation. However the Japanese in attendance at these ceremonies could not have been expected to wear Western formal attire, as would have been proper according to European protocol. Based

2 Ernest Satow, *A Diplomat in Japan* (Seeley, Service, 1921), pp. 198–199.

on what did Satow make this statement? After the Meiji government was formed, replacing the shogunate, inherited diplomatic ceremonial was rapidly Westernized. What were the continuities and discontinuities in this process that produced the “emperor’s diplomatic ceremonial”?³ This book is an attempt to provide a foundation and clear a path for investigating these questions.

Further, the shogunal audiences for Western diplomats on which I focus took place, naturally, in the shogun’s castles—thirteen of the seventeen in Edo castle and the last four in Osaka castle. There were other diplomatic negotiations between Western representatives and Japanese officials such as members of the shogunate senior council or the magistrates in charge of international relations held in the official residences or offices of the Japanese. In such cases, too, a number of proprieties were observed, as both sides exchanged formal greetings, food and drink were provided, and gifts were presented. If we understand “diplomatic ceremonial” in a broad sense, all these matters are of course included. As I will mention later, there is previous research that uses early receptions of Russian envoys to consider diplomatic ceremonial as a typical example of intercultural communication. Although I keep in mind such experiences of the shogunate, the focus of this book, by contrast, is on shogunal audiences held in Tokugawa castles. Through close examination of these most formal and highest level audiences, I seek to illuminate the decisions and actions over time of the key players who dealt with foreign affairs in the Tokugawa regime.

At the outset of the period covered in this book, the foreign representatives who came to Japan regarded the Tokugawa shogun as the most powerful figure, *de facto*, and as the person with authority to conclude treaties. They presented to the shogun letters from their heads of state appointing them as official envoys, a practice that was part of established international customary law in the West and seen as indispensable for constructing and maintaining relations between states. This is the antecedent of today’s Ceremony of the Presentation of Credentials,⁴ and therefore it must be distinguished from receptions carried out as part of ordinary business. On the other hand, the informal meetings that the last shogun Yoshinobu had

3 On diplomatic ceremonial in the Meiji period, see Nakayama Kazuyoshi, *Mikado no gaikō girei: Meiji tennō no jidai* (Asahi Shimbunsha, 2007). See also John Breen/Jon Burin, *Girei to kenryoku: Tennō no Meiji ishin* (Heibonsha, 2011).

4 In present-day Japan, in accordance with Article 7 of the Constitution, newly appointed diplomats from other nations present their letters of credence to the emperor at the imperial palace.



with foreign diplomats, even on the premises of his castles, did not have a symbolic nature, and for that reason I will exclude them from my analysis.

The primary aim of this book is to reveal in detail the true state of diplomatic ceremonial in Japan in the last years of Tokugawa rule. Despite its importance, this is a subject that has been unexamined in previous research. Once we examine it, what we might term an alternative history of bakumatsu foreign relations comes into sharp relief, which, due to the function of diplomatic ceremonial, was clearly different from the processes of political negotiation that hitherto captured all our attention. We can imagine that the approach I have taken here, taken as a whole, might lead to a reappraisal of the Tokugawa shogunate's management of foreign relations, as well as a reassessment of the long-term significance of this management in Japanese diplomatic history.

(2) How This Book Differs from Previous Research: The Importance of Examining Overlooked Issues of Ceremonial

Diplomatic ceremonial establishes the standard forms by which relations between states are expressed. Yet despite the fact that it has been indispensable historically and continues to be observed even today, in scholarly work on the history of Japan's international relations—especially in research on relations with Europe and the U.S. in the modern era—it has always been regarded as ornamental, as not belonging to the substance of those relations. Perhaps because of this, it has not been given enough attention. To be sure, we can find a few references to such ceremonies in studies of political processes such as treaty negotiations—the “substance” of foreign relations.⁵ However, as an object worthy of serious consideration in and of itself, ceremonial is completely ignored in previous research.

In work published in 2008, Ikuta Michiko did examine bakumatsu-era interactions between Russia and Japan by looking at diplomatic ceremonial, and her work is significant for being the first to directly approach this subject.⁶ But she was concerned primarily with analyzing how a code of cross-cultural communication came into being and used diplomatic ceremonial as material for doing so. Also, she confined her analysis to

5 For example, see Ishii Takashi, *Meiji tshin no kokusaiteki kankyō* (Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1957), Matsuura Rei, *Tokugawa Yoshinobu* (Chūō Kōronsha, 1975), and Naruiwa Sōzō, *Bakumatsu Nihon to Furansu gaikō* (Sōgensha, 1997).

6 Ikuta Michiko, *Gaikō girei kara mita bakumatsu Nichiro bunka kōryūshi: Egakareta sōgo imēji/hyōshō* (Mineruva Shobō, 2008).

cases of reception of foreign diplomats by shogunate officials in charge of foreign affairs (not the shogun himself), occasions on which ceremonial came into play. In contrast to Ikuta's approach, this book places the focus on audiences with the shogun in his castles in Edo and Osaka, meetings in which state-to-state relationships were most clearly expressed. Mitani Hiroshi is another scholar who understood diplomatic ceremonial in state-to-state relationships as having the same kind of significance in the history of foreign relations in the bakumatsu period, but he limited himself to general discussion.⁷

Having said this, previous research that is relevant to my own approach includes not only work directly related to ceremonial in bakumatsu-period diplomacy. In adjacent territories of scholarly inquiry, a rich stock of valuable research has accumulated, and I have sought to use the results of that research.

Under the Tokugawa regime, Edo castle was the residence of the shogun and the nucleus of politics, and the admission of daimyo and direct retainers of the shogun into the castle precincts, especially the granting of audiences with the shogun himself, functioned as extremely important forms for confirming the supreme position of the shogun and the continuity of his lord-vassal relationships. A calendar of regular annual events beginning with a new year's ritual constituted the axis of the shogun's schedule. These regular rituals, and also the special experience of daimyo or direct retainers meeting with the shogun (*o-memie*) on more irregular occasions—such as reaffirming a retainer family's hereditary succession or giving a new position to a high-level retainer (especially when sending him off to a distant assignment, referred to as *o-itoma*)—served, along with their temporal-spatial settings, to reinforce the power of the shogunate. At the same time, the order expressed in such settings functioned not only among people of warrior status within the Tokugawa system, but it applied to the regime's interactions with the world outside of it, typically when receiving messengers sent to the shogun by the emperor in the capital of Kyoto and guests from religious institutions such as Nikkō Tōshōgū shrine or Higashi and Nishi Honganji temples. Enhancing the authority of the shogun, these

7 Mitani Hiroshi, "19-seiki Higashiajia ni okeru gaikō kihan no henka: Girei to gengo," in Meiji Ishinshi Gakkai, ed., *Sekaiishi no naka no Meiji ishin* (Yūshisha, 2010), pp. 220–37. Also, Mitani, "Antei to gekihen: Fukuzatsukei o hinto ni henka o kangaeru," in Shigakkai, ed., *Rekishigaku no saizensen* (Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2004), pp. 79–98. In addition, although the period treated is different, a study based on concerns similar to those of this book is Ishikawa Hiroshi, "Kindai Nitchō kankei to gaikō girei: Tennō to Chōsen kokuō no kōsai no kentō kara," *Shigaku zasshi* 108:1 (1999), pp. 39–65.

ceremonial interactions helped create the shape of a broader state. A number of historians have written about early modern warrior status group standards of proper conduct in general, including the etiquette of shogunal audiences, among them Fukai Masaumi, Hirai Kiyoshi, Futaki Ken'ichi, Ōtomo Kazuo, and Watanabe Hiroshi.⁸

The parameters of this tradition of ceremonial and protocol extend to cases when similar ceremonies were conducted in order to administer relations between the Tokugawa regime and regimes of foreign countries. The reception of missions from Korea and Ryūkyū, with which the Tokugawa shogunate maintained “correspondence” (*tsūshin*) relationships, belongs to this category. As is well known, official missions from Korea visited Japan twelve times during the Edo period. As the second of those missions was received by the shogun at Fushimi castle in 1617 and the twelfth at the residence of the lord of the Tsushima domain, who served as the shogunal intermediary for exchanges with Korea, in 1811, audiences for the missions were actually held in Edo castle ten times. (While ceremonies were held at Fushimi and Tsushima due to various circumstances as replacements for ones held at Edo castle, they should not be excluded from the tradition of the series of ceremonial-setting audiences). Between 1634 and 1850, the Ryūkyū kingdom sent a total of eighteen missions to the shogun, all of which were granted audiences with him. These consisted of missions to convey congratulations on the succession of a new shogun (*keiga-shi*) and those to express gratitude upon the succession of a new Ryūkyūan king (*shaon-shi*). (All but the first of those at Edo castle; in 1634 the audience was held at Nijō castle in Kyoto.)⁹

Apart from the above missions, the shogunate continuously carried on exchanges with Holland, although they were not formal state-to-state (“correspondence”) relations and were officially categorized as a private “commercial” relationship (*tsūshō*). In the early Edo period, parties led by the Opperhoofd, the director of the Dutch factory on the island of Dejima in Nagasaki harbor, journeyed to Edo and were received by the shogun in his castle every year on the pretext of expressing gratitude for being allowed to conduct trade; from 1764, these attendances became semiannual; and

8 The number of these authors' books and essays is so large that I will not give a detailed list in this note. In the list of references at the end of this book I have included titles of the works from which I obtained particularly valuable suggestions as I pursued my own research.

9 Unlike the case of the Korean missions, in previous research the methodology for counting the Ryūkyū missions has not been uniform and there are discrepancies in cited figures, but I think the data in the table that appears on p. 218 of Kamiya Nobuyuki's *Higashiajia no naka no Ryūkyū to Satsuma han* (Azekura Shobō, 2013) can be regarded as the most accurate.

from 1790, they took place every four years.¹⁰ In contrast with the formal ceremonies for state representatives, which are recorded in archival documents as *o-ai* (the shogun “meeting” them), these audiences with the Dutch were categorized as *go-ran* (the shogun and others in the castle, including women, “viewing” them).¹¹ Accordingly, audiences with the Dutch differed in content, as well, and the ceremonial established for them should not be confused with that for the above-mentioned state rituals. However, I am touching upon this old Dutch case here because Holland was among the Western nations with which Japan entered into a diplomatic relationship in the late years of the Tokugawa era, and moreover, the etiquette that had become customary for the Dutch factory director’s obligatory attendance at Edo castle was referred to by the shogunate as an example of practices not applicable to the reception of Western diplomats.

With respect to Japanese foreign relations prior to the modern period, historian Nagazumi Yōko has investigated the ceremonial followed in dealing with the Portuguese and Dutch at the beginning of Edo period, and recently, by making extensive use of the Dutch records, Frederik Cryns has cast new light on the background of the Opperhoofd’s attendance on the shogun in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.¹² As for scholarship on Ryūkyūan embassies, while on the whole there has been a strong tendency to focus on the political background of dispatch of these missions, there is an article by Maehira Fusaaki that places emphasis on ceremonial. In addition, I want to take note of Miyagi Eishō’s work as a rare example of an effort to provide clear explanations, based on historical sources, of a number of specific aspects of the Ryūkyū missions’ journeys up to Edo and various ceremonies in Edo.¹³ Regarding missions from Korea, there is not enough space here to enumerate all the research that has been done, beginning with the comprehensive work of Miyake Hidetoshi and Nakao Hiroshi. But although the scholars who

10 Kokusho Kankō Kai, ed., *Tsūkō ichiran*, vol. 6 (Kokusho Kankō Kai, 1913), pp. 198–99.

11 See, for example, Yanai Kenji, ed., *Tsūkō ichiran zokushū*, vol. 2 (Seibundō Shuppan, 1968), pp. 289–91. For comparison see Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjō, ed., *Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei monjo*, vol. 16 (Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1923), pp. 529–32.

12 Nagazumi Yōko, *Kinsei shoki no gaikō* (Sōbunsha, 1990); Frederik Cryns/Fuederikku Kureinsu, “Oranda shōkanchō to shōgun ekken: Yabō, ishin, zassetsu,” in Kasaya Kazuhiko, ed., *Tokugawa shakai to Nihon no kindai* (Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2015), pp. 551–78. Also Katagiri Kazuo has written on the Edo attendance by the Dutch factory director, especially on the lodging facilities at which he stayed. However, these are not full-range studies on ceremonial.

13 Maehira Fusaaki, “Bakuhansai kokka no gaikō girei to Ryūkyū: Tōshōgū girei o chūshin ni,” *Rekishigaku kenkyū* 620 (1991): 33–44; Miyagi Eishō, *Ryūkyū shisha no Edonobori* (Dai-ichi Shobō, 1982); in addition, Yokoyama Manabu, *Ryūkyūkoku shisetsu torai no kenkyū* (Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987).

followed them have gone into considerable depth in writing about particular aspects—such as the reactions of domains located along the Koreans' route (from the western end of Japan's main island to Edo in the east) and menus at banquets held by different domains¹⁴—the amount of consideration that has been given specifically to ceremonies in Edo castle is surprisingly limited.

There is one valuable exception: Ronald Toby's work.¹⁵ Toby contradicted the prevailing view of the scholarship by arguing that in the late Edo period Japan "had a ready-made canon of protocol and diplomatic behavior to which she turned."¹⁶ His analysis, however, is for the most part restricted to ceremonies for receiving Korean embassies in the early Edo period in an attempt to show that Japan's early modern foreign relations framework was established therein. In this book, I start with the ceremony of Townsend Harris's audience with the thirteenth shogun Iesada in Edo castle, seeing it as a clear point of continuity between such earlier external relations and the last years of Tokugawa rule, a period that has been called "bakumatsu" in Japanese and seen as discontinuous from previous times largely because of the start of wider interaction with Western nations. Then I pursue the development of ceremonies of the shogunal reception of European and American diplomatic missions beginning with Harris.

What I hope to have made clear is that despite the existence of several previous studies of Japanese diplomatic ceremonial in the early modern era, up to now there has been no research that offers a head-on examination of such ceremonial during the last twelve years of Tokugawa rule, during which seventeen ceremonies took place for receiving representatives of heads of state and it became a critically important task for the shogunate to conduct them.

14 For example, Ichikawa Hiroaki, "Chōsen tsūshinshi no gyōretsu kōsei to daimyō no yakufutan taikai: Daimyō kaeki to ukeoi shōnin no seiritsu," *Shikai* 50 (2003), pp. 28–40; Tamai Tatsuya, "Chōsen tsūshinshi/Ryūkyū shisetsu tsūkō to jōhō/settai/ōtai: Iyo no kuni Tsuwajijima o jirei to shite," *Fūzoku shigaku* 36 (2007), pp. 2–22; Furuta Tomofumi, "Chōsen tsūshinshi settai no zaisei futan: Hōreki tsūshinshi no Hagī han o jirei to shite," *Nanakuma shigaku* 16 (2014), pp. 121–41; Hamada Akemi and Hayashi Jun'ichi, "Edo bakufu no settai ni mirareru Edo chūki kara kōki no kyōō no keitai," *Nihon kasei gakkai shi* 40:12 (1989), pp. 35–43; Takamasa Haruko, *Chōsen tsūshinshi no kyōō* (Akashi Shoten, 2001); Takamasa Haruko, *Chōsen tsūshinshi o motenashita ryōri* (Akashi Shoten, 2010).

Although it does not deal specifically with ceremonial, in Chapter 1 of this book I will touch on research in the field of Korean history regarding bakumatsu Korean embassies to Japan that never took place. This stimulated my own interest in ceremonial, particularly in that it led me to realize that there was a close connection between the reception of Harris in 1857 and the formal hospitality accorded to the embassies from Korea.

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

16 Toby, *State and Diplomacy in Early Modern Japan*, p. 229.

It is natural to understand the ceremonies for receiving missions from Korea and Ryūkyū from the early Edo period onwards as having been devised and implemented within the general tradition of ceremonial and protocol for the warrior status group that previous research has made clear over time. Almost none of this previous research, however, took note of international relations. Rather, it took matters related to domestic order under the system of rule by the shogunate and the daimyo domains as its main axis. On the other hand, even studies on ceremonial that made external relations their main subject have not provided a full-blown probe into that of the bakumatsu-era. It is not going too far to say that diplomatic ceremonial of the last years of Tokugawa shogunate has been forgotten, left in the gap between the years covered by Nagazumi and Toby, on one side, and Nakayama Kazuyoshi's *Mikado no gaikō girei* (The Emperor's Diplomatic Ceremonial; see footnote 3), on the other. We have overlooked the Tokugawa shogunate's deliberations surrounding and actual practice of diplomatic ceremonial for European and American diplomats in the years before the substantial Westernization of Japan and thereby failed to observe the continuous development of the country's international relations from the early modern period to the bakumatsu period and from the bakumatsu to the Meiji period.

The present work attempts to fill the gap in the existing scholarship. I intend it to serve to connect several fields that have been separate from each other, to enable us to understand, more comprehensively than we have before now, the thought and behavior of Tokugawa policy-makers who faced the urgent necessity to construct new relationships with Western nations.

It is probably safe to say that in Europe and the United States more research has been carried out on diplomatic ceremonial and protocol than in Japan.¹⁷ Judging from my own survey of the Western literature, we can distinguish two broad types of writing. On the one hand, there is work that, while scholarly, focuses on actual diplomatic practice and is perhaps meant to be useful for actual diplomats. On the other hand, there are also historical studies of "diplomacy" that, as a matter of course, discuss ceremonial and protocol as an element in the foreign relations of European rulers.¹⁸ Japanese

17 As I say this, I must add that my reading in the Western literature has been primarily of works written in or translated into English. I have to concede that I may be overlooking evidence and analysis that appeared in research published in other languages.

18 The pioneering work of the first type was the great book by Sir Ernest Satow, *A Guide to Diplomatic Practice* (London: Longmans and New York: Green & Co., 1917). The author had been a key member of the British mission to Japan that I treat in Chapter 6. Many years passed between Satow's publication and the appearance of more work in this genre; after World War II, we see numerous volumes, most of them published in the United States. Among the most notable are John

diplomatic ceremonial in the bakumatsu period (the main theme of this book) was conceived of based on a tradition of Japanese standards of proper conduct, but at the same time directly descended from customs that had accumulated over many years in the diplomacy of European monarchs. I will treat the situation in Europe in Chapter 2.

I have found a collection of essays, co-edited by Markus Mösslang and Torsten Riotte and published in the UK in 2008, entitled *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815–1914*, to be particularly valuable. While this volume belongs to the latter category of the two types I mentioned above, as the editors emphasize in their introductory chapter,¹⁹ the defining characteristic of this book is that it does not discuss diplomacy through changes in systemic or political conditions but sees it as the results of professional skills and actual acts (including, occasionally, idiosyncrasies and personal preferences) of men on the front lines, a perspective the editors call “a cultural history of diplomacy.” This strongly resonates with the approach I have adopted since my earlier study of Rutherford Alcock, the first British minister to Japan.²⁰

Adopting a cultural history of diplomacy perspective, one cannot avoid casting off the old abstractions about diplomacy of previous scholarship and talking instead about the very concrete endeavors of human beings. At the same time, careful attention must be paid to the symbolic quality of these endeavors insofar as they demand that these individuals be treated in their host countries in a way fit for the representative of the ruler of his home nation—indeed, of the nation itself. As a result, necessarily, ceremonial and protocol becomes an important topic. The essays collected by Mösslang and Riotte show this clearly, and three of the fifteen take up issues of ceremonial and protocol head-on as a main theme. There is no room for disputing the fact that diplomacy has symbolic aspects, yet they have been simply taken

R. Wood and Jean Serres, *Diplomatic Ceremonial and Protocol: Principles, Procedures & Practices* (Columbia University Press, 1970) and Pauline Innis, Mary Jane McCaffree, and Richard M. Sand, *Protocol: The Complete Handbook of Diplomatic, Official & Social Usage* (Dallas: Durban House Publishing Company, 2002). Of the second type, M. S. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450–1919* (Longman, 1993) and Jeremy Black, *A History of Diplomacy* (Reaktion Books, 2010) are among the most important books. In addition, combining elements of both types of writing about the history and practice of diplomacy, there is Sir Harold Nicolson's *Diplomacy* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963 [1939]), which is generally regarded as a classic.

19 Markus Mösslang and Torsten Riotte, “Introduction: The Diplomats' World,” in Mösslang and Riotte, eds., *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815–1914* (Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 1–20.

20 Sano Mayuko, *Ōrukoku no Edo: Shodai Eikoku kōshi ga mita bakumatsu Nihon* (Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2003), p. 259.

for granted and consequently overlooked. Exactly because ceremonial and protocol have not been sufficiently examined in the past, the direction found in this volume is important.²¹

Antony Best's article in *The Diplomats' World* treats the case of Japan.²² He shares the point of view of the book's editors and emphasizes the importance of protocol in the process of East Asian nations' accepting European diplomatic usages or acceding to Western domination. However, Best does not mine the original sources to depict and analyze the actual forms of protocol, and his study is limited to the years 1867–1900. His main point is that in the development of diplomatic protocol in this period, Japan underwent a process of “civilizing” itself, as its relationship with Great Britain deepened. If he had directed his attention to the diplomatic ceremonial of the bakumatsu period, however, or to that in Japan before Western envoys arrived, it is likely that his conclusions about the significance of diplomatic protocol would have been different.

Another author who highlights the importance of ceremonial in diplomacy is Michael R. Auslin. In his *Negotiating with Imperialism*, Auslin traces the history of Japanese-U.S. (and by implication Japanese-Western) relations in the latter half of the nineteenth century as a story of negotiation and bargaining between two existing diplomatic cultures.²³ In bringing the point of view of culture to bear in the analysis of ceremonial, he shares the perspective of Mösslang, Riotte, and their collaborators. However, Auslin dates the beginning of Japan's diplomatic cultural negotiations with Western states—and by extension the beginning of its modern international relations—as 1858, when the U.S.-Japan Treaty of Amity and Commerce was signed. Auslin misses something quite important by not casting his gaze back one more year, that is, to Townsend Harris's 1857 meeting with the shogun at Edo castle, which I describe in detail in this book.

Insofar as this book focuses on situations in which European and Asian traditions of ceremonial, each of which had functioned effectively in its own sphere, came into contact with each other, it must compare the establishment and maintenance of diplomatic ceremonial in Japan with that in neighboring Asian countries, which similarly were forced, in basically the same period, to respond to demands from Western nations that they

21 Mösslang and Riotte, “Introduction,” p. 16.

22 Antony Best, “The Role of Diplomatic Practice and Court Protocol in Anglo-Japanese Relations, 1867–1900,” in *The Diplomats' World*, pp. 231–53.

23 Michael R. Auslin, *Negotiating with Imperialism: The Unequal Treaties and the Culture of Japanese Diplomacy* (Harvard University Press, 2004).

open diplomatic relations. Engaging in full-fledged research on this will be my next important scholarly project, but in Chapter 2 I offer a cursory comparison and touch upon two related cases that cannot be omitted.

(3) Research Methodology and the Organization of this Book

This study is based on a close, systematic reading of primary sources. I have relied heavily on materials that have been issued in printed editions such as *Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei monjo*, edited by the Historiographical Institute of the University of Tokyo, *Zoku Tokugawa jikki*, edited by Kuroiwa Katsumi, and *Zoku Tsūshin zenran*, edited by Tsūshin Zenran Henshū Inkaï,²⁴ and I have pored over related original materials that are preserved in the National Archives of Japan (the Cabinet Library) and the Historiographical Institute of the University of Tokyo, among other archives. My major aim in this research was to recapture what happened on days when foreign envoys presented themselves at Edo castle and on days just before and after those occasions, and to make clear the course of shogunal retainers' debates as they decided what order the audience ceremonies should follow and what particulars of etiquette should be observed. At the same time, I have seen it as important to augment the information in the Japanese records by delving into the records of the Western nations that approached the shogunate, thereby supporting my arguments from multiple angles. By analyzing the evidence I have gathered in this way and building upon insights from the research in other fields (adjacent to diplomatic history), I have sought to reveal the actual state of, and also the meaning of, diplomatic ceremonial in the last years of Tokugawa rule.

Incidentally, when I speak about the details of diplomatic ceremonial that I have investigated in this study, I am referring not only to the program of the ceremony (the order in which actions should proceed), but also various fine points that are involved when ceremonies are conducted, which include such things as the appropriate costume to be worn by those present, and the food and drink to be offered. In that sense, my research necessarily had to reach into the broad realms of culture. It is difficult to achieve an adequate understanding of these matters on the basis of the above-mentioned records,

24 As I cite these authoritative works very frequently, below I will simplify my notes by giving only the titles and volume numbers; in my citations I will omit the names of the editors and publishers and the years of publication or republication. Suffice it to say here that *Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei monjo* was published by Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, *Zoku Tokugawa jikki* by Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, and *Zoku Tsūshin zenran* by Yūshōdō Shuppan.

which are accounts only of matters directly related to ceremonial in the castle at each of the seventeen audiences. To reveal the context within which bakumatsu diplomatic ceremonial was shaped, I have referred to histories of costume, histories of cuisine, and studies of other subfields of cultural history.

Here let me describe the organization of this book.

Chapters 1 and 2 provide foundational information for the chapters that follow. I want readers to get a firm grasp of the international environment and other background aspects in the years under consideration here, to enable them to appreciate the meaning of late Tokugawa diplomatic ceremonial. In these chapters I make frequent reference to the scholarship in related fields of research. The first chapter puts the stress primarily on Japan. After presenting a survey (in part one) of palace ceremonial in general under the Tokugawa regime, I focus (in part two) on scenes from the reception of a mission from Korea to show the state of Tokugawa ceremonial for foreign relations *before* the arrival of official representatives from Europe and the United States. Then (in part three), I introduce the career of the shogunate retainer Tsutsui Masanori, who will play a major role in the affairs that I analyze. This will acquaint readers with this volume's fundamental approach of emphasizing the individual human beings on the frontline of foreign relations. In the second chapter I swing away from the domestic to the foreign and examine traditions of diplomatic ceremonial in Western nations.

In Chapters 3 through 6, I advance the core arguments of this study as I present a detailed account, grounded firmly on documentary records, of what I have determined to be four stages in the development of diplomatic ceremonial in the shogun's castles in the seventeen ceremonies between the 1857 reception of Townsend Harris in Edo and the 1867 audiences with the last shogun Yoshinobu in Osaka. It is important for us to picture anew the concrete aspects of this ceremonial, but not only that. I would like to reevaluate the significance of ceremonial in each of these stages of development, paying careful attention to the connections between the ceremonies and giving due consideration to both shogunate officials' process of trial and error and the motives of the Western envoys.

In my last chapter I recapitulate the case for scrutinizing late Tokugawa diplomatic ceremonial. I hope that as a result of my investigation of this overlooked topic, the role played by the diplomacy of the Tokugawa shogunate in the history of Japan and East Asia, as well as *vis-à-vis* the Western world, will be clearly understood.

