


澳门基金会  
北京外国语大学  
中国海外汉学研究中心  
大象出版社  
合作项目

主编 张西平 吴志良 陶德民  
副主编 顾钧

# 北上天津北京远征 随记 (1858-1859)

(卷上)

Journal of S. Wells Williams: Expedition  
to Tientsin and Peking (1858-1859)



卫三畏文集

Selected Works of  
Samuel Wells Williams

宫泽真一 (主) 转写  
徐宝锋 (副) 整理  
马聪敏 (副)

 大象出版社

卫三畏文集  
Selected Works of  
Samuel Wells Williams

---

北上天津北京远征随记  
(1858—1859)  
(卷上)

Journal of S. Wells Williams:  
Expedition to Tientsin and Peking  
(1858—1859)

宫泽真一 (主)  
徐宝锋 (副) 转写、整理  
马聪敏 (副)

---



大象出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

北上天津北京远征随记(1858—1859):英文/[美]卫三畏著.  
[日]宫泽真一等转写、整理. —郑州:大象出版社,2014.1  
ISBN 978-7-5347-7971-8

I. ①北… II. ①卫… ②宫… III. ①社会生活—史料—中国—  
清后期—英文 IV. ①K255.06

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2014)第010001号

卫三畏文集

北上天津北京远征随记(1858—1859)

宫泽真一(主)

徐宝锋(副) 转写、整理

马聪敏(副)

---

出版人 王刘纯

责任编辑 李光洁

责任校对 钟 骄

---

出版发行 **大象出版社**(郑州市开元路16号 邮政编码450044)  
发行科 0371-63863551 总编室 0371-63863572

网 址 [www.daxiang.cn](http://www.daxiang.cn)

印 刷 河南省瑞光印务股份有限公司

经 销 各地新华书店经销

开 本 787×1092 1/16

印 张 50.75

字 数 736千字

版 次 2014年2月第1版 2014年2月第1次印刷

定 价 265.00元

若发现印、装质量问题,影响阅读,请与承印厂联系调换。

印厂地址 郑州市二环支路35号

邮政编码 450012

电话 (0371)63956290

## 主编序言

陶德民 张西平 吴志良

2008年8月8日，在北京奥运会开幕的当天，新落成的美国驻华使馆举行了剪彩仪式。美国国务院历史文献办公室为此发行了纪念图册，题为《共同走过的日子——美中交往两百年》，其中把1833年抵达广州的卫三畏(Samuel Wells Williams, 1812—1884)称扬为美国“来华传教第一人”，虽然他并非是第一个来到中国的美国传教士。图册对卫三畏在促进美中两国人民的相互了解方面所作的贡献作了这样的概括和评价：“传教士成为介绍中国社会与文化的重要信息来源，因为他们与大部分来华经商的外国人不一样，这些传教士学习了中文。例如，美国传教士卫三畏就会说流利的广东话和日语。他曾参与编辑英文期刊《中国丛报》，供西方传教士及时了解中国的最新动态，方便在美国的读者了解中国人的生活。卫三畏还编辑出版了《汉英拼音字典》（即《汉英韵府》——序者）和分为上下两卷的历史巨著《中国总论》。时至今日，他依然被公认为对19世纪的中国生活认识得最为精透的观察家。”

图册中也提到“蒲安臣于1862年成为第一个常驻北京的美国代表，在促进中国的国际关系上扮演了更为积极的角色。蒲安臣迅速结识了一批清政府的主要改革派官员，其中就包括咸丰皇帝的弟弟，设立了第一个外务部（应为总理各国事务衙门——序者）的恭亲王奕訢，”以及他1867年辞去驻华公使后作为清朝使节率团访问欧美，与当时的美国国务卿签订《蒲安臣条约》一事。“该条约扩展了中美两国的往来领域。条约规定，两国人民享有在彼此国家游历、居住的互惠权，并可入对方官学；中国领事在美国口岸享有完全的外交权利；鼓励华工移民美国；美国政府支持中国的领土主权。”其实，蒲安臣的卓有成效的外交活动及其维护正义的外交主张，与当时担任使馆秘书兼翻译的卫三畏的鼎力相助是分不开的。卫三畏的儿子卫斐列后来倾注极大热忱为蒲安臣撰写传记，其重要原因之一也在于此。

今天，当我们出版这部文集以纪念卫三畏诞辰200周年，并重新探讨其经历和成就之际，有必要思考这样一个问题，即卫三畏一生所体现的诸多志趣和倾向之中，什么是值得我们加以特别关注的呢？虽然这是一个“仁者见仁，智者见智”的问题，多数人恐怕都不会对以下见解持有异议，即卫三畏在对华态度上所发生的“从教化到对话”的某种转变可以说是他留给后世的最重要的精神遗产之一。而这恰恰可以从耶鲁大学校园里留存至今的两件文物上得到印证。

第一件文物是该校公共大食堂 (Commons Dining Hall) 墙上的卫三畏肖像画, 它其实是设在纽约的美国圣经协会所藏同一油画的一个复本。如所周知, 卫三畏的在华生涯大抵分为两个阶段, 作为传教士的前 22 年 (1833—1855) 和作为外交官的后 20 年 (1856—1876)。在前 22 年的最后一段时间里, 他还作为首席翻译官随同佩里将军的舰队两次远征日本, 在改变日本锁国政策的外交谈判过程中发挥了重要作用。佩里将军对其语言天赋和交涉手腕的赏识, 无疑是卫三畏转而步入为期 20 年的外交生涯的一个契机。1877 年辞职回国后不久, 他受聘为耶鲁大学的中国语言文学讲座教授。1881 年春被遴选为美国圣经协会会长后, 他便提出希望有才华的画家制作自己的肖像画, 并将其献给圣经协会。结果, 由耶鲁大学艺术学院的韦约翰教授制作的油画所呈现的是这样一个形象: 等身大的卫三畏站立在放有纸、笔和一个中国式花瓶的桌子边上, 目视前方, 手持 1858 年《中美天津条约》的文本。

很显然, 这样的构图反映了卫三畏本人的意思: 他一直把基督教传教自由的条款得以列入 1858 年《中美天津条约》看作自己毕生的最大成就。这是因为当时负责谈判的美国公使列卫廉对是否要在条约中加入该条款并不经意, 只是在卫三畏的坚持之下才获得了最后的成功。此一事实, 不仅可见于耶鲁大学斯德龄纪念图书馆附属档案馆所藏卫三畏的亲笔日记, 也可以由当时协助他进行谈判工作的丁魁良牧师后来所写的《花甲忆记》得到证实: “那份现在成为条约荣耀之处的条款是卫三畏博士提出的。”在预定签约的 6 月 18 日即“决定命运的那天早上, 卫三畏博士告诉我他一夜未眠, 一直在考虑这份宽容条款。现在他想到了一种新的形式, 可能会被对方接受。他写了下来, 我建议我们应当马上坐轿子直接奔赴中方官邸解决这个问题。……中方代表接见了我们, 他们当中的负责人稍作修改, 就接受了卫三畏博士的措辞”(详见陶德民《从卫三畏档案看 1858 年中美之间的基督教弛禁交涉——写在〈基督教传教士传记丛书〉问世之际》)。1876 年夏天, 美国国务院接受卫三畏的辞呈, 在正式解职通知中对他赞扬有加: “您对中国人的性格与习惯的熟悉, 对该民族及其政府愿望与需求的了解, 对汉语的精通, 以及您对基督教与文明进步事业的贡献, 都使您有足够的理由自豪。您无与伦比的中文字典与有关中国的诸多著作已为您赢得科学与文学领域内相应的崇高地位。更为重要的是, 宗教界不会忘记, 尤其多亏了您, 我们与中国订立的条约中才得以加入自由传教这一条。”而卫三畏则在复信中坦承, 这一嘉许是“最最让他感动与满意的”(见卫斐列著, 顾钧、江莉译《卫三畏生平及书信——一位美国来华传教士的心路历程》)。顺便提到, 在 1858 年 6 月 19 日, 亦即《中美天津条约》签订的第二天, 美国驻日总领事哈里斯便与德川幕府的代表签订了《美日修好通商条约》。卫三畏闻讯后, 又不失时机地向美国的新教诸团体提出派遣牧师赴日传教的建议, 并得到了切实的响应。所以, 对美国基督教会的东亚传教事业来说, 卫三畏确实是一位有功之臣。

那么, 卫三畏是基于一种什么样的信念而企图以基督教义来教化东亚的所谓异教徒的呢? 试举一个例子。1853 年 7 月 16 日, 在佩里将军初访日本, 成功向日方递交美国总统国书一周之后, 卫三畏曾从停泊在江户湾的军舰上给他在土耳其传教的弟弟 W. F. 威廉斯写了一封长信, 其中指出: “佩里告诉日本官员, 他将在次年率领一支

更大的舰队以求得到他们对所提要求的回答，即所有前来访问或遇难流落日本海岸的美国人应得到善待，美国汽船在一个日本港口得到煤炭以及有关物资的补给。这些是我们花费巨大开支和派出强大舰队到日本水域的表面上理由，而真正的理由是为了提高我们民族的名誉和得到称扬我们自己的材料。在这些理由的背后并通过这些理由，存有上帝的目的，即将福音传达给所有国家，并将神旨和责任送达这个至今为止只是在拙劣地模仿耶稣之真的民族。我十分确信，东亚各民族的锁国政策决非根据上帝的善意安排，其政府必须在恐怖和强制之下将之改变，尔后其人民或可自由。朝鲜人、中国人、琉球人和日本人必须承认这唯一活着的和真实的上帝，他们的锁国之墙必将为我们所拆除，而我们西方的太平洋沿岸城市正开始派出船队前往大洋的彼岸。”从卫三畏对佩里访日使命的解读来看，他固然赞成打开东亚各国的大门，但更重视把上帝的福音传入各国人们的心扉，期盼由此引发一系列的变革。因为他认定上帝所代表的真善美的品格和力量是美国等基督教国家所拥有的绝对优势和无比强势的源泉（详见陶德民《十九世纪中叶美国对日人权外交的启示——写在日本开国150周年之际》）。

然而，卫三畏在以后长期驻节北京的岁月里，逐步加深了对中国的悠久历史和深厚传统文化的了解，使他在对华态度上开始发生“从教化到对话”的某种转变。而这一点可以耶鲁校园里的另一件艺术杰作来作为象征，那就是在卫三畏于1884年2月16日去世两周之后，在举行其丧礼的巴特尔教堂（Battell Chapel）东北角中心位置安装的一块非常别致的彩色纪念玻璃。玻璃的中央写有《论语》中的七个汉字：“敏则有功，公则说。”（意思大体为，勤勉能积成事功，公道则众人心悦诚服。）玻璃的下方用英文记载了卫三畏的名字、生卒年份以及他一生所扮演的角色与身份，即“传教士、学者、外交官、耶鲁学院中文教授”。这块玻璃由纽约的路易斯·第法尼公司（Louis C. Tiffany & Co.）负责制作，其别出心裁的设计显然是出于卫三畏生前的授意。

卫三畏选用孔子的话作为自己一生的概括，可谓恰如其分。勤勉能积成事功的道理，可以从他孜孜不倦编纂而成的《中国丛报》、《中国总论》以及《汉英韵府》等多种刊物和名著得到了解。公道则众人心悦诚服的道理，则充分体现在了他辞职回国之际所受到的各界朋友的赞扬。他在信中告诉他的妻子，“临行前威妥玛于周六、西华于周一为我举办了两次特别宴会，我见到了北京的所有名流，并受到了他们的盛赞。然后，似乎是为了区别于外交聚会，丁韪良、艾约瑟、怀定先后请我吃饭。我告诉过你，我在丁韪良家见到了所有的传教士，那真是一次令人难忘的聚会”。“接连不断的登门送别者中有三四位是总理衙门的官员，京城中最位高权重的大官也来为我送行。除了亲王之外，我都是在办公室里会见他们，彼此依依惜别。九位官员每人赠我一柄折扇作为纪念，这充分显示了中国人的友善”。不仅北京的新教传教士们发给他一封送别信以示友谊与敬意，上海的同仁也发给他一封相似的信，恰如其分地总结了他在中国的生活：“您长期担任美国使馆秘书、翻译，九次代理公使的职务，这些工作给了您许多重要的机遇，使您得以把知识、经验用于为中国人造福、为您自己的国家谋利，尤其是为基督教在中国的传播效力。对您工作中表现出的高度责任感，我们不胜钦佩。”对这些热情洋溢的赞美之辞，卫三畏则表示自己的所作所为只不过是执行上帝的旨意，“我在传教过程中与同伴们相处融洽、身体健康、工作愉快，为此我要虔诚地赞

美造物主”。

在某种意义上说，卫三畏选用孔子的话来概括自己的一生，也显示了他对中国文化传统的敬重之意。而这种敬重之意，可以由1879年他为反对加州的排华风潮而撰写的《中国移民》中的一节得到佐证：“当加州的法庭想用立法来反对中国人时，它将中国人等同于印第安人的简单态度是颇为古怪的。生理学家查尔斯·匹克林将中国人和印第安人归为蒙古的成员，但加州的最高法院却认为‘印第安族包括汉族和蒙古族’。这样在概念错误的同时，它还支持了一种错误的观点。它把现存最古老国度的臣民和一个从未超越部落关系的种族相提并论；把这样一个民族——它的文学早于《诗篇》和《出埃及记》，并且是用一种如果法官本人肯于学习就不会叫作印第安语的语言写就，而它的读者超过了其他任何民族的作品——与最高的写作成就仅是一些图画和牛皮上的符号的人群混为一谈；把勤奋、谨慎、技艺、学识、发明等所有品质和全部保障人类生命和财产安全的物品等同于猎人和游牧民族的本能和习惯。它诋毁了一个教会我们如何制作瓷器、丝绸、火药，给予我们指南针，展示给我们茶叶的用处，启迪我们采用考试选拔官员的制度的民族；把它和一个轻视劳动，没有艺术、学校、贸易的种族归为同类，后者的一部分现在还混迹于加州人中间，满足于以挖草根过活。”虽然卫三畏在赞扬中国人的同时，也表达了他对印第安人的歧视态度，他的观点还是得到当时耶鲁学院全体教授的同情，他们纷纷签名支持他起草的请愿书，呼吁海斯总统否决1879年的反移民法，其中包含这样的警告：如果我们的政府首先改变条约的规定，中国政府也可以根据国际法取消治外法权，致使美国在华公民失去领事的保护。此外，1878年中国北方发生大饥荒时，身处太平洋彼岸的卫三畏利用他对美国在华传教士和商社的影响，不遗余力地推动救灾。他还试图劝说国会归还1859年中方赔款余额的一部分来帮助缓解灾区的困境。而早在1860年，他就曾建议国务院用这笔赔款余额在中国建立一所美中学院，以培养中方的翻译、通商和外交人才。这个建议得到了新上任的总统林肯的同意，只因为当时的国会未予批准而搁浅。卫三畏这个未能实现的建议完全可以称之为后来退回庚款吸引中国学生留美的先驱性方案。

卫三畏还对亲眼目睹的中国同时代的缓慢而确凿的变化做了一定的正面评价。1883年7月，即辞世的半年多之前，卫三畏在儿子的帮助下终于完成了《中国总论》这一巨著的修订工作，在增补版的序言中他写下了如下字句：“我在1833年到达广州时，和另外两位美国人作为‘番鬼’向行商经官正式报告，在他的监护之下才得以生存。1874年，我作为美国驻北京公使馆秘书，跟随艾忒敏公使觐见同治皇帝，美国使节站在与‘天子’完全平等的地位呈上国书。由于一生之中的这两次遭遇，并念念不忘在思想和道德上的重大进步是使一个孤傲的政府从强加于人的姿态改而听从他人所必需的，毫不足怪的是，我确信汉人的子孙有着伟大的未来，不过，唯有纯正基督教的发展才是能使这一成长过程中的各个冲突因素免于互相摧残的充分条件。无论如何，这个国家已经度过被动时期，这是肯定无疑的。中国不可能再安于懒散隔绝——像过去那样，以过于自负的态度俯视其他国家，就像面对她所无需劳神的星星一样。”

如果说，17世纪的礼仪之争最后是以天主教士在康熙禁令之下被逐出中国告终的，那么，这场可谓19世纪的礼仪之争则是以“天朝上国”在第二次鸦片战争之后所做

出的巨大让步来结局的，包括废除以夷相称、公使驻京、平身觐见皇帝而不必行三跪九叩之礼。卫三畏的字里行间所透露的，既有在礼仪上争得与最古老“中央王国”之“天子”平等地位自豪，又有从其所信奉的上帝的立场针砭这个王国“懒散隔绝”和“过于自负”的高傲。联系到上述1853年他给在土耳其传教的弟弟W. F. 威廉斯的长信，可见这时的卫三畏虽然在其对华态度上开始了“从教化到对话”的转变，但并未把“异教徒”放在完全对等的位置上，特别是在道德和精神的层面上。在这个意义上说，自以为占据着道德精神的制高点，只有基督教可以拯救中国的卫三畏也难免“过于自负”的诟病。这就是笔者在前文中提到其转变时，始终不忘加上“某种”一词来予以限定的缘故。

尽管如此，卫三畏在序言中宣称，修订版“坚持初版序言中所述的观点——为中国人民及其文明洗刷掉古怪的、模糊不清的可笑印象”。卫三畏相信，在传教“事业取得成功的基础上，中国作为一个民族，在道义和政治两方面，将会得到拯救。这一成功有可能和人民的需要同步前进。他们将会变得适应于自己着手处理问题，并且和外国文明以多种活动形式结合起来。不久，将会引进铁路、电报和制造业，随之而来的是中国人民中成百万地受到启发，无论在宗教、政治和家庭生活的每一方面”。这种力图呈现中国文明及民族的美好品质和衷心期待中国在对外交往中日益开放进步的善意态度，自然是应该予以充分肯定的。

从卫三畏的例子不难联想到，身处所谓“轴心文明”（主要以几大世界性宗教作为标识）的人们往往患有“老子天下第一”的自恋症，而以“居高临下”的态度傲视其他人，难以免俗和根治。反观我们自己，历代国人的“华夷之辨”又何尝不是如此？而时至今日，仍不乏“宅兹中国”的自尊和输出“天下体系”的自负。但也不必悲观，因为这个五彩缤纷的世界本来就是由形形色色、各有偏好的人们构成的。他们之间有相辅相成的关系，也有相反相成的因素。虽然各派宗教和文化的代表自以为有“替上帝传教”或“替天行道”的使命，谁都无法垄断真理和剥夺他人的信仰，也不能指望按照自己的面貌来彻底改造他人。其出于宗教或政治动机的种种努力的后果，客观上会推动各国和各民族之间的交往和融合，并推动人类文明的进步和升华，则是毫无疑问的。从这一点来看，卫三畏一生的变化过程所显示的方向对我们建构今日地球村的和平共处规则还是不乏启迪作用的，那就是要逐渐学会把“老子化胡”的心态改为“相敬如宾”的心理，对异民族、异文化和异文明采取更加宽容、尊重和善于调适的态度，以使用文明对话来取代文明对抗，从而把亨廷顿认为不可避免的“文明冲突”消弭于萌芽状态和无形之间。



## Preface

While visiting the Archive of the Yale University Library to prepare for publication in China of the correspondence (September 22 1812 – February 16 1884)<sup>1</sup> of Samuel Wells Williams, I found the three bound volumes of his diaries. One of them is what you have now in your hands, his daily journal of the American Expedition to Tientsin and Peking in 1858 and 1859<sup>2</sup>.

S. Wells Williams liked to write letters to his family, friends and colleagues. What we sometimes call his “Peking Journal” in short is actually not a diary, but it is the collection of 200 sheets of letter-paper which were written, folded and carried by person or by mail to his wife, as private letters first of all. After his death, his only son, Frederick Wells Williams edited those private letters for the sake of publication.

We can see how Frederick edited his father’s writings. For one thing, he cut off quite a lot of whole pages and passages especially referring to the family affairs and personal religious life of his father, which amounts to something nearly 50 leaves in all. He sometimes thought it better to change the words or paraphrase expressions of his father. We can notice a few misprints as well, which apparently were overlooked in proof-reading by Frederick.

My principle of preparing a transcription text out of whatever autograph papers, such as letters or diaries, of S.

1 《美国耶鲁大学图书馆藏卫三畏未刊往来书信集》(全23册), 广西师范大学出版社, 2012年12月。

2 Yale MS547/ Series II. Samuel Wells Williams Papers / Box 30. Journal of Visit to Peking 1858–1859.

Wells Williams, is a scribe's constant faithfulness to his original writing. The working procedure is something like careful and patient reading of his autograph writing to start with, then preserve or represent it in every way possible to our modern computer usage.

It is hard to say who formed the original sheets of letter-paper into a bound volume, perhaps by S. Wells Williams himself, dating back to 1860s to 1870s, or by his son Frederick dating back to 1900s. We can understand that the bound volume was better than a collection of numbered and folded sheets of letter-paper, when it came to printing. On the other hand, a bound volume is likely to suffer much more damage, for a spine and thread is often broken by rough hands of compositors.

Actually the preservation condition of our volume is extremely bad indeed, torn pages, spine broken, etc. Since it is apparently hard to have the damaged volume microfilmed, the only choice left to me for reading and typing it was to spend one summer at New Haven to read and transcribe it from the original document, another summer to make a digital camera photo copy of the volume, and the third summer for my son, 宫泽文雄 to spend two weeks at the Library to get my own digital photo copy re-shot or corrected. He pointed out so many parts of my first draft transcription text which were not faithful representations of the original text.

We fear that it costs so much time and cost in restoration that perhaps for some time to come we may find it difficult to prepare any facsimile reprint edition of the original "Peking Journal" volume for publication.

宫泽真一 (北京语言大学汉学研究所), chief editor, is responsible for the transcription text of this volume, while both 徐宝锋 (北京语言大学) and 马聪敏 (陕西师范大学)

assisted me in correcting the transcription text and making editorial notes.

I tried my best to be faithful and exact to the original writing of S. Wells Williams. Notes in square brackets are those of editors, while a few notes in round brackets are those of S. Wells Williams himself. Frederick, his son, added a number of scribblings in red pencils on the original text, and also he changed the way of speaking of his father etc. I ignored them all of the later changes or mistyping on the part of Frederick, purposing only to be as faithful a transcriber to his father as possible.

It is a great pleasure to dedicate this humble work to Hiroko and John Charles in memory of our joint work toward initiating the study-abroad-scholarship of the Toyota City & Trevelyan Trust Fund for both Toyota City and British students at the International Student House, Great Portland, London, when we were younger goats.

Before concluding this note, kindly allow me a moment to name and tell you about three scholars and one editor in particular. Without their respective efforts to encourage and help me, the two projects of publishing my transcripts of S. Wells Williams' correspondence and journals could not have been accomplished.

Dr. Gu Jun has been the main organizer of the two projects, always genial and willing to offer his helping hands to me. He kindly included my humble transcripts into his two Williams editions in China.

Mr. Jonathan Huang has encouraged me by repeating his conclusive words, "Do it!" Besides his life-long research and knowledge of Lu Xun, I am indebted to him many times for his cultivated wits and friendship à la Dr. Samuel Johnson.

Dr. 田力 is teaching history at Ninpo University now, but

one day several years back I chanced to visit the microfilm reading room of the National Library in Beijing. I caught a glimpse of a young scholar intent on reading some English autograph letters of early missionaries. I was pleasantly surprised to know that a young promising scholar is interested in working on autograph writings, sometimes very difficult stuff to read and type for anybody. Instantly I respected him so much that I told him his Chinese name can be translated into Japanese saying “Watashi wa Otokodesu,” with the two characters combined to form a new character 男 .

Lastly, I heavily owe to the editor in charge of the publishing project of the Williams writings at this press, Ms Li, for her excellent English and ever sincere devotion to her editorial work.

宫泽真一 (Shinichi Miyazawa)  
November, 2013, Beijing

## Contents

Preface .....	1
Journal of S. Wells Williams:Expedition to Tientsin and Peking 1858 .....	1
Notes .....	313
Journal of S. Wells Williams:Expedition to Tientsin and Peking 1859 .....	337
Reference .....	740
Notes .....	750

1858

129

a distance, and out of the boat who landed, we hear that  
200 at least were killed or disabled within a few mo-  
ments. The Chinese, in order to see where their enemy  
was, had prepared fireworks at the end of long sticks,  
which they held over the wall and burned; the light  
was bright and illuminated the ground, and they could  
give with certainty. The walls and embrasures were  
crowded with men, some of them waving flags, and  
urging the English to come on, others discharging their  
poisoned arrows, and the most dangerous sending hun-  
dreds of balls among them. The English began to re-  
treat, and then the casualties became more serious, for the  
wounded were often unable to help themselves into the  
boats, and were drowned in the attempt; the shot hit  
the boats and some were left on the beach, injured  
and caught by the iron chevaux-de-frise on the bot-  
tom.

Nobody could think of leaving the wounded there, &  
the boats went to and from the nearest wharves, taking  
everybody who got in, and coming back as soon as  
possible. The party landed about half past eight, and  
the boats continued to search the bank for wounded strag-  
glers until 2 o'clock; their cries could be heard on board  
ships, and they guided the Chinese too to the boats in  
search for them. The dead were left, and in the morn-  
ing the Chinese came down for their heads; but I



Mississippi, April 17, 1858

We left Shanghai this week Monday, (12<sup>th</sup> Ap.) and have had few incidents during the passage, much worthy of note. Mrs F. D. Williams, & Mrs Wheelock, with their husbands, of whom you have some acquaintance, I believe, and half a dozen gentlemen, went to Wusung with our party in the "Antelope," to see the Minnesota as much as anything else. During the 10 days passed in Shanghai I [have] [been] was much occupied with a succession of trifling matters, and the time preceded quickly; and now we are off the mouth of the Pei-ho, more than half expecting a rebuff and no better success than those who have preceded us. Yet the ignorance and distance of past generations can no longer be maintained by the Chinese, tho' much patience will be needed to remove them, and not unlikely some application of the switch to compel unwilling Pride.

I have found the captain and officers of the amiable gentlemen, and if it had not been for the depression from seasickness, squeamishness, I should have enjoyed the passage hither much more, as I could all sea-voyages. It certainly makes me wonder more at the power of those minds which can well compose on board ship.

Capt. Nicholson & Mr Reed [William Bradford Reed: 1806—1876/ American Minister to China, April 1857 to November 1858] spend much time in recalling old names and scenes, both of them being from Phil<sup>a</sup>, in whose prosperity and hap they take much interest. One therefore hears much of people who have & still live, & though not knowing one of them personally, [so] [that] I have been much entertained. M<sup>r</sup> Reed [William Bradford Reed] knows many public men, of whom I have only heard by report



or newspapers eulogiums, and has formed rather decided opinions on the standing of most of them, & their relative value in the political and social world. Whether I agree with him or not, the portraitures are not the less amusing & instructive. The marine officer, Jacob Read, is one and the same that he was when in the “Vandalia,” and I have had some joking with him as to his part of the performance of conducting P. Parker [D<sup>r</sup> Peter Parker: 1804-1888/ pioneer medical missionary in China/ embarked on June 3, 1834, in the missionary boat of Olyphant’s company *Morrison* for Canton] across the Garden at Canton in Feb. / 56 when the latter made his advent at Commissioner. He was as much impressed with the solemn nonsense as any others present, at that time. The chief engineer of this ship was in her last cruise, & from him I have learned something about the people then with him. Life in the navy is a kaleidoscope sort of existence, and the transition from one ship to another in successive voyages, each one furnishing an entirely new set of persons and minds, tends to explain somewhat the careless & selfish characteristics so prominent in most naval persons who have no higher standard of action than the good opinion of those they happen to be with. After the fourth or fifth cruise, this mode of life becomes easy, & I don’t wonder that naval men cling to it, fruitless as it is in the higher attainments of life. Capt. Nicholson reads prayers morning & evening himself, and most of the officers and crew attend, it being optional with them to do so; he is entitled to much praise for this, the more so as it is so unusual in our navy.

On Thursday we passed near Shantung Promontory, near enough to get the idea of a barren & rugged succession of hill-tops, none of them very high, say 300 or 400 ft. and none of them presenting any woodland. Probably a landing