

On the “Official Missions to Hạ châu” (下洲公務) in the Early Nguyễn Period

CHEN Ching-ho (陳荊和)

English translation of 陳荊和「阮朝初期の「下洲公務」に就いて」, 創大アジア研究 (*Sôdai Ajia kenkyû* / *The Journal of Institute of Asian Studies*, Soka University) 11 (March 1990): 63–82, with the author’s summary (摘要), p. 83 (English title in the journal’s contents: “On the ‘Hạ-châu Missions’ (下洲公務) conducted during the early Period of the Nguyen Dynasty,” by Chingho A. Chen); collated with the French translation by Claudine Salmon, Shibata Shintarō and Tạ Trọng Hiệp, “Les « missions officielles dans les Hạ châu » ou « Contrées méridionales » de la première période des Nguyễn,” *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* 81 (1994): 101–124.

Translator’s [i.e., Claude’s] Preface

Chen Ching-ho’s article was written in Japanese and published in 1990. In 1994 Claudine Salmon, with Shibata Shintarō and Tạ Trọng Hiệp, published a French translation in the *BEFEO*. The Vietnamese translation of the *Đại Nam thực lục*, several missions that Chen had missed, Western-calendar dates, and the original English of the passages Chen quoted from Alastair Lamb. It also contains a number of misreadings of the Japanese. This English translation tries to keep what the French added while staying faithful to what Chen actually wrote.

The conventions followed are these:

- **Base text.** The English is translated from the Japanese original. The French was consulted sentence by sentence. Where the two differ in substance, the English follows the Japanese, and a translator’s note (TN) records what the French says. Appendix A lists the most significant differences in one place.
- **Romanization.** As requested, the romanizations of the French translation are kept: Vietnamese *quốc ngữ* for Vietnamese persons, places, offices and ship names; pinyin for Chinese persons and book titles (e.g. Huang Zhongtong, *Haiguo tuzhi*); and the French forms of other place names (Kelapa, Pinang, Malaka). They have been checked against a scan of the printed *BEFEO* article. Where the printed French romanization does not match the Chinese characters in Chen’s text, it is still kept, but each case is listed in Appendix B with the characters and their standard reading.
- **Chinese text.** Chinese characters are given for key terms and for every passage of the *Đại Nam thực lục* (and other Chinese sources) that Chen quoted. Chen printed them in Japanese forms (竜, 仏, 広, 図, 伝, 総, 弁 and so on). They are given here in traditional forms, as they appear

in the Nguyễn chronicle. Characters absent from standard fonts are described by their components, e.g. [木+哥]. The Chinese has not been checked against an edition of the *Thực lục* itself, so for anything that will be cited, a check against the Keio University edition is still recommended.

- **Dates and references.** Dates are given as Chen gives them: cyclical year, regnal year, lunar month, with the Western year in parentheses. Where the French translators converted the lunar date to a Western month that differs from Chen’s year, their conversion follows in square brackets. The references in the form “= VN trans. II, 78” point to volume and page of the Vietnamese translation by the Institute of History (Viện Sử học). They were added by the French translators and are kept because they are useful. In the chronicle references, “first kỷ” etc. are the first, second and third records (*đệ nhất kỷ* 第一紀 etc.) of the *Chính biên*, and “q.” is *quyển* 卷.
- **Notes.** Three kinds of note appear as footnotes, each labelled: [Chen] the author’s own notes, with their original numbers; [French trans.] notes added by the French translators, with their numbers in the *BEFEO*; and [TN] notes by the present translator. Missions that the French translators added to Part I are printed in shaded boxes marked “Added by the French translators.”
- **Pagination.** Page numbers of the Japanese original are given in grey as [J63] , [J64] , etc. They are placed at the nearest paragraph or sentence break, so they are approximate.
- **Author’s summary.** The Japanese article ends with a one-page summary by the author (摘要, p. 83). The French translation omitted it. It is translated at the end of this document.

On the “Official Missions to Hạ châu” in the Early Nguyễn Period

CHEN Ching-ho¹

Introduction

[J63] The first, second and third records (*kỷ* 紀) of the *Đại Nam thực lục chính biên* 大南寔錄正編 (hereafter ĐNTL) cover the three reigns of Gia Long 嘉隆, Minh Mạng 明命 and Thiệu Trị 紹治, a period of roughly sixty years from the 1780s to the 1840s. In their records of relations with the various parts of Southeast Asia, we frequently find entries stating that official ships (*quan thuyền* 官船) of the Nguyễn went “to Hạ châu on official business” (*như Hạ châu công vụ* 如下洲公務).² What was the content and character of this official business? And what places did Hạ châu 下洲 and the place names related to it designate? The purpose of this article is to try to answer these questions.

Apart from Hạ châu, the names of places and countries in Southeast and South Asia with which the Nguyễn government had relations at this time include Giang-lưu-ba 江流波, Tiểu Tây (Dương) 小西(洋), Cô-á 孤亞 [sic, for 姑亞], Mã-la-kha 瑪羅[木+哥], Tân-gia-ba 新嘉波, Tân-lang-dữ 檳榔嶼, Nhu-phật 柔佛 and Tam-ba-lăng 三吧凌. The geographical areas these names designate are almost the same as in Chinese usage. Hạ châu is different. For some periods it is impossible to determine clearly where it refers to, and this can cause perplexity when one uses the ĐNTL as a historical source.³

¹[French trans., unnumbered note on the author] “The author, born in 1917, is a historian specializing in Southeast Asia who was attached to the EFEO in Hà Nội from 1942 to 1945. He has published, in particular, various studies on Vietnam and its Chinese communities. The present study, which we translate from the Japanese, is his second-to-last to date. It appeared in *Sôdai Ajia kenkyû* / *The Journal of Institute of Asian Studies* (Soka University, Tokyo), no. 11, March 1990, pp. 63–82, under the title ‘Nguyễn chôn shoki no “Kashû kômu” ni tsuite.’ To make the text easier to read, we have added various notes marked N.d.T. in parentheses, and for all quotations from the *Đại Nam thực lục chính biên* we have given references to the Vietnamese translation by the Institute of History in Hà Nội. We have also reinserted the few missions that the author had missed (while marking them in italics in the list by destination in Part III). We have tried to translate titles and administrative offices to make the text easier to follow, but have added the Sino-Vietnamese terms in parentheses to avoid ambiguity. As this article goes to press, the latest issue of the *Sôdai Ajia kenkyû* (no. 15, March 1994) has just appeared in honour of Professor Chen Ching-ho; it contains a list of all his works in Japanese, Chinese, English and Vietnamese (pp. 151–155).”

²[TN] Throughout their translation, including the title, the French translators gloss Hạ châu 下洲 as “Contrées méridionales” (Southern Regions). Chen himself does not translate the term; he treats its meaning as the question the article sets out to answer. The literal sense is “lower islands/lands,” and Chen argues in Part III that “lower” here also carries the sense of “southern.” The term is left untranslated here.

³[TN] The printed list is: 江流波, 小西(洋), 孤亞 [sic, for 姑亞, Goa], 瑪羅[木+哥] (Malaka), 新嘉波, 檳榔嶼, 柔佛, 三把凌. The French list (Giang-lưu-ba = Kelapa or Batavia; Tiểu Tây Dương = “Petites Mers de l’Ouest”; Cô-á = Goa; Mã-la-kha = Malaka; Tân-gia-ba = Singapore; Tân-lang-dữ = Pinang; Nhu-phật = Johor; Tam-ba-lăng = Semarang) therefore matches Chen’s, with identifications added. The third character of 瑪羅[木+哥] (kha) is written 木 beside 哥, here and in the 1793 entry; it is not in standard fonts. Tam-ba-lăng is written 三把凌 here and 三吧凌

The relations between modern Vietnam and the Western powers have long been the subject of excellent studies, from the standpoint of diplomacy and trade, by H. Cordier, Ch. B. Maybon, J. Chesneaux, A. Lamb, Wong Lin Ken, N. Tarling and Nguyễn Thế Anh.⁴ Most of these, however, rely on the sources and records of the English East India Company, and Vietnamese sources have received little attention. This short study gathers the Vietnamese material found in the ĐNTL and attempts to compare it with the European sources.

I. The Overseas Missions of the Early Nguyễn: A General Survey

Let us begin by setting out the relevant passages in chronological order. The first appearance of Hạ châu is in the entry for the 8th month of *mậu-thân*, the 9th year (1788), in the first *kỷ* of the ĐNTL (q. 3, 17b = VN trans. II, 78):

命內院鄭進才、周文觀等往下洲，採買砲彈、硫黃、焰硝，以備軍用。

Ordered Trịnh Tiên Tài and Châu Văn Quan of the Nội viện 內院⁵ to go to Hạ châu to purchase cannon shot, sulphur and saltpetre for military use.⁶

The Vietnamese translation of the ĐNTL by the translation team of the Institute of History (Viện Sử học) adds a note to Hạ châu in this passage: “that is, Xanh-ga-pua or Tân-gia-ba, commonly called Miền dưới [the lower region].”⁷ In the 8th month of that year Nguyễn Phúc Ánh (later Gia Long, first emperor of the Nguyễn dynasty), in the course of his long civil war with the Tây Sơn regime, had just recovered Gia Định for the time being. Here he was sending envoys to Hạ châu

later. Chen also says that the problem of Hạ châu “can cause perplexity when one uses the ĐNTL as a source”; the French says rather that “the ĐNTL do not help us to solve the problem.”

⁴[French trans. n. 1] N.d.T. For the very numerous studies of H. Cordier, Ch. B. Maybon and J. Chesneaux, see Nguyễn Thế Anh, *Bibliographie critique sur les relations entre le Viêt-nam et l'Occident (ouvrages et articles en langues occidentales)* (Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve & Larose, 1967). The other works the author refers to are: Alastair Lamb, *The Mandarin Road to Old Hué: Narratives of Anglo-Vietnamese Diplomacy from the 17th Century to the Eve of the French Conquest* (London, 1970); Wong Lin Ken, “The Trade of Singapore 1819–69,” *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 33, pt. 4, no. 192 (Dec. 1960): 1–315; Nicholas Tarling, *Imperial Britain in South-East Asia* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1975); and *Piracy and Politics in the Malay World: A Study of British Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century South-east Asia* (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1978; 1st ed. 1963).

⁵[French trans. n. 2] N.d.T. Perhaps an abbreviated form of Nội Hàn Viện, one of the three small secretariats created under Gia Long; cf. Alexander Barton Woodside, *Vietnam and the Chinese Model: A Comparative Study of Vietnamese and Chinese Government in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 2nd printing, 1988), p. 85.

⁶[TN] The printed article has 鄭進才, which agrees with the French Trịnh. (The OCR transcription read 鄭.) The French renders 砲彈 (cannon shot) as “des armes et des munitions,” its usual rendering of 兵器 (arms).

⁷[Chen n. 1] Tổ Phiên-dịch, Viện Sử học 史學院翻譯組, *Đại Nam thực lục* 大南寔錄 [Vietnamese translation], Tập II, Chính biên, Đề nhất kỷ I (Hanoi, 1963), p. 78, n. 1. [French n. 3 gives the same reference and adds (N.d.T.): “See below for the author’s interpretation.”]

to procure cannon shot and gunpowder. Thereafter the camp of the Nguyễn lord sent envoys toward Hạ châu many times for the same purpose.⁸

***Canh-tuất*, 11th year (1790), 12th month [French: Jan. 1791] (first *kỷ*, q. 5, 11a = VN trans. II, 129)**

[J64] The same kind of order is recorded here:

命內院陳武客往江流波，採買兵器。

Ordered Trần Vũ Khách of the Nội viện to go to Giang-lư-ba to purchase arms.⁹

The translation team of the Institute of History annotates this Giang-lư-ba: “that is, Gia-các-ta (Jakarta), the present capital of Indonesia.”¹⁰ In early modern times, however, the overseas Chinese and Chinese merchants referred to Jakarta by the name 咬啍吧 (Jiaoliuba). The *Mingshi* 明史 uses the same characters in its notice on Holland. Zhang Xie’s 張燮 *Dongxiyang kao* 東西洋考 of the Ming glosses the name as 加留吧 (Jialiuba) in its entry on Xiagang 下港 [Banten]. The *Hailu* 海錄¹¹ writes 噶喇吧 (Gelaba). The coconut palm is called *kalapa* in Javanese, and before the arrival of the Dutch, Jakarta was called Sunda Kalapa; so the overseas Chinese and Chinese merchants presumably called it 咬啍吧 for that reason. In the Dutch period the name Batavia was rendered in Chinese as 巴道以啞 (Badaoyiya) or 目豈余 (Mudouyu).¹² The translation team seems to regard Giang-lư-ba (Sino-Vietnamese Giang-lư-ba; Fujianese reading Kang liu po) as a transliteration of “Jakarta.” It is more reasonable to regard it as a transliteration of 咬啍吧 (Kao

⁸[TN] Chen writes that Nguyễn Phúc Ánh had recovered Gia Định in the 8th month “for the time being” (一旦), in the course of “the long civil war with the Tây Sơn regime.” The French omits both qualifications and instead dates the recapture precisely to “the 1st day of the 8th month,” which is not in the Japanese. The Japanese transcription writes the Vietnamese note first as “Xanh-gia-pua” and later as “Xanh-ga-pua”; the French has Xanh-ga-pua in both places.

⁹[TN] The printed article has 陳武客, which agrees with the French Khách.

¹⁰[Chen n. 2] Ibid., p. 129, n. 1. [= French n. 4]

¹¹[French trans. n. 5] N.d.T. The *Hailu* was written by Yang Pingnan on the basis of information from Xie Qinggao (1765–1821), who had become blind after spending fourteen years abroad; the first edition dates from 1842.

¹²[Chen n. 3] My annotated edition of Shangdezhe 尚德者 [W. H. Medhurst], comp., “Jiaoliuba zonglun” 咬啍吧總論, *Shigaku* 史學 22, no. 1, p. 73. [French n. 6 adds the date 1943 and (N.d.T.): “In the Minnan dialect, Mudouyu is pronounced Bactauu.”]

liu pa). As can be seen in the *Ka I Hen Tai* 華夷變態,¹³ the ships of Chinese merchants that came to Nagasaki to trade from Jakarta were all called “Kelapa ships” (咬啣吧船, *Ko-ryû-pa sen*).¹⁴

Quý-sửu, 14th year (1793), 11th month (first kỳ, q. 6, 35a = VN trans. II, 183)

命該隊眺呐鳴 (Quảng-nôi-vê) 、隊長巴哆吱 (Pa-đơ-chi) (均西洋人) , 往姑亞 (Cô-á) 城、瑪羅[木+哥] (Mã-la-kha) 等處採買兵器。

Ordered the *cai đội* 該隊 [company commander] Quảng-nôi-vê and the *đội trưởng* 隊長 [squad leader] Pa-đơ-chi (both Westerners) to go to the city of Cô-á, Mã-la-kha and other places to purchase arms.

Cô-á in this passage also appears in the first kỳ, in the entry for the 1st month of *đinh-mùi*, the 8th year (1787). The translation team identifies it as Goa, the Portuguese possession on the Malabar coast of India, and Mã-la-kha as Malaka on the Malay Peninsula.¹⁵ The two Westerners were French volunteers in the service of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh. The first was probably Godefroy de Forçanz,¹⁶ and the second probably Bishop Jean Labartette.¹⁷¹⁸

¹³[French trans. n. 7] N.d.T. On the three manuscript versions of the *Ka I Hen Tai* [華夷變態] and on the Chinese translation published in 1906, see Chen Ching-ho, “Qingchu huabo zhi Changqi maoyi ji Rinan hangyun” (The Role of Chinese Junks in Nagasaki–South Trade and Navigation during the Early Ch’ing), *Nanyang xuebao* 25, no. 1 (June 1957): 14, n. 28. On the text published in 1958–60, see notice 216 of the *Revue bibliographique de sinologie* 6 (1960): 120–121.

¹⁴[TN] Chen says that 咬啣吧 was the name used for Jakarta by overseas Chinese “in early modern times” (近世). The French renders this as “jusque récemment” (until recently), which is a mistranslation. The printed article has 明史和蘭伝 (notice on Holland in the *Mingshi*), as the French understood it. The Chinese names of Batavia are printed 巴道以啞 and 目荳余, which agree with the French Badaoyiya and Mudouyu (n. 6; the French text has “Mutouyu”). The French also supplies Minnan readings not in the Japanese (Kaoliupa, Kaliupa, Koahlapa, Kangliupa), the date of the *Dongxiyang kao* (1617), the gloss Banten for Xiagang, and the Malay form *kelapa*. From this point on, the French translation renders 江流波 simply as “Kelapa,” following Chen’s argument, and that practice is followed here.

¹⁵[Chen n. 4] Vietnamese translation of the ĐNTL, p. 183, nn. 1, 2. [= French n. 8]

¹⁶[Chen n. 5] Alastair Lamb, *The Mandarin Road to Old Hue* (London, 1970), p. 180.

¹⁷[Chen n. 6] Ibid., p. 192. [French n. 9 combines Chen’s notes 5 and 6 (“Lamb, p. 180 n. 1 and 192”) and adds: “where it is stated that the Breton Godefroy de Forçanz arrived in Indochina in 1789, served Nguyễn Phúc Ánh as commander of the navy and died at Huế in 1811; as for Jean Labartette, a native of Bayonne, it is noted that he came to Indochina as a missionary in 1773 and in 1799 succeeded Pigneau de Béhaine as head of the mission. He died in Annam in 1833 at the age of 77.”]

¹⁸[TN] The French says that Cô-á appears “in the 9th year, *đinh-mùi* (1787)”; Chen has the 8th year (丁未八年), and the French itself gives the 8th year when the same entry is cited later (on Bút-tu-kê). The first name is printed 眺呐鳴 with Chen’s romanization Quảng-nôi-vê (French Quảng-nôi-vê). Chen romanizes the second name Pa-đơ-chê; the French has Pa-đơ-chi. The French omits “city” (城) after Cô-á. On the character [木+哥] in Mã-la-kha, see the note on the introduction.

Bính-thìn, 17th year (1796), 10th month (first *kỷ*, q. 9, 3a = VN trans. II, 247)

命該隊巴郎締 (Ba-lang-hy) 、巴羅移 (Ba-la-di) (紅毛人) 往下洲採買兵器。

Ordered the *cai đội* Ba-lang-hy and Ba-la-di (Hồng mao men 紅毛人) to go to Hạ châu to purchase arms.

The *Haiguo tuzhi* 海國圖志¹⁹ (juan 13, "Southeast Ocean: Island Countries, 3" 東南洋海島國三) says: "The Yingguili 英圭黎 are called Hongmao 紅毛 [red-haired] by the Chinese" (英圭黎，華人呼為紅毛). So Hồng mao sometimes meant the English. Usage in the ĐNTL varies, however, and Hồng mao often refers to white Europeans in general, just as Tây dương nhân 西洋人 ("Westerners") does. As will be shown below, Ba-lang-hy and Ba-la-di were both Frenchmen.²⁰

Đinh-tý, 18th year (1797), 2nd month (first *kỷ*, q. 9, 15b = VN trans. II, 257)

命內院曾光蘆往柔佛國，採買兵器。

Ordered Tăng Quang Lư of the Nội viện to go to the country of Nhu-phật to purchase arms.²²

The translation team annotates this Nhu-phật as "the state of Johore at the southern tip of the Malay Peninsula."²³ This is a careless note: the name does not refer to present-day Johor Bahru, which the overseas Chinese call Roufo xinshan 柔佛新山 ("New Johor"). The name Roufo 柔佛 first appears in the notice on Roufo (柔佛傳) in the *Mingshi*, which says: "Roufo is also called Wuding jiaolin" (柔佛一名烏丁礁林). Professor Xu Yunqiao 許雲樵 took Wuding jiaolin to be a transcription of Ujong Tanah and identified the place as Old Johor (Johor Lama).²⁴

¹⁹[French trans. n. 10] N.d.T. A geographical compendium on foreign countries compiled by Wei Yuan (1794–1856), which had a very great influence in China. There are several editions: the first, of 1844, in 50 chapters; the second, of 1847, in 60; and the third, of 1852, in 100 chapters. Cf. J. K. Fairbank and Ssu-yü Têng, *Ch'ing Administration: Three Studies*, Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies 19 (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), pp. 216–217.

²⁰[French trans. n. 11] N.d.T. See below, the text corresponding to note 58 [i.e. the discussion of Barisy in Part III].

²¹[TN] Chen compares Hồng mao with 西洋人 (Tây dương nhân, "Westerners"); the French has "Dương nhân." The French also adds "(Barisy)" after Ba-la-di, anticipating Part III.

²²[TN] The printed article has 曾光蘆 (Tăng Quang Lư), which agrees with the French.

²³[Chen n. 7] Vietnamese translation of the ĐNTL, p. 257, n. 1.

²⁴[Chen n. 8] Wu Hua 吳華, *Roufo xinshan huazu huiguan zhi* 柔佛新山華族會館志 (Singapore, 1977), p. 1. [French n. 12 reads: "Cf. his (i.e. Xu Yunqiao's) preface to Wu Hua, *Roufo xinshan huazu huiguan zhi* (Monograph on the Chinese associations of Johor Baru), Singapore, Dongnanya yanjiu suo, 1977, p. 1." It then adds (N.d.T.): "In fact it is Professor Xu Yunqiao's interpretation that seems to be correct; it is also found in the dictionary of South Seas toponyms by Chen Rongjia, Xie Fang and Lu Junling, *Gudai nanhai diming huishi*, Beijing, Zhonghua shuju, 1986, p. 956."]

²⁵[TN] The French misreads this passage. It makes Chen say that Xu Yunqiao took Wuding jiaolin to be Ujong Tanah, but that "it is rather to be thought" to be Johor Lama, as though Chen were correcting Xu. In the Japanese, Chen reports both points as Xu's: Xu read 烏丁礁林 as Ujong Tanah and identified it with Johor Lama (許雲樵氏

In the 11th month of the following year, *mậu-ngọ*, the 19th year (1798) [French: Dec. 1798/Jan. 1799; q. 10, 17b = VN trans. II, 293], the ĐNTL records: “The country of Nhu-phật sent the envoy A-băng²⁶ Cà-trạc to present local products; he was generously rewarded and sent back” (柔佛國遣使阿冰[木+哥]濯來獻方物，厚賜遣還). This presumably refers to [the reign of] Sultan Mahmud III (1770–1812).²⁷²⁸²⁹

[J65] *Mậu-ngọ*, 19th year (1798), 12th month [French: Jan.–Feb. 1799] (first *kỷ*, q. 10, 18a = VN trans. II, 294)

命欽差屬內衛尉烏離為 (Ô-li-vi) 乘青雀號船，如下洲採買兵器。

Ordered the *khâm sai thuộc nội vệ úy* 欽差屬內衛尉 [imperial envoy, officer of the palace guard] Ô-li-vi to board the ship *Thanh Tước* and go to Hạ châu to purchase arms.³⁰

The translation team again annotates this Hạ châu as Xanh-ga-pua or Tân-gia-ba.³¹ Ô-li-vi was Olivier de Puymanel (1768–99), a Frenchman in the service of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh.

Tân-dậu, 22nd year (1801), 7th month (first *kỷ*, q. 14, 30a = VN trans. II, 423)

遣欽差屬內該隊巴羅移 (Ba-la-di) 如下洲採買砲器。

Sent the *khâm sai thuộc nội cai đội* 欽差屬內該隊 [imperial envoy, company commander of the palace guard] Ba-la-di to Hạ châu to purchase artillery.

This was Ba-la-di’s second mission, following his trip five years earlier; it is discussed below.³²

In 1802 the camp of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh achieved the unification of north and south and the Nguyễn dynasty came into being. After that, missions to Hạ châu to procure arms stopped. But the “Regulations on tax rates for merchant ships” (*thương thuyền thuế ngạch điều lệ* 商船稅額條例)

は烏丁礁林をUjong Tanahの対音とし、これを旧柔仏 (Johor Lama) に考定された). The French translators’ note 12 (see note 8 above), which says that Xu’s interpretation “in fact” seems correct, therefore answers a disagreement that is not in the original. The French also gives a Minnan reading (Otengtana) not in the Japanese.

²⁶[French trans. n. 13] N.d.T. No doubt a transcription of *abang*, a Malay word meaning “elder brother,” also used as a term of address to a man older than oneself.

²⁷[Chen n. 9] Joginder Singh Jessy, *History of S.E. Asia, 1824–1965* (Lunas, 1985), p. 127.

²⁸[French trans. n. 14] N.d.T. Haji Buyong Adil, in his history of Johor (*Sejarah Johor*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1971), makes no mention of this mission.

²⁹[TN] Chen gives Mahmud III’s dates as 1770–1812; the French gives 1761–1812, the dates usually cited for his reign. The envoy’s name is printed 阿冰[木+哥]濯, which agrees with the French A-băng Cà-trạc. The date conversion and the reference (q. 10, 17b = VN trans. II, 293) were added by the French translators.

³⁰[TN] The printed article has 衛尉 (vệ úy), as the French reads it. Chen spells the name Puymanell here and Puymanel later; the French uses Puymanel throughout. Chen’s gloss for the Vietnamese note in this entry is “Xanh-ga-pura or Tân-gia-ba”; the French gives only “Tân-gia-ba, i.e. Singapore.”

³¹[Chen n. 10] Vietnamese translation of the ĐNTL, p. 294, n. 2. [= French n. 15]

³²[TN] This sentence is omitted from the French translation.

concerning Hà Tiên trấn 河仙鎮, Siam and Hạ châu, fixed in the 8th month of the 8th year of Gia Long (1809) (first kỳ, q. 39, 5a–6b), give us a glimpse of one aspect of relations between Vietnam and Hạ châu at the time.³³ These regulations deal mainly with Hà Tiên trấn and with Siamese merchant ships, and set out in detail the amount of duty according to the size of the ship. The provisions concerning Hà Tiên trấn are as follows (first kỳ, q. 39, 6ab = VN trans. IV, 35–36).³⁴

一、河仙商船來商諸鎮，照麻六甲、閩婆商船徵稅。

(1) Merchant ships of Hà Tiên that come to trade in the various trấn are to be taxed at the rates for merchant ships of Malaka and Java [Liam Kelley's note: 閩婆 (*đồ ba/xà ba*) was not Java. It was the area of the Malay Peninsula across the Gulf of Thailand from Hà Tiên. I will have an article on this soon. Note though how in this article Kelapa (Batavia) is consistently used. The concept of "island Java" is not present in the ĐNTL, and probably wasn't a concept held by the Vietnamese in this period.].³⁵

一、金銀、鹽米、銅錢、琦[王+南]、沈香並禁，不得商賣。

(2) Gold and silver, salt and rice, copper coins, kỳ nam [calambac]³⁶ and agarwood (trầm hương) are all prohibited and may not be traded.³⁷

一、河仙與暹羅、下洲商船，但聽通商自嘉定四鎮至廣義而止。

(3) Merchant ships of Hà Tiên, and of Siam and Hạ châu, are permitted to trade only from the four trấn of Gia Định as far as Quảng Ngãi.³⁸

³³[TN] The printed title is 商船稅額條例 (thương thuyền thuế ngạch điều lệ), with 商船 in the provisions as well; the OCR transcription had 商舶. The French gives the title as "thuế thuyền thuế ngạch điều lệ." Which form the ĐNTL itself uses has not been checked.

³⁴[TN] Chen quotes the four provisions without numbers. The French numbers them (5), (6), (10) and (11), evidently following their position in the full text of the regulations. Here they are numbered (1) to (4) in the order Chen gives them.

³⁵[TN] The printed article confirms that Chen quotes this provision as concerning merchant ships of Hà Tiên (河仙商船). His commentary below, however, speaks of ships from Hạ châu being taxed at the Malaka and Java rate, and the French translation, following the commentary, puts "the merchant ships of the Hạ châu" into the provision itself. The reading in the ĐNTL should be checked. [It is Hà Tiên. Even though Hà Tiên was incorporated (or being incorporated) into the Nguyễn empire at this time, its ships were still considered as "non domestic," which indicates that Hà Tiên was still a kind of "special zone." It's only in 1825 that a regulation was established that changed the status of Hà Tiên ships and treated them as domestic ships.]

³⁶[French trans. n. 16] N.d.T. This term also designates a kind of eaglewood.

³⁷[TN] The second character is printed with the jade radical, 王 beside 南, a form of 楠 not in standard fonts; 琦楠 (kỳ nam) is calambac, a grade of aloeswood, as the French reads it. The OCR transcription had 琦璫 here and 琦璫 in Part II.

³⁸[TN] The French rendering of this provision omits "and Hạ châu" (下洲), mentioning only the ships of Hà Tiên and Siam.

一、諸城營鎮商民與清人居本國者，不得擅往暹羅及下洲商賣。

(4) Merchants and commoners of the various citadels, *dinh* and *trấn*, and Qing people residing in this country, may not on their own authority go to Siam or Hạ châu to trade.³⁹

From these provisions we learn the following. At the time, ships from Hạ châu that came to trade at Vietnamese ports paid the same duties as merchant ships from Malaka and Java [No! From 閩婆 (*đồ ba/xà ba*)]. They could trade only at ports south of Quảng Ngãi. Important goods such as gold and silver, salt and rice, *kỳ nam* and agarwood could not be taken out of Vietnam. And Qing people residing in Vietnam could not go to Siam or Hạ châu to trade at will without government permission.⁴⁰

Emperor Minh Mạng came to the throne in the 1st year of his reign (1820). In the 6th month of that year the *nội hàn* 內翰 Trần Vĩnh Hựu 陳永佑 and others were sent to Guangdong to “purchase goods” (*thái mãi hóa hạng* 採買貨項),⁴¹ and in the 6th month of the 3rd year (1822) the *cai đội* Hồ Văn Khuê 胡文奎 and others were sent there for the same purpose. At almost the same time, officials also began to be sent toward Hạ châu. The entry for the 2nd month of the 4th year of Minh Mạng (1823) (second *kỷ*, q. 19, 14b–15a = VN trans. VI, 6 [sic]) reads:

命該奇吳文忠、巡海都營黃忠全等分乘平波、定浪二號船，如下洲。

Ordered the *cai cơ* 該奇 [battalion commander] Ngô Văn Trung and the *tuần hải đô dinh* 巡海都營 [sea-patrol commander] Huang Zhongtong (Hoàng Trung Đồng) and others to board the two ships *Bình Ba* and *Định Lãng* separately and go to Hạ châu.^{42,43}

³⁹[TN] The French renders 諸城營鎮 as “the towns of Vietnam” and omits the force of 擅 (“on their own authority”). The phrase refers to the administrative units of the realm (citadels, *dinh* and *trấn*).

⁴⁰[TN] This whole paragraph of commentary is omitted from the French translation.

⁴¹[French trans. n. 17] N.d.T. Cf. note 2 [on the *Nội viện* / *Nội hàn viện*].

⁴²[TN] The printed article gives the name as 黃忠全, which would be read Hoàng Trung Toàn (pinyin Huang Zhongquan). The French consistently gives Huang Zhongtong (Hoàng Trung Đồng), which corresponds to 黃忠全 (全 = 同). The same thing happens with the place name printed 大全 in Part II, which the French reads Đại-dồng. In both cases, therefore, the French translators, who checked the Vietnamese translation of the ĐNTL, read đồng where Chen printed 全. This suggests that the chronicle has 全 and that 全 is a misreading or typesetting substitution in the Japanese article, though this should be confirmed in the ĐNTL [It’s 全 in the ĐNTL; however, the problem is that 全 is a variant character for both *tong/đồng* 同 and *quan/toàn* 全. So, both readings are possible, but the translators of the ĐNTL have it as “đồng.”]. The French romanization is kept. The French gives the ship names 定浪 and 定洋 as *Định Lãng* and *Định Dương*; the standard reading of 浪 is *lãng*. On the ship-naming system see the French translators’ note 23 below. The reference “VN trans. VI, 6” is printed thus in the French, followed by “n. 17”; it is inconsistent with the other references to volume VI and may be a misprint.

⁴³ In the French translation, the name 黃忠全 is transcribed in Pinyin, as Huang Zhongtong rather than in Vietnamese as Hoàng Trung Đồng. There are some names below that they also transcribed in Pinyin. I think they are correct in assuming that these men were Chinese. They were in charge of maritime security. However, they translate

Minh Mạng gave a special instruction about their mission: "This voyage is not for buying goods; We wish precisely to learn about the mountains and rivers, the scenery and the products of foreign countries. Wherever you go, you must study the compass carefully and record [the bearings] clearly, so that the directions may be known" (此行非為市貨，正欲知外國山川風物，爾等所至須熟看子午盤，記注明白，俾知方向). On this view, the mission of Ngô Văn Trung, Huang Zhongtong and the others was not to buy arms and munitions as before. Nor was it to "buy goods" (*thị hóa* 市貨), that is, to trade or import merchandise. Its purpose was to learn about the mountains, rivers, scenery and products of foreign countries and to become skilled in the use of the *tý ngọ bàn* 子午盤 (compass). In other words, it was said to be a mission to gather overseas information about the Hạ châu region and to train in navigation. As will be shown below, however, this is a whitewash by the ĐNTL, and the voyage involved considerable turmoil both before and after.⁴⁴

[J66] The order for the *chính tuần hải đô dinh* 正巡海都營 Huang Zhongtong to go to Hạ châu had originally been issued in the 7th month of the 3rd year of Minh Mạng (1822). Huang Zhongtong then asked to go back first to Gia Định and board an official ship there for Hạ châu. Minh Mạng told him to stay in the capital until the time of departure, since soldiers stationed in the capital were to go with him. Huang Zhongtong next declared that he did not know the route to Hạ châu well. Minh Mạng was angered and reprimanded him, and his edict is recorded in the ĐNTL. Its gist is as follows. Huang Zhongtong's statements contradict one another. In truth he means to use the official mission (*công sai* 公差) as a pretext to return to Gia Định, assemble private goods, trade in Hạ châu and enrich himself. Moreover, Hạ châu is only ten-odd days' voyage from the Thuận An estuary 順安海口. He holds the post of sea patroller, yet now he says he does not know the route; what has he been doing all this time? Further, the *phó tuần hải* 副巡海 [vice sea patroller] Sái Văn Quý 蔡雲貴 must have gone to Hạ châu many times; are none of his subordinates still around? If neither Huang Zhongtong nor the personnel of the *đô dinh* know the sea route, then setting up a *Tuần hải đô dinh* is a complete waste (second *kỷ*, q. 16, 19ab = VN trans. VI, 83).⁴⁵

his title (*tuần hải đô dinh* 巡海都營) as "préfet maritime de la capitale," probably assuming that the *đô* 都 refers to the capital. It doesn't. It means something like "grand," and he was in charge of the "Grand Sea Patrol Camp."

⁴⁴[TN] Chen says bluntly that the ĐNTL's account of the mission's purpose is a "whitewash" or "embellishment" (粉飾). The French softens this to "les ĐNTL ne disent pas tout" (the ĐNTL do not tell the whole story). Chen's later argument (Part II, on Hedde) depends on the stronger claim.

⁴⁵[TN] The French seriously misreads this paragraph. (1) It says that Huang "had suddenly returned to Gia Định" and proposed the voyage only "on his return"; in the Japanese he *asked* to return to Gia Định first. (2) It says that the emperor, "wishing to leave the capital with his soldiers," told Huang to stay "until his return"; in the Japanese the emperor told Huang to stay in the capital until departure because soldiers from the capital were to go with him. (3) It presents Huang's private trading in Hạ châu as a fact; in the edict it is what Huang *intended* (所存). (4) It gives the distance as "some tens of days"; the Japanese has "only ten-odd days" ((数)十余日). (5) It says that "none of [Sái Văn Quý's] assistants had stayed there"; the edict asks rhetorically whether none of his subordinates are still

Huang Zhongtong had originally been a follower of He Xiwen 何喜文 (Hà Hỉ Văn), a pirate of the Tiandihui 天地會 (Thiên địa hội, “Heaven and Earth Society”) lineage. In the year *bính-ngô* (1786), when Nguyễn Phúc Ánh was a refugee in Bangkok, Huang submitted to him together with He Xiwen. Because he distinguished himself in Nguyễn Phúc Ánh’s northern campaign, he was appointed *phó tuần hải đô dinh* 副巡海都營 [vice sea-patrol commander].⁴⁶ I take it that the *chính tuần hải đô dinh* was the commander of a maritime patrol force. That the holder of such a post did not know the route to Hạ châu would astonish anyone, not only Minh Mạng. Perhaps for this reason, the Huế court ordered the Ministry of War (Binh bộ 兵部) to contact Deng Yayang (Đặng Á Dương) 鄧亞養 and Lin Yabao (Lâm Á Bảo) 林亞保, who seem to have been Chinese traders. They offered to cooperate, and it was decided that they would accompany the mission. Huang Zhongtong, for his part, was confined in the Cẩm y vệ 錦衣衛 [Brocade Guard] and released only after several months (ibid.).⁴⁷

In the 2nd month of the 4th year of Minh Mạng (1823), the *cai cơ* Ngô Văn Trung and Huang Zhongtong sailed down to Hạ châu on the two ships *Bình Ba* and *Định Lãng* and returned in the 11th month of the same year. As soon as they returned, both men in charge were punished. First, Huang Zhongtong accused Ngô Văn Trung of embezzling official goods. Ngô was arrested and exiled to Cam Lộ 甘露,⁴⁸ but Minh Mạng, remembering that Ngô had been one of his meritorious servants in the Vọng Các 望閣 (Bangkok) period, released him and assigned him to Bắc Thành 北城 (Hà Nội). Huang Zhongtong was rewarded with one hundred strings of cash (錢一百緡) for denouncing Ngô (q. 19, 15a = VN trans. VI, 146). But it then came to light that Huang had gone against the emperor’s wishes, and he too was punished. According to the ĐNTL, the emperor had chosen, besides the above-mentioned Deng Yayang and Lin Yabao, the *nội dinh cai đội* 內營該隊 He Yaliu (Hà Á Lục) 何亞六 and Chen Yasan (Trần Á Tam) 陳亞三 to go with the mission to Hạ châu. At the time of departure, however, Huang Zhongtong had on his own authority replaced them with the supernumeraries (*ngạch ngoai* 額外) He Yaman (Hà Á Mãn) 何亞滿 and Huang Yaxi (Hoàng Á Hỉ) 黃亞喜. This was discovered after the return, and Huang Zhongtong was demoted from *chính tuần hải đô dinh* to an ordinary *cai đội* (q. 23, 10b = VN trans. VI, 225). Huang thus fell from favour for a time, but he was later restored as *chính tuần hải đô dinh* and

available. The printed article gives Sái Văn Quý’s title as 副巡海 (vice sea patroller), as the French does. The name 蔡雲貴 would normally be read Sái (or Thái) Văn Quý; the French has Sái Văn Quý.

⁴⁶[Chen n. 11] *Đại Nam chính biên liệt truyện sơ tập* 大南正編列傳初集, q. 28, 1b–2a. [French n. 18 adds: “reprint Keio University, vol. IV, pp. 1318–1319.”]

⁴⁷[TN] The printed article has 鄧亞養 (Đặng Á Dương), which agrees with the French Deng Yayang.

⁴⁸[French trans. n. 19] N.d.T. Cam Lộ, in the hinterland of Quảng Trị province under Vietnamese control, was an important commercial crossroads and a place of exile for convicts sent to the army. There were several degrees of exile; Cam Lộ was a “near exile” (*phụ cận*) for people from Quảng Nam and the whole South. Cf. ĐNTL, vol. 12, p. 52 (1833, 2nd month, ch. 89).

posted to Gia Định citadel.⁴⁹ In my view, the recriminations within the Huế government over the Hạ châu missions during these one or two years suggest that the concept of Hạ châu, the destination of the missions, had changed. I discuss this in detail below.⁵⁰

Minh Mạng, 5th year (1824), 12th month [French: Jan.–Feb. 1825] (second kỷ, q. 30, 15ab = VN trans. VII, 105)

遣該奇胡文奎等分乘平洋、定洋、平波、安波諸號船，往下洲、江流波公務。

Sent the *cai cơ* Hồ Văn Khuê and others to board the ships *Bình Dương*, *Định Dương*, *Bình Ba* and *An Ba* separately and go to Hạ châu and Kelapa on official business.⁵¹

[J67] Following this passage, the ĐNTL fixes the number of salute guns to be fired when large ships such as the *Thụy Long* 瑞龍 and *Bình Dương* entered the port of Đà Nẵng or Thuận An. On entering Đà Nẵng, the ship was to hoist a yellow flag and fire three guns, and the Điện Hải 奠海 fort was likewise to hoist a yellow flag and reply with seven. On entering Thuận An, the ship and the Trần Hải 鎮海 fort were both to hoist yellow flags and fire three guns each.

Added by the French translators. Minh Mạng, 6th year, 12th month (Jan. 1826) (second kỷ, q. 36 = VN trans. VII, 237): “The *cai cơ* Trần Hùng Hòa was granted the honorary title of *phó vệ úy* [deputy guard commander] so that he could go on an official mission to Kelapa and Hạ châu together with the *vệ úy* Nguyễn Văn Phong, the *phó vệ úy* Đoàn Dương and the *tuần hải* Huang Zhongtong (Hoàng Trung Đồng).”

Minh Mạng, 8th year (1827), 12th month [French: Jan.–Feb. 1828] (second kỷ, q. 49, 37a = VN trans. VIII, 358)

遣院使阮仲併、衛尉陳文禮、文書房陳公璋、侍衛阮文玩等分乘威風、奮鵬、靜波諸號船，如下洲公務。

Sent the *viện sứ* 院使 [envoy of the Nội viện] Nguyễn Trọng Tính, the *vệ úy* 衛尉 [guard commander] Trần Văn Lễ, Trần Công Chương of the *văn thư phòng* 文書房

⁴⁹[Chen n. 12] Ibid., q. 28, 2b. [French n. 20 adds: “ed. cit., p. 1319.”]

⁵⁰[TN] The French misreads several points in this paragraph. (1) It says that Huang was rewarded “since Ngô’s deception of the emperor had been discovered and punished”; in the Japanese it is *Huang’s* defiance of the emperor that was discovered, and Huang who was punished. (2) It gives the name of the first substitute as “He Yanan (Hà Á Mãn)”; the French itself later uses He Yaman, and the character 滿 is read Mãn. (3) It says Huang “lost all power for a time” but omits that he was demoted to an ordinary *cai đội*. (4) Most importantly, the last sentence of the paragraph is mistranslated. Chen says that the recriminations suggest a change in the *concept of Hạ châu, the destination* (公務の目的地である下洲の概念に変化あった). The French makes it “the official conception of these missions changed.” The point matters because it announces the argument of Part III. Note also that Chen dates the return of this mission to the 11th month here, but to the 10th month in Part III.

⁵¹[TN] The Japanese lists four ships (平洋, 定洋, 平波, 安波). The French lists only three, omitting the *Bình Dương* (平洋). The French also misprints the date as “janv./févr. 25 1825” and gives Hồ Văn Khuê as *cai cơ* here, whereas in 1822 he was *cai đội*. In the following paragraph the French omits the names of the Điện Hải and Trần Hải forts.

[secretariat], the *thị vệ* 侍衛 [imperial guard] Nguyễn Văn Ngoan and others to board the ships *Uy Phong*, *Phấn Bằng* and *Tĩnh Ba* separately and go to Hạ châu on official business.⁵²

Added by the French translators. Minh Mạng, 10th year (1829), 11th month (q. 63 = VN trans. IX, 338): "Mission to Tiểu Tây Dương of the two ships *Phấn Bằng* and *Định Dương*, commanded by Nguyễn Trọng Tính and Trần Chấn."⁵³

Added by the French translators. Minh Mạng, 11th year (1830), 1st month (q. 64 = VN trans. X, 10): "Mission to Hạ châu of the ship *Thanh Hải*, commanded by Nguyễn Văn Sáng and Tôn-thất Thường."

Added by the French translators. Minh Mạng, 11th year (1830), 8th month (q. 69 = VN trans. X, 145): "Mission to Luzon of the ship *Uy Phong*, which was driven off course by contrary winds and ended up at Kelapa. It was commanded by Đoàn Dũ and Đào Trí Phú (d. 1854), with the demoted officials Đặng Văn Khải and Nguyễn Đình Tân."

Minh Mạng, 11th year (1830), 10th month [French: Dec. 1830/Jan. 1831] (second kỷ, q. 69, 24a = VN trans. X, 160)

遣署中水副衛尉段恪，乘清海船如下洲公務。

Sent the acting (*thự* 署) *trung thủy phó vệ úy* 中水副衛尉 [deputy commander of the Central Naval Guard] Đoàn Khắc to board the ship *Thanh Hải* and go to Hạ châu on official business.

Minh Mạng, 12th year (1831), 1st month (second kỷ, q. 71, 14a = VN trans. X, 209)

命內閣典簿阮大瑾、司務陳文恂等，乘平海船往下洲公務。

Ordered the *nội các điển bạ* 內閣典簿 [registrar of the Grand Secretariat] Nguyễn Đại Cẩn, the *tư vụ* 司務 [clerk] Trần Văn Tuấn and others to board the ship *Bình Hải* and go to Hạ châu on official business.

Minh Mạng, 12th year (1831), 11th month [French: Jan. 1832] (second kỷ, q. 77, 5ab = VN trans. X, 386)

遣水軍衛尉陳文禮、副衛尉潘文敏、段恪等，分乘威鳳、清洋、平洋諸號船，往江流波、檳榔嶼、下洲公務，革員潘清簡派從效力。

Sent the *thủy quân vệ úy* 水軍衛尉 [commander of the Naval Guard] Trần Văn Lễ, the *phó vệ úy* Phan Văn Mẫn, Đoàn Khắc and others to board the ships *Uy Phụng*, *Thanh*

⁵²[TN] The printed article gives the ships as 威風, 奮鵬 and 靜波, which agree with the French *Uy Phong*, *Phấn Bằng* and *Tĩnh Ba*.

⁵³[French trans. n. 21] N.d.T. We know from other sources that Lí Văn Phúc (1785–1849) also took part in this mission; cf. his account of his journey to Bengal entitled *Tây hành kiến văn kí lược*, p. 5a.

Dương and *Bình Dương* separately and go to Kelapa, Pinang and Hạ châu on official business. The cashiered official (*cách viên* 革員) Phan Thanh Giản was assigned to accompany them, to redeem himself by service (*hiệu lực* 效力).⁵⁴

The *cách viên* in this passage were officials who had been dismissed from office for some offence. At the time, such officials often accompanied the missions to Hạ châu and Kelapa and served on them to atone for their offences. The Phan Thanh Giản who appears here was a tragic figure. Under Tự Đức he became Governor-General of Nam Kỳ (Nam Kỳ tổng đốc 南圻總督). In 1863 he was sent to Paris on imperial orders to negotiate with the government of Napoleon III for the recovery of the three eastern provinces of Nam Kỳ, but he failed. When the three western provinces were also occupied by the French in July 1867, he took responsibility and committed suicide. The entry for the same month also records that Hà Tông Quyền 何[宗]權, *thị lang* of the Ministry of Revenue (Hộ bộ thị lang 戶部侍郎) and concurrently in charge of the affairs of the Grand Secretariat, "for an offence deserving penal servitude, was by special order cashiered, made a soldier and sent to serve on the ocean route to redeem himself" (罪當問徒，特令革職為兵，發往洋程效力). According to the entry for the 9th month of the same year (1831), the *thị lang* of the Ministry of Works (Công bộ thị lang 工部侍郎) Ngô Phúc Hội 吳福會 was also punished and dismissed. He seems to have gone with the ship *Bình Hải*, but he died on the voyage; the emperor took pity on him and restored him to his former rank of *thị lang* of the Ministry of Works.⁵⁵⁵⁶

⁵⁴[TN] The French gives the Sino-Vietnamese term as "*cách quan*"; the characters 革員 are read *cách viên*. The transcription gives the title of Phan Văn Mẫn as 副衛尉 and his name as 潘文敏. The French adds dates for Phan Thanh Giản (1796–1867) and Hà Tông Quyền (1789–1839) that are not in the Japanese.

⁵⁵[French trans. n. 22] N.d.T. In fact, the date given here is only that of the day on which the emperor rehabilitated Ngô Phúc Hội on learning of his death (at a date not specified in the sources), which occurred during his mission to the Hạ châu. He could not in fact have been on the same ship as Phan Thanh Giản and Hà Tông Quyền, since they did not leave until the 11th month, two months later.

⁵⁶[TN] The printed article gives the name as 何權 and the concurrent office as 充辦閣務 (in charge of the affairs of the Grand Secretariat). The French has Hà Tông Quyền (i.e. 何宗權); Chen seems to have omitted the middle character. The French renders 罪當問徒 ("his offence deserved penal servitude") as "banni pour avoir commis une faute," which is imprecise. The French also misreads the account of Ngô Phúc Hội. It calls him a "préposé" (clerk) of the Ministry of Works, although Chen calls him *thị lang* (vice-minister), and it says he was sent "with the preceding one [Hà Tông Quyền] on the same ship." Chen says he went with the *Bình Hải* (the ship of the 1831 1st-month mission). The French translators' note 22 therefore refutes a claim Chen did not make.

Minh Mạng, 13th year (1832), 1st month (second *kỷ*, q. 78, 18a = VN trans. XI, 21)

遣城守尉阮登暄、黎文慶等，乘平字八號船，如下洲公務。

Sent the *thành thủ úy* 城守尉 [chamberlain of the citadel garrison] Nguyễn Đăng Huyền, Lê Văn Khánh and others to board ship no. 8 of the character *Bình* 平 [French: *bính*]⁵⁷ and go to Hạ châu on official business.⁵⁸

Added by the French translators. Minh Mạng, 13th year (1832), 4th month (second *kỷ*, q. 79 = VN trans. XI, 68–69): “Sent Đoàn Khắc, Nguyễn Tri Phương (c. 1800–1873) and Lí Văn Phúc on a mission to Luzon aboard the ship *Định Dương*.”⁵⁹⁶⁰

Minh Mạng, 13th year (1832), 10th month (second *kỷ*, q. 85, 26ab = VN trans. XI, 220)

命城守尉阮登暄等乘定洋大船，往新嘉坡公務。向例派員往外國各用敕，帝以演習洋程亦是尋常差派，若仍作敕命之辭，未重國體，乃命戶部嗣後改給商舶文憑。

Ordered the *thành thủ úy* 城守尉 Nguyễn Đăng Huyền and others to board the large ship *Định Dương* and go to Tân-gia-ba (Singapore) on official business. Previously, officials sent to foreign countries had each carried an imperial edict (敕). The emperor considered that practising ocean voyages was also a routine assignment, and that to go on couching it in the language of an imperial command did not show proper regard for the dignity of the state. He therefore ordered the Ministry of Revenue henceforth to issue merchant-ship certificates (*thương bạc văn bằng* 商舶文憑) instead.⁶¹

⁵⁷[French trans. n. 23] N.d.T. Ships were classified by means of a character and numbered. The largest, sheathed with copper, were divided into ships of the capital and ships of the provinces. The capital ships mentioned in connection with the Hạ châu missions had, before 1828, the *suffixed* character Ba [波] (the largest class) or Lãng [浪] (2nd class); for details of their dimensions see ĐNTL, trans., vol. IX, pp. 178–179. After 1831 this character was replaced by a *prefixed* character, Bính [丙] or Đinh [丁], with numbering from 1 to 20; cf. ĐNTL, ch. 73, Minh Mạng 13 (1831) [sic], 4th month, trans. vol. X, pp. 254–255. For the provincial ships, the character remained the same.

⁵⁸[TN] Chen prints the ship’s class character as 平 (Bình); the French reads it as *bính* (丙), which fits the classification system described in the French note. The ĐNTL should be checked. [It’s 平].

⁵⁹[French trans. n. 24] N.d.T. See below, Part II, an extract from the emperor’s statement concerning Nguyễn Tri Phương’s discovery of the clandestine export of sugar and rice to the Hạ châu. He also mentions, without further detail, the import of opium from the Hạ châu, and returns once more to this clandestine opium trade in 1836; see q. 169, trans. XVIII, 138. See also the long note by Hoàng Xuân Hãn (“Quần đảo Hoàng-sa,” *Sử Địa*, Saigon, no. 29, 1975, p. 15) on a poem by Lí Văn Phúc entitled *Vọng kiến Vạn-lí trường-sa tác*, in which he tells how their ship nearly ran aground on the sands of the Paracel Islands after leaving Đà Nẵng on the 14th of the 5th month. The ship finally got free and returned to the port of Thái Cầm in Quảng Ngãi.

⁶⁰[TN] This entry is not in Chen’s chronological list in Part I, but Chen counts a Luzon mission of 1832 in Part III and refers to it in Part II (the Mạc Hầu Hi affair). The French translators accordingly did not italicize it in their Part III list.

⁶¹[TN] The French misunderstands this passage. It renders it as: “according to the regulations, envoys going abroad had a brevet; the emperor regularly sent envoys to survey the sea route; if it was a decision not touching the affairs

It is noteworthy that the name Tân-gia-ba (Singapore) appears here for the first time. Also, official ships on overseas missions had previously carried imperial edicts, but from this mission onward a merchant-ship certificate issued by the Ministry of Revenue, that is, a merchant-ship licence, replaced the edict.

Minh Mạng, 13th year (1832), 11th month [French: Dec. 1832/Jan. 1833] (second kỳ, q. 86, [J68] 18ab = VN trans. XI, 247)

遣前水副衛尉潘文敏、後水副衛尉阮進寬、右水副衛尉阮文質帶同革員黃文
宣、潘輝注、張好合，分乘奮鵬、瑞龍、安洋三大船，往江流波公務。

Sent the *tiền thủy phó vệ úy* 前水副衛尉 [deputy commander of the Forward Naval Guard] Phan Văn Mẫn, the *hậu thủy phó vệ úy* 後水副衛尉 [deputy commander of the Rear Naval Guard] Nguyễn Tiên Khoan and the *hữu thủy phó vệ úy* 右水副衛尉 [deputy commander of the Right Naval Guard] Nguyễn Văn Chất, together with the cashiered officials Hoàng Văn Đàn, Phan Huy Chú and Trương Hảo Hợp, to board the three large ships *Phấn Bằng*, *Thụy Long* and *An Dương* separately and go to Kelapa on official business.

This passage is noteworthy because men who later became well known accompanied the mission as cashiered officials. They include Phan Huy Chú (1782–1840), the compiler of the *Lịch triều hiến chương loại chí* 歷朝憲章類誌, and Trương Hảo Hợp. After his return Phan Huy Chú is said to have written an account of what he saw and heard, the *Dương trình ký kiến* 洋程記見 (also called *Hải trình chí dị* 海程誌異 or *Hải trình chí* 海程誌). It seems to have been lost, and I have not seen it.⁶²⁶³ Of the three official ships, the *Thụy Long* and the *An Dương* returned in the 9th month of the 14th year (1833). Hoàng Văn Đàn (also written 黎元宣), one of the cashiered officials on the mission, died during the voyage and was [posthumously] restored to the office of *viên ngoại lang* 員外郎 (q. 88, 22b).⁶⁴

of state, the Ministry of Finance was ordered to transform this brevet into a letter of credence for a commercial ship." The Chinese says that the emperor judged that a routine training voyage should not be dignified with an imperial edict, which would not accord with the dignity of the state (未重國體), and so ordered merchant-ship certificates to be issued instead. Chen's commentary makes the same point.

⁶²[Chen n. 13] *Đại Nam chính biên liệt truyện nhị tập* 大南正編列傳二集, q. 18, 21a. Information kindly provided by Mr Nguyễn Thế Anh. [= French n. 25]

⁶³[French trans. n. 26] N.d.T. The original text, kept in the Bảo Đại library in Huế and cited by L. Cadière and P. Pelliot ("Première étude sur les sources annamites de l'histoire d'Annam," *BEFEO* 4 [1904]: 658, notice 104) and then by E. Gaspardone ("Bibliographie annamite," *BEFEO* 34 [1935]: 32), seems indeed to have disappeared. But several copies are preserved in Hà Nội, at both the Hán-Nôm Institute and the Institute of History; cf. the annotated edition by Phan Huy Lê, C. Salmon and Tạ Trọng Hiệp, *Un émissaire vietnamien à Batavia: Phan Huy Chú, Hải trình chí lược*, « Récit sommaire d'un voyage en mer » (1833), Cahier d'Archipel 25 (Paris, 1994; bilingual French–Vietnamese).

⁶⁴[TN] The Japanese gives the alternative titles of Phan Huy Chú's account as 海程誌異 or 海程誌. The French replaces these with *Hải trình chí lược* (海程志略), the title of the surviving text edited by the French translators (see

Minh Mạng, 14th year (1833), 1st month (second *kỷ*, q. 88, 18b = VN trans. XII, 21)

遣水軍率隊黎文饒等，乘平洋大船，如下洲公務。

Sent the *thủy quân suất đội* 水軍率隊 [naval officer] Lê Văn Nhiêu and others to board the large ship *Bình Dương* and go to Hạ châu on official business.⁶⁵

Minh Mạng, 15th year (1834), 1st month (second *kỷ*, q. 118, 7b = VN trans. XIV, 45–46)

遣該隊阮良輝、主事李文馥等管乘定洋、清洋諸號船，如下洲公務，帶隨筆須稽人個路（Cruz?）、秀羅（二人名，原安插在沱灑汛），放之還國。

Sent the *cai đội* Nguyễn Lương Huy, the *chủ sự* 主事 [secretary] Lí Văn Phúc and others in command of the ships *Định Dương* and *Thanh Dương* to go to Hạ châu on official business, taking with them the Bút-tu-kê 筆須稽 men Cá Lô (Cruz?) and Tú La (the names of two men, who had been kept at the Đà Nẵng post), in order to release them to return to their country.⁶⁶

Bút-tu-kê also appears in the first *kỷ*, in the entry for the 1st month of *đinh-mùi*, the 8th year (1787). Its Vietnamese reading, Bút-tu-kê, is a transliteration of the French *Portugais*.⁶⁷ These two Portuguese had presumably been taken in at Đà Nẵng after a shipwreck.

Minh Mạng, 16th year (1835), 9th month (second *kỷ*, q. 159, 29a = VN trans. XVII, 136)

遣長史陳興和、校尉阮良輝等，乘奮鵬大船，如下洲公務。

Sent the *trưởng sử* 長史 [administrative officer] Trần Hưng Hòa, the *hiệu úy* 校尉 [commandant] Nguyễn Lương Huy and others to board the large ship *Phấn Bằng* and go to Hạ châu on official business.

their note 26). The French also omits the fact that Hoàng Văn Dần died on the voyage, and says instead that he “was restored to his functions as chef de bureau of the Ministry of Rites,” citing q. 95 = VN trans. XII, 225, where Chen cites q. 88, 22b. The alternative name 黎元亶 given by Chen is omitted in the French.

⁶⁵[TN] The printed article has 黎文饒, which agrees with the French Lê Văn Nhiêu.

⁶⁶[TN] The printed article reads 原安插在沱灑汛 (“who had been placed at the Đà Nẵng post”) and 放之還國. Chen says the two Portuguese were probably “housed” (收容) at Đà Nẵng after a shipwreck; the French says they were “taken” (pris). The French note on Bút-tu-kê (n. 27) cites “ĐNTL, version vietnamienne, t. I, p. 64, n. 1” (= Chen n. 14).

⁶⁷[Chen n. 14] Vietnamese translation of the ĐNTL, p. 64, n. 1. [= French n. 27]

Minh Mạng, 16th year (1835), 11th month [French: Dec. 1835/Jan. 1836] (second *kỷ*, q. 162, 18b–19a = VN trans. XVII, 217)

遣水軍副衛尉阮文法、二等侍衛武輝用等，帶同效力陳名彪，乘靈鳳大船，如小西公務。又令通言阮文敏與充四譯館陳大忠、阮有光從船前往下洲，仍留學習。

Sent the *thủy quân phó vệ úy* [deputy commander of the Naval Guard] Nguyễn Văn Pháp, the second-class *thị vệ* Vũ Huy Dụng and others, together with Trần Danh Bưu, who was serving to redeem himself, to board the large ship *Linh Phượng* and go to Tiểu Tây on official business. Further ordered the interpreter (*thông ngôn* 通言) Nguyễn Văn Mẫn, and Trần Đại Trọng and Nguyễn Hữu Quang, serving in the *Tứ dịch quán* 四譯館 [Office of Interpreters], to go with the ship to Hạ châu and remain there to study.⁶⁸

The ĐNTL then records Minh Mạng's comment on the dispatch of officials overseas:

帝謂侍臣曰：我所派兵船往諸外國者，蓋欲使諳熟海程，且知諸形勢風俗，非競利也。若以利言，則國家所乏非財，又何必遠求為哉。

The emperor said to his attendant officials: "We send warships to the various foreign countries because We wish [Our men] to become thoroughly familiar with the sea routes and to know the lie of the land and the customs of those places. It is not to compete for profit. If it were a question of profit, what the state lacks is not wealth; why then should We need to seek it so far away?"

Besides the navigational training and information-gathering of the earlier missions, this mission sent students of languages to Hạ châu. Nguyễn Văn Mẫn and the others were probably the first students the Nguyễn government sent abroad. Their place of study, Hạ châu, was Singapore, and the language they studied was presumably English.⁶⁹ Tiểu Tây is an abbreviation of Tiểu Tây Dương 小西洋 ("Lesser Western Ocean"), the counterpart of Đại Tây (Dương) 大西(洋) ("Greater

⁶⁸[TN] The transcription has 陳大忠, read Trần Đại Trung; the French gives "Đại Trọng," dropping the surname and misreading 忠.

⁶⁹[French trans. n. 28] N.d.T. These students learned many other languages besides English. According to the *Khâm định Đại Nam hội điển sự lệ*, q. 132, section Nhu viễn (trans. Tạ Quang Phát, Publication no. 10 of the Institut de recherches archéologiques, Saigon, 1965, vol. 1, p. 30a), which gives detailed information on the sending of language students abroad, it seems clear that Nguyễn Hữu Quang went to study at Kelapa, as he had requested, and not at Singapore. Indeed, the ĐNTL report elsewhere, for the year 1839 (second *kỷ*, q. 207 = trans. XXI, p. 250), that from Kelapa they took a Western ship to go "farther" for a stay of a year, in order to observe customs and to buy Western objects.

Western Ocean"). Both appear fifty years earlier, in the following record in the entry for the 1st month of *ất-tỵ*, the 6th year of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh (1785) (first kỷ, q. 2, 15b = VN trans. II, 58):⁷⁰

皇長子景至小西洋，會大西國有變，乃棲于小西封卑嚨哆城。

The emperor's eldest son Cảnh reached Tiểu Tây Dương. As there happened to be an upheaval in the country of Đại Tây, he stayed at the city of Phong-ty-sê-ri in Tiểu Tây.

This record concerns the journey of Cảnh, eldest son of Gia Long (Nguyễn Phúc Ánh). In 1785 Cảnh was taken toward France by Pigneau de Béhaine (Évêque d'Adran) of the Société des Missions étrangères de Paris, to request help from the government of Louis XVI. [J69] Đại Tây (Dương) means France itself. According to the translation team, Tiểu Tây (Dương) means the French possessions in India, and the city of Phong-ty-sê-ri 封卑嚨哆 is Pondicherry on the Coromandel coast.⁷¹ It therefore seems that Nguyễn Văn Pháp and the others travelled in 1835 by way of Hạ châu as far as Pondicherry.⁷²

Minh Mạng, 17th year (1836), 1st month (second kỷ, q. 165, 2ab = VN trans. XVIII, 6)

遣水軍副衛尉段恪、署戶部員外郎陳曰偁等管水軍弁兵乘青鸞大船，往江流波公務。

Sent the *thủy quân phó vệ úy* Đoàn Khắc, the acting *viên ngoại lang* 員外郎 [vice-director] of the Ministry of Revenue Trần Viết Xương and others, in command of naval officers and soldiers, to board the large ship *Thanh Loan* and go to Kelapa on official business.

Following this entry, the ĐNTL records regulations on leave for soldiers returning from overseas missions.

Minh Mạng, 17th year (1836), 6th month (second kỷ, q. 170, 10a–11a = VN trans. XVIII, 175–176)

奮鵬船派員長史陳興和等自下洲還，私帶鴉片禁物、爺蘇教本，事發，下刑部嚴審。和坐發油瓶堡充軍，同事員外郎武宰、校尉阮良輝發甘露充軍，副衛尉阮文勒革職，發水軍為兵。

The *trưởng sử* Trần Hưng Hòa and others, officials dispatched on the ship *Phấn Bằng*, returned from Hạ châu privately bringing opium, a prohibited article, and books of the religion of Jesus. The matter came to light and was sent down to the Ministry of Justice

⁷⁰[TN] The French gives this as the "5th year, *ất-tỵ*" of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh. Chen has the 6th year (乙巳六年), which agrees with the count used elsewhere in the article (1788 = 9th year).

⁷¹[Chen n. 15] Ibid., p. 58, nn. 1, 2. [= French n. 29]

⁷²[TN] Chen infers that the 1835 mission went "by way of Hạ châu as far as Pondicherry." The French says more weakly that Nguyễn Văn Pháp and his companions "may also have passed through Pondicherry." The French renders the 1785 passage conditionally ("il y aurait eu des troubles"), whereas the Chinese states it as fact.

for strict investigation. [Trần Hưng] Hòa was sentenced to be sent to the Du-bình 油瓶 stockade to serve as a soldier. His colleagues, the *viên ngoại lang* Vũ Tể and the *hiệu úy* Nguyễn Lương Huy, were sent to Cam Lộ⁷³ to serve as soldiers. The *phó vệ úy* Nguyễn Văn Lặc was cashiered and sent to the navy as a common soldier.⁷⁴

This entry concerns the punishments of Trần Hưng Hòa, Nguyễn Lương Huy and the others, who had gone down to Hạ châu in the 6th month [sic] of the previous year. On their return they were found to have brought back opium, which it was forbidden to import, and Christian Bibles. After this, the ĐNTL sets out detailed regulations for the inspection of official ships returning from abroad. There is no doubt that inspection on return was tightened as a result of this incident.

Minh Mạng, 17th year (1836), 11th month [French: Dec. 1836/Jan. 1837] (second kỷ, q. 175, 13ab = VN trans. XVIII, 319)

遣內閣侍郎阮知方、管侍衛武文解等，帶同革員效力陳名彪、黃公材，分乘瑞龍、靈鳳、雲鵬、青鸞各號船，駛往江流波、新嘉波、檳榔嶼地方公務。乃準定各號船派往洋程應貯砲彈例。（下略）

Sent the *nội các thị lang* 內閣侍郎 [vice-director of the Grand Secretariat] Nguyễn Tri Phương, the *quản thị vệ* 管侍衛 [commander of the imperial guard] Vũ Văn Giải and others, together with the cashiered officials Trần Danh Bưu and Hoàng Công Tài, serving to redeem themselves, to board the ships *Thụy Long*, *Linh Phượng*, *Vân Điêu* and *Thanh Loan* separately and sail to the regions of Kelapa, Singapore and Pinang on official business. Regulations were then fixed on the cannon and ammunition to be stored on each ship sent on ocean voyages. (Remainder omitted.)

It seems to have been the custom at the time that a mission did not leave as soon as it was ordered; it set out after a period of preparation. According to the entry for the 12th month of the same year, an English merchant ship happened to be wrecked and sink in the Hoàng Sa 黃沙 (Xisha, i.e. Paracel) Islands, and more than ninety of its crew drifted ashore on the coast of Bình Định. The Nguyễn government rescued them. It then ordered Nguyễn Tri Phương and Vũ Văn Giải, the officials being dispatched to the West (*như Tây phái viên* 如西派員), to take them to the wharf of Hạ châu (*Hạ châu phụ đầu* 下洲埠頭) and send them home (q. 176, 1ab = VN trans. XVIII, 330).⁷⁵

⁷³[French trans. n. 30] N.d.T. See note 19 [on Cam Lộ].

⁷⁴[TN] The printed article has 油瓶堡 (Du-bình, as in the French) and 武宰 (Vũ Tể, as in the French). It writes the religion as 爺蘇 (for 耶蘇). Chen dates the departure of this mission to "the 6th month of the previous year," but the dispatch of Trần Hưng Hòa on the *Phấn Bằng* is recorded above under the 9th month of 1835; the French repeats Chen's "6th month." Chen's commentary calls the books "Christian Bibles" (聖書); the French, more literally, has "livres sur la religion chrétienne."

⁷⁵[TN] The French renders 如西派員 as if it meant that the government "sent Nguyễn Tri Phương to the west and ordered Vũ Văn Giải to escort them." The phrase designates both men as the officials who had been appointed to go west (on the mission of the previous month). The French also writes simply "jusque dans les Hạ châu" here,

The official ships on these missions also carried considerable numbers of soldiers, cannon and ammunition. The reason, needless to say, was to deal with the pirates then rampant in the Gulf of Siam, the Strait of Malaka and along the Malay coast.

Minh Mạng, 20th year (1839), 1st month [French: 10th month] (second *kỷ*, q. 207, 7a–10b = VN trans. XXI, 227–228)⁷⁶

分派官船如外洋公務：

瑞龍船：正辦＝參知陶致富，副辦＝員外郎陳秀穎，往江流波。

奮鵬船：正辦＝署侍郎陳[名]彪，副辦＝員外郎高有贊，往三吧凌。

靈鳳船：副辦＝副衛尉阮德隆、員外郎黎伯秀、員外郎潘靜，往小西洋。

仙璃船：正辦＝郎中陳大本，副辦＝署員外郎阮猷，往下洲。

祥鶴船：正辦＝郎中黎文秋，副辦＝員外郎杜懋賞，往下洲。

Official ships dispatched separately on business to the outer ocean:

Thụy Long: commander (*chính biện* 正辦) the *tham tri* 參知 [vice-minister] Đào Trí Phú; vice-commander (*phó biện* 副辦) the *viên ngoại lang* Trần Tú Dĩnh; to Kelapa.

Phấn Bằng: commander the acting *thị lang* Trần Danh Bưu; vice-commander the *viên ngoại lang* Cao Hữu Tấn; to Semarang (Tam-ba-lăng).

Linh Phụng: vice-commanders the *phó vệ úy* Nguyễn Túc Long, the *viên ngoại lang* Lê Bá Tú and the *viên ngoại lang* Phan Tĩnh; to Tiểu Tây Dương.

Tiên Li: commander the *lang trung* 郎中 [department director] Trần Đại Bản; vice-commander the acting *viên ngoại lang* Nguyễn Do; to Hạ châu.

Tường Hạc: commander the *lang trung* Lê Văn Thu; vice-commander the *viên ngoại lang* Đỗ Mậu Thường; to Hạ châu.⁷⁷

omitting 埠頭, though it later quotes the phrase as “Hạ châu phụ đầu.” Chen places this under the 12th month, but in Part III he cites it as “the entry for the 11th month.”

⁷⁶[TN] Chen dates this entry to the 1st month (正月) of the 20th year; the French to the 10th month. The French date is also consistent with the French translators’ note 28, which cites q. 207 for 1839. The ĐNTL should be checked. [It’s the 10th month.]

⁷⁷[TN] Chen’s term is 正弁/副弁, i.e. 正辦/副辦 (*chính* or *chánh biện*, *phó biện*). The French prints “*chính biện*” and “*phó biện*,” a misreading of 辦; the correct reading is used here. The printed article confirms *Tiên Li* 仙璃 and Nguyễn Do 阮猷 (猷 is usually read Du), as in the French. The French romanization Nguyễn Túc Long does not match 阮德隆 (Nguyễn Đức Long). Chen prints the commander of the *Phấn Bằng* as 陳彪, but the French Trần Danh Bưu (陳名彪, who appears in the 1835 and 1836 entries) is probably right. The French also omits “acting” (署) before two of the titles.

On this overseas mission, one ship each went to Kelapa, Semarang and Tiểu Tây Dương, and two to Hạ châu. It was the largest in scale of all. [J70] Earlier ĐNTL entries merely recorded that a commander (with his office and name) boarded such-and-such a ship, or that several boarded ships separately, and where they went. From this order onward the entries become more detailed. Besides the ship's name and destination, they record the offices and names of the officers, divided into *chính biện* 正辦 (commander) and *phó biện* 副辦 (vice-commander). The text given above is my arrangement of that entry. After the passage quoted, the ĐNTL also lists the quantity of cannon and ammunition carried by each ship, and the rules for rewarding and punishing the personnel on their return.⁷⁸

Minh Mạng, 21st year (1840), 4th month (second kỷ, q. 212, 32b–33b = VN trans. XXII, 114)

瑞龍船派員參知陶致富、員外郎陳秀穎等自江流波公回，（中略）致富買得西洋氣機船一艘以獻。

The officials dispatched on the ship *Thụy Long*, the *tham tri* Đào Trí Phú, the *viên ngoại lang* Trần Tú Dĩnh and others, returned from their mission to Kelapa ... (passage omitted) ... [Đào] Trí Phú presented a Western steamship (*Tây dương khí cơ thuyền* 西洋氣機船) that he had bought.

This Western "*khí cơ thuyền*" is a steamship. It appears to have been the first steamship bought by the Nguyễn government in the Minh Mạng period. There is no reliable source, however, on whether it was bought at Kelapa (Jakarta) or at Singapore, where Đào presumably called on the way, or on its name, size and performance. Đào Trí Phú reported to Minh Mạng that he had bought it from "Phú-lãng-sa people" (富浪沙人), that is, Frenchmen. In this entry the ĐNTL also records a conversation between Minh Mạng and Đào Trí Phú about the First Opium War.

Minh Mạng, 21st year (1840), 5th month (second kỷ, q. 213, 10b–11a = VN trans. XXII, 129)

遣副衛尉協領侍衛阮進雙，充清洋船正辦，員外郎陳秀穎充副辦，送洋人哺移助等（派員陶致富所屬，護隨氣機船）回下洲地方，因便採買貨項。

Sent the *phó vệ úy hiệp lĩnh thị vệ* 副衛尉協領侍衛 Nguyễn Tiến Song as commander of the ship *Thanh Dương*, with the *viên ngoại lang* Trần Tú Dĩnh as vice-commander, to take the Westerner Bô-đi-trợ and others (who had been attached to the dispatched

⁷⁸[TN] The French misreads Chen's remark that the list above is his own arrangement of the ĐNTL entry (その記事を整理したのが上掲の文である), rendering it as "this description, as we have just analysed it, is drawn from the quotations above."

official Đào Trí Phú and had escorted the steamship) back to the Hạ châu region, and to purchase goods on the same occasion.⁷⁹

The task of this mission of Nguyễn Tiến Song and the others was to take the Western crew of the steamship bought by Đào Trí Phú, Bô-đi-trợ and the rest, back to Hạ châu, and while there to buy goods needed by the Huế court.

Minh Mạng, 21st year (1840), 11th month (second kỳ, q. 219, 13a–14a = VN trans. XXII, 328)

分派官船如外洋公務，青鸞船以參知陶致富充正辦，員外郎潘顯達充副辦，往江流波、三吧凌；瑞龍船以黎文秋充正辦，往新嘉坡。

Official ships dispatched separately on business to the outer ocean: the *Thanh Loan*, with the *tham tri* Đào Trí Phú as commander and the *viên ngoại lang* Phan Hiển Đạt as vice-commander, to Kelapa and Semarang; and the *Thụy Long*, with Lê Văn Thu as commander, to Singapore.⁸⁰

This entry also contains regulations on requests for leave by officials before they set out on overseas voyages.

After Minh Mạng died and Thiệu Trị (r. 1841–47) came to the throne, overseas missions began again in the 2nd year of Thiệu Trị. The ĐNTL records are arranged below in chronological order.

Thiệu Trị, 2nd year (1842), 11th month (third kỳ, q. 26, 5a–6a = VN trans. XXIV, 251)

金鸞船：副辦＝二等侍衛武文智、內務府員外郎阮文功，往江流波地方。

靈鳳船：副辦＝署戶部員外郎尊室常。

雲鵬船：副辦＝內務府員外郎陳秀穎。

翔鶴船：副辦＝漕政副使阮公義。

均往新嘉坡地方，操演水程，仍照內政府[內務府]清單採辦。至三年（1843）正月，翔鶴船纔出順安海口，遇風飄蕩，不知所之，惟公義陸行，幸免。

Kim Loan: vice-commanders the second-class *thị vệ* Vũ Văn Trí and Nguyễn Văn Công, *viên ngoại lang* of the Nội vụ phủ 內務府 [Imperial Household Department]; to the Kelapa region.

⁷⁹[TN] The printed article has 哺移助, which agrees with the French Bô-đi-trợ. The French omits the title 協領侍衛 and renders it as “vice-commander of the imperial guard.”

⁸⁰[TN] The printed article has 青鸞 (*Thanh Loan*) and 潘顯達 (Phan Hiển Đạt), as the French reads them. The French gives the folio as 13b–14a; Chen has 13a–14a.

Linh Phụng: vice-commander Tôn-thất Thường, acting *viên ngoại lang* of the Ministry of Revenue.

Vân Diêu: vice-commander Trần Tú Dĩnh, *viên ngoại lang* of the Nội vụ phủ.

Tường Hạc: vice-commander Nguyễn Công Nghĩa, *tào chính phó sứ* 漕政副使 [deputy commissioner of grain transport].

All went to the Singapore region to practise navigation and to make purchases according to the list issued by the Nội vụ phủ. In the 1st month of the 3rd year (1843), just as the *Tường Hạc* left the Thuận An estuary, it met a storm and was driven off, and its whereabouts are unknown. Only [Nguyễn] Công Nghĩa, who was travelling by land, was fortunate enough to escape.⁸¹

Thiệu Trị, 3rd year (1843), 12th month [French: Jan.–Feb. 1844] (third kỷ, q. 35, 1b–2a = VN trans. XXIV, 447–448)

奮鵬船：正辦＝戶部原左參知陶致富，副辦＝內務府員外郎陳秀穎，往江流 [J71] 波。

靈鳳船：副辦＝尚茶院使黎茂幸，往新嘉坡。

神蛟船：副辦＝漕政副使阮公義，往新嘉坡。

以開正放洋，操演水程，照內務府清單採辦。致富年前派往江流波辦理，多未清，故復命之往。

Phấn Bằng: commander Đào Trí Phú, formerly *tả tham tri* 左參知 of the Ministry of Revenue; vice-commander Trần Tú Dĩnh, *viên ngoại lang* of the Nội vụ phủ; to Kelapa.

Linh Phụng: vice-commander Lê Mậu Hạnh, *viện sứ* of the Thượng trà viện 尚茶院 [Imperial Tea Office]; to Singapore.

Thần Giao: vice-commander Nguyễn Công Nghĩa, *tào chính phó sứ*; to Singapore.

They were to set sail at the start of the new year, practise navigation, and make purchases according to the list issued by the Nội vụ phủ. [Đào] Trí Phú had been sent

⁸¹[TN] Chen prints 內政府, evidently a slip for 內務府, which he uses correctly elsewhere. The French badly misreads the last sentence. It says that “it was only in the 3rd year that the *Tường Hạc* left the port of Thuận An, because it had met a storm ... and its trace had been lost; only Công Nghĩa, who returned by land, was spared.” The sense is that the ship was lost in a storm just as it left port (纔出) in the 1st month of 1843. The French also gives Vũ Văn Trí’s title as “*nhị đẳng thị úy*”; the characters are 二等侍衛 (thị vệ). It omits “acting” (署) in Tôn-thất Thường’s title, and gives the folio as 5a–6b.

to Kelapa the year before to handle affairs there, and much of this was still unsettled; he was therefore ordered to go again.⁸²

“The year before” here refers to Đào Trí Phú’s voyage to Kelapa in the 11th month of the 21st year of Minh Mạng (1840). There was business that he had not been able to finish then, so he was sent again.

Thiệu Trị, 4th year (1844), 7th month (third kỳ, q. 40, 19a–22a = VN trans. XXIV [sic], 108–112)

陶致富自西洋回，進火機船一艘，值二十八萬緡餘。初明命年間，致富奉派如西買火機小船以歸，有烟飛、霧飛、香飛等號，至是又以大船進，名為電飛火機大船。

Đào Trí Phú returned from Tây Dương [the Western Ocean] and presented a steamship (*hỏa cơ thuyền* 火機船) valued at more than 280,000 strings of cash. Earlier, in the Minh Mạng period, [Đào] Trí Phú had been sent to the West to buy small steamships and had brought them back; they were named *Yên Phi*, *Vụ Phi*, *Hương Phi* and so on. Now he again presented a large ship, named the large steamship *Điện Phi*.⁸³

This passage suggests that the unfinished business of Đào Trí Phú at Kelapa was in fact the purchase of the large steamship *Điện Phi*. The ĐNTL goes on to describe the size and construction of the *Điện Phi* in considerable detail. Its hull was 9 *trượng* 5 *xích* 7 *thốn* long, 2 *trượng* 1 *xích* 5 *thốn* wide and 9 *xích* deep, and large wheels were fitted to its sides. As for its speed, the ĐNTL notes with evident astonishment that the relay horses (*mã đệ* 馬遞, express horses) took 4 days, 6 *thìn* and 5 *khắc* to carry dispatches overland from the Cần Giờ post (芹蔴汛) at the mouth of the Saigon River in Nam Kỳ to the capital, Huế. The *Điện Phi* covered the distance in only 3 days and 6 *thìn*, 1 day and 5 *khắc* faster than the express horses. Emperor Thiệu Trị went in person to the Thuận An post (荻汛) to watch the *Điện Phi*, *Vân Phi* and *Vụ Phi* at drill.⁸⁴ One small problem arises here. The entry for the 12th month of the 3rd year says that Đào Trí Phú was sent to Kelapa, but the entry for the 7th month of the 4th year says he returned from Tây Dương. One might take this to mean that Đào Trí Phú went on from Kelapa (Jakarta) by another ship to Tây Dương (France) and brought the *Điện Phi* back to Huế. But a round trip from Vietnam to Jakarta to France in only six or seven months would have been impossible under the transport conditions of the time.

⁸²[TN] The French calls Lê Mậu Hạng the “commander” of the *Linh Phương*; the Chinese says 副辦 (vice-commander). The French omits the clause 以開正放洋 (“to set sail at the start of the new year”). French n. 31 (not marked N.d.T.) adds: “It was on this mission that Cao Bá Quát took part; his name has been omitted here.”

⁸³[TN] The value is 值二十八萬緡餘, “more than 280,000 strings.” The printed French gives “plus de 28 000 ligatures,” an error by a factor of ten. The French also says Đào bought “three” small steamships; the Chinese names three ships followed by 等 (“and so on”) and does not give a number. The French gives the folio as 19a–22b.

⁸⁴[TN] The French omits the width of the ship (2 *trượng* 1 *xích* 5 *thốn*).

I therefore think that Tây Dương here should be understood in the sense that Xiyang 西洋 has in the *Dongxiyang kao*.⁸⁵

Thiệu Trị, 6th year (1846), 11th month [French: Dec. 1846/Jan. 1847] (third kỷ, q. 62, 21ab = VN trans. XXVI, 190)

遣戶部右侍郎尊室常、郎中阮公義等，乘寶龍大船，駛往江流波地方；工部署郎中武廷意、員外郎杜俊大，乘彩鸞大船，駛往新嘉坡地方，操演水程，因便採買貨項。

Sent the *hữu thị lang* 右侍郎 of the Ministry of Revenue Tôn-thất Thường, the *lang trung* Nguyễn Công Nghĩa and others to board the large ship *Bảo Long* and sail to the Kelapa region; and the acting *lang trung* of the Ministry of Works Vũ Đình Ý and the *viên ngoại lang* Đỗ Tuấn Đại to board the large ship *Thái Loan* and sail to the Singapore region, to practise navigation and to purchase goods on the same occasion.⁸⁶

The *Bảo Long* returned in the 7th month of the following year, the 7th year (1847), and Tôn-thất Thường and the others received rewards. It then came to light, however, that on an earlier visit to Guangdong, Tôn-thất Thường had given a letter of introduction (*dẫn văn* 引文) to the Qing merchant ship *Yuxing* 裕興 and encouraged it to come to Vietnam to trade, and this became an issue (q. 70, 12b = VN trans. XXVI, 350).

In sum, as outlined above, overseas missions were carried out four times during the seven years of the Thiệu Trị period (1841–47). Their destinations were limited to Kelapa and Singapore, and their main purpose seems to have been the purchase of steamships by Đào Trí Phú and others.

II. Problems in the Trade between Vietnam and Hạ châu

The above is a survey of the Hạ châu missions under the three reigns of Gia Long, Minh Mạng and Thiệu Trị. Before the unification of the three regions (tam kỳ 三圻), the purpose of the Hạ châu missions was purely the procurement of military supplies. [J72] After unification, in the Gia Long period (1802–20), there is no record of official ships being sent to Hạ châu. The missions to Hạ châu and other places were resumed in the 4th year of Minh Mạng (1823) and continued until the 6th year of Thiệu Trị (1846). Their main purposes were the navigational training of naval personnel, the gathering of information on the international situation, and the procurement of goods and articles needed by the Nội vụ phủ. Other purposes can also be listed: the sending back of captured pirates (1833); the repatriation of Westerners staying in Vietnam (two Portuguese in

⁸⁵[French trans. n. 32] N.d.T. This is the study by Zhang Xie cited above, in which “eastern and western routes” are to be understood as two sea routes leading from China to the various countries of Southeast Asia.

⁸⁶[TN] The French omits Tôn-thất Thường’s title (*hữu thị lang* of the Ministry of Revenue) and wrongly calls Vũ Đình Ý “director of the Ministry of Finance”; the Chinese has 工部署郎中, acting *lang trung* of the Ministry of Works.

1834, more than ninety shipwrecked English seamen in 1836, and in 1840 Bô-đi-trợ and the others of the crew of the purchased steamship); the dispatch of students abroad (1835); and the purchase of steamships (1839, 1843).⁸⁷

As noted above, from the 8th year of Gia Long (1809) the Nguyễn government prohibited the sale abroad of important domestic goods such as rice, gold and silver, copper coins, salt, *kỳ nam* and agarwood. It also prohibited Vietnamese merchants and resident Qing merchants from going to Siam or Hạ châu to trade on their own authority, and it barred Siamese and Hạ châu merchant ships from entering ports north of Quảng Ngãi. But as the government's Hạ châu missions developed, the smuggling out of rice from Nam Kỳ and the smuggling in of opium gradually became a problem.⁸⁸

As a countermeasure, in the 3rd month of the 5th year of Minh Mạng (1824) the Nguyễn government proclaimed a ban on opium and at the same time enacted and published the "Regulations on the illicit sale of grain" (*đạo mại tức mễ điều lệ* 盜賣粟米條例). In the preamble Minh Mạng states, in substance: "In Gia Định there are many crafty merchants who secretly sell grain to Hạ châu and to Qing merchants. We therefore ordered the court officials to deliberate and fix strict provisions to correct this abuse. According to the general opinion, Gia Định is the great trấn of the south, its fields are fertile, and its grain surpasses that of all the other trấn. The regions north of Bình Định have always depended heavily on the rice of Nam Kỳ, and when the price of rice rises in Gia Định the other regions follow. The illicit sale of grain therefore bears closely on the finances of the state and the livelihood of the people." The regulations set out the methods of enforcement and the penalties in detail. The last provision is that merchants within the jurisdiction of Gia Định citadel who go to Hạ châu to trade may carry enough rice for their own rations, but anyone who ships out rice beyond this limit is to be severely punished (second *kỷ*, q. 26, 10a–11b = VN trans. VII, 28–30).⁸⁹

As a further measure connected with the grain regulations, in the 7th month of the 6th year of Minh Mạng (1825) the Nguyễn government decided to remit port duties, in proportion to the amount of rice carried, for foreign ships that came to trade at Hà Tiên trấn with rice from Siam, Đại-đồng 大

⁸⁷[TN] The French expands this list. It says that these missions, according to the ĐNTL, "captured pirates and took home Chinese officials whose ship had run aground on the Vietnamese coast (ĐNTL 88 and 91 = trans. XII, 14, 97) (1st and 3rd months 1833)." The Chinese officials are not mentioned in the Japanese. The French also dates the student mission to 1835/36 and the steamship purchases to 1839 and 1844, where Chen has 1835 and 1839, 1843.

⁸⁸[TN] The French reverses Chen's logic here: "This had as its consequence the development of the official missions to the Hạ châu and, in parallel, the contraband ..." Chen does not say that the ban caused the missions. He says that *as the missions developed*, rice smuggling and opium smuggling increasingly became a problem (政府の下洲公務が進展するに従って). The same wording recurs in Chen's summary, point 3.

⁸⁹[TN] The French mistranslates 盜賣 ("illicit sale") as though it referred to piracy: "a regulation concerning the pirate sale of rice" and "the malversations caused by the pirate merchants." There is no reference to pirates in the preamble. The French also inserts "[today Hồ Chí Minh City]" after Gia Định, and presents the whole preamble as a direct quotation, whereas Chen paraphrases it.

全,⁹⁰ Chân-bôn 真奔 (Chantaboun) or Hạ châu. If rice made up 80 per cent or more of the cargo, the duties were remitted entirely; if 50 per cent or more, they were reduced by 70 per cent; if 30 per cent or more, they were reduced by half. This was of course the other side of the grain regulations just described, a policy that actively encouraged the import of grain (second *kỷ*, q. 34, 7a = VN trans. VII, 184).⁹¹

Next, according to the entry for the 6th month of the 13th year of Minh Mạng (1832) (= VN trans. XI, 69), Mạc Hầu Hi 鄭侯熺, *suất đội* 率隊 of the *chánh đội* 正隊 of the Hà Tiên cơ 河仙奇, was denounced by the dispatched official Nguyễn Tri Phương. The charge was that, under the pretext of reconnoitring the Siamese pirates (暹羅海賊), he had carried rice and sugar to Hạ châu and sold them illicitly. Mạc Hầu Hi was presumably a descendant of Mạc Thiên Tứ 鄭天賜 (1700–1780), the former *đô đốc* of Hà Tiên trấn.⁹² What is puzzling is that, according to the same entry, Nguyễn Tri Phương had gone on a mission to Lã-tổng 呂宋 (Manila) with the acting *trung thủy phó vệ úy* Đoàn Khắc (段格 [sic; elsewhere 段恪]). How then could he have learned that Mạc Hầu Hi had sold rice illicitly at Hạ châu? Yet the same entry says: “Nguyễn Tri Phương saw it and, on his return, reported the matter” (阮知方見之，還以事奏). Perhaps Đoàn Khắc and Nguyễn Tri Phương’s party called at Hạ châu on the way and learned there of Mạc Hầu Hi’s illicit sales. [J73] The failure to explain the circumstances is an example of the ĐNTL’s carelessness. In any case, after returning home in the 10th month of the 14th year of Minh Mạng (1833), Mạc Hầu Hi was also found to have bought opium illicitly. He was finally arrested by the *tổng trấn* 總鎮 of Gia Định, interrogated by the Ministry of War and imprisoned (second *kỷ*, q. 108, 13a = VN trans. XIII, 159).⁹³

⁹⁰[French trans. n. 33] N.d.T. These are two different place names: Chân-bôn, which designates the Thai town of Chantaboun or Chantaburi, and Đại-đồng. The latter is harder to identify. We have, however, found it on the general map entitled *Đại Nam toàn đồ*, dated 1839 (Minh Mạng 19, 1st day of the 8th month), at the end of the fine polychrome manuscript of the EFEO, shelfmark VIET/A-Gé 4 (cf. BEFEO 75 [1986]: 285 and pl. 5). It appears a little east of Chantaboun, on the coast, facing the islands of Ko Chang and Ko Kot.

⁹¹[TN] The French renders this measure as applying to “foreign ships coming from Đại-đồng and Chân-bôn and other regions of the Hạ châu.” It omits Siam and the destination, Hà Tiên, and it makes Đại-đồng and Chân-bôn part of Hạ châu, which Chen does not say. Chen prints the first place name 大全 (Đại Toàn); on the probable reading 大全 (Đại Đồng), see the note on Huang Zhongtong’s name in Part I. [Again, it’s in the ĐNTL.]

⁹²[French trans. n. 34] N.d.T. Cf. Ching-ho A. Chen, “Mac Thien Tu and Phrapaya Taksin: A Survey on Their Political Stand, Conflicts and Background,” in *Proceedings, Seventh IAHA Conference, 22–27 August 1977, Bangkok* (Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press, 1977), pp. 1534–1575.

⁹³[TN] The printed article has 暹羅海賊 (“Siamese pirates”). It gives Đoàn Khắc’s name here as 段格, against 段恪 in Part I. The French calls Mạc Hầu Hi simply “chef de régiment à Hà Tiên.” It renders Chen’s sharp remark that the lack of explanation shows the ĐNTL’s “carelessness” (杜撰) as “perhaps due to the imprecision of the text.” It says Mạc Hầu Hi “must have sold opium,” whereas Chen says he was found to have secretly *bought* (密買) opium. And it calls the *tổng trấn* of Gia Định a “brigadier général.” The added dates for Mạc Thiên Tứ (1700–1780) come from the French.

In the same year (1832) Tôn-thất Mạch 尊室脈 returned from a Hạ châu mission and submitted a memorial to Minh Mạng. According to it, when he arrived at Hạ châu, 100 *cân* of rice cost three or four foreign silver dollars (*phiên ngân* 番銀), but within a few months the price had fallen to about one dollar. Minh Mạng commented on this. His comment shows clearly how Nam Kỳ and Hạ châu were linked at the time through rice and opium, so I quote it in full:

帝曰：下洲諸島土地礪瘠，田禾稀少，米粒常多不繼，往往取給於嘉定及暹羅諸商船以資食用。而暹羅去秋水災，民多菜色，安有米粒賣之他處？必也在城海禁疏忽，故姦民多託行商盜載貿易。不然，此島何從得此米粒，遽爾減賤若是乎？朕向聞阮知方之言，固已疑之，今燭此情形，果不誤矣。夫米粒民之所資，輸賣於他既屬不可，而所易之貨又無一長物，至有蔑視刑章，復盜買鴉片載回，規圖厚利，播毒於人，此風在嘉定為尤甚。其令城臣立即密委幹[員?]，多方探拏，及嚴飭諸汛守，務期捕獲姦狀，查明加等問治。（第二紀，卷七十九，27ab）

The emperor said: "The islands of Hạ châu have poor, stony soil and few rice fields. Their grain often runs short, and they frequently obtain supplies for their food from the merchant ships of Gia Định and Siam. But Siam suffered floods last autumn and many of its people look famished.⁹⁴ How could Siam have grain to sell to others? It must be that the maritime prohibitions in [Gia Định] citadel have grown lax, so that many crafty people, under the pretext of going to trade, load [rice] illicitly and sell it. Otherwise, where could these islands have got this grain, and how could its price have fallen so suddenly? When We heard Nguyễn Tri Phương's report earlier, We already suspected this. Now that these circumstances have been brought to light, Our suspicion has proved correct. Grain is what the people live on. To ship it abroad and sell it to others is already impermissible, and the goods received in exchange are not worth anything at all. There are even those who, in contempt of the penal statutes, go on to buy opium illicitly and bring it back, scheming for large profits and spreading poison among the people. This practice is worst of all in Gia Định. Let the officials of the citadel at once secretly commission capable men to search out and seize [offenders] by every means, and give strict orders to the various posts to make every effort to catch the culprits, establish the facts and punish them with increased severity." (second *kỷ*, q. 79, 27ab = VN trans. XI, 69–70)⁹⁵

⁹⁴[French trans. n. 35] N.d.T. Literally "the colour of green vegetables" [菜色].

⁹⁵[TN] The French mistranslates one key sentence as "the population cannot go and sell it in other regions, and moreover the price it obtains is not constant." The Chinese says that shipping rice abroad for sale is impermissible and that the goods obtained in exchange are worthless (所易之貨又無一長物). The French renders 100 *cân* as "100 livres."

This passage shows that smuggling of this pattern, in which the rice of Nam Kỳ was exchanged for the opium of Hạ châu, was very widespread. Despite the concern of the Huế court and its strict orders to suppress it, this kind of smuggling never ceased.

John Crawford (1783–1868), who visited Đà Nẵng and Huế in September 1822 on the orders of the Governor-General of India, Lord Hastings, discussed the consumption of opium in Vietnam in item 141 of his report (dated 3 April 1823). About 150 chests a year were brought into the country (the wholesale price of a chest being 3,500 Spanish dollars). Two-thirds were consumed in Bắc Kỳ and one-third in Nam Kỳ and Cambodia. Before the opening of Singapore, part of the supply came by junk from Canton, and the greater part overland from Canton.⁹⁶⁹⁷ The implication of this observation is that after the opening of Singapore, opium was smuggled into Vietnam directly from Singapore.

In the 2nd month of the 17th year of Minh Mạng (1836) the “prohibition on merchant ships illicitly selling rice” (商船盜賣米粒之禁) was proclaimed again. Minh Mạng’s edict on this occasion (second *kỷ*, q. 166, 33b–34b = VN trans. XVIII, 67) says:

乃近聞派員多稱，船到下洲，常見本國民船私向賣米，一見官船，始皆驚懼四散；又聞往往為閩婆島夷擄掠，其幸不為所擄者，則又私買鴉片帶回貿易。事事弊端不一。

Recently We have heard many of the dispatched officials report that when their ships reach Hạ châu, they often see boats of Our own people privately selling rice there, and that the moment these boats sight the official ships they all scatter in fright. We have also heard that they are often seized and plundered by the island barbarians of Java [閩

⁹⁶[Chen n. 16] A. Lamb, op. cit., p. 262. [= French n. 36]

⁹⁷[TN] Chen gives the item number as 141 (第141項目); the French has “rubrique 41.” Chen elsewhere says the report was divided into 71 items occupying pp. 115–185, so the numbering may be that of the printed report’s paragraphs; the original should be checked.

婆 (đồ ba/xà ba)], and that those lucky enough not to be seized then privately buy opium and bring it back to sell. In every respect the abuses are manifold.⁹⁸⁹⁹

The edict again ordered the governors-general, governors and provincial administrators (đốc phủ 督撫, bố chính 布政) of the six provinces of Nam Kỳ, south of Khánh Hòa 慶和 and Bình Thuận, to tighten enforcement. Yet according to the *Waiguo shilüe* 外國史略 cited in the *Haiguo tuzhi* (juan 9, "Southeast Ocean: Coastal Countries" 東南洋海岸國), the ships (*jiaban* 甲板, i.e. merchant ships) "of the various countries and other countries" that came to trade at Xinjiapo 新嘉坡 (also called Xinshilipo 新實力坡 or Xinbutou 新埠頭) in the 14th year of Daoguang (1834) numbered 472. Of these, 27 were Chinese, 24 Siamese, 72 Malay (Malaiyou 馬來由) and 49 Vietnamese. Evidently large numbers of Vietnamese ships were still sailing south.

Meanwhile, within Vietnam, in the 5th month of the 17th year of Minh Mạng (1836), Lê Văn Nhuận 黎文潤, *thủ ngự* 守禦 [commander] of the An Thái post (An Thái thủ 安泰守) in Vĩnh Long province in Nam Kỳ, accepted a bribe from a Qing merchant and helped him export grain illicitly. [J74] In the 6th month of the same year it was discovered that the party of the *trưởng sứ* Trần Hưng Hòa, the official dispatched on the ship *Phấn Bằng*, had returned from its Hạ châu mission bringing even prohibited opium and Christian books, and those involved were punished. As a result, from then on, the officials and soldiers of official ships returning from missions were allowed to go ashore only after the goods they had bought abroad and their personal baggage had been examined in detail. The examination took place at the Thuận An or Đà Nẵng post where they arrived, and was carried out by personnel sent from the Ministry of Revenue, the Ministry of Works, the Censorate (Đô sát 都察) and the imperial guard (q. 170, 10a–11a).¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸[French trans. n. 37] N.d.T. Compare with this remark an interesting note by G. W. Earl (*The Eastern Seas, or Voyages and Adventures in the Indian Archipelago in 1832–33–34*, London, 1837, pp. 197–198) on the Cochinese who ventured into the Southern Seas to trade despite their emperor's prohibitions: "The Cochinese are deservedly great favourites with those who are well acquainted with them, and from their liveliness and vivacity, they have often been compared with the French. In their commercial intercourse with Singapore, they have to struggle against many disadvantages. In the first place the selfish government of their country not permitting a foreign trade, they are consequently, when engaged in this forbidden pursuit, obliged to steal away and risk all their little property, and probably their lives also; and being unable to procure arms, become the favourite prey of the cowardly Malay pirates [This is what the 閩婆 (đồ ba/xà ba) refers to], many of them, perhaps to the annual amount of one hundred and fifty being killed or taken, within a day's sail of our settlement in Singapore." Elsewhere he also mentions those settled in Bangkok: "There are also considerable bodies of Burmese, Cambodians, and Cochinese, settled at Bangkok ..." (p. 170).

⁹⁹[TN] The printed article ends the quotation with 事事弊端不一 ("in every respect the abuses are manifold"). The French renders the last clause as "autant de pratiques frauduleuses."

¹⁰⁰[TN] The printed article has 慶和 (Khánh Hòa), as the French reads it. The French reads 安泰守 as a personal or place name, "the post of An Thái Thủ"; 守 here is the word for a guard post (*thủ*), and 守禦 is Lê Văn Nhuận's title. The French omits the month (5th month) of this case. It also mistranslates the order: "ordre est à nouveau donné par les gouverneurs" (order is given by the governors) should be "to the governors."

In the 3rd month of the following year, the 18th year of Minh Mạng (1837), it came to light that a Qing resident of Gia Định named Huang Ye 黃葉 had colluded with Hoàng Văn Thông 黃文通, an employee of the Kiến An công phủ 建安公府 (the residence of the emperor’s younger brother, Prince Đái 昊). He had fraudulently had his private ship recognized (冒認) as a *nhiêu* ship (饒船) and for more than ten years had traded to Hạ châu, Fujian and northern and southern Vietnam without paying the official duties (q. 179, 29b–30a = VN trans. XIX, 90).¹⁰¹

Thus the Hạ châu missions of the Minh Mạng and Thiệu Trị reigns gave rise to a pernicious trend: Vietnamese and Qing merchants in Nam Kỳ competed to go to Hạ châu, smuggling out grain and smuggling in opium in return. This proved hard to correct, and it seems to have been the turning point that led the next emperor, Tự Đức, to turn his attention to Hong Kong, newly established in 1842 as a British colony and free port.^{102 103}

Professor Wong Lin Ken 黃麟根 of the University of Singapore long ago published a detailed study, based on English East India Company sources, of Singapore’s external trade from 1819 to 1869. In the part on trade with Vietnam (Cochinchina) from the 1820s to the 1850s, Wong states the following:^{104 105}

Crawfurd’s mission of 1822 obtained permission for British merchants to trade at Saigon, Đà Nẵng, Faifo (Hội An) and Huế, but they made no attempt to take advantage of it, and in 1825 the king (Minh Mạng) expressed his dissatisfaction on this point to the Resident of Singapore. In figures, the trade between the two sides amounted to only \$93,781 in 1824 and to no more than \$134,698 in 1826–27. The early trade between Singapore and Vietnam was carried on by Chinese residing in Vietnam. In 1825, however, the king sent officials to Singapore on two armed junks to buy woollens and glassware. It later turned out that these Vietnamese officials had also been instructed to investigate and report on the condition, geography and products of the European settlements in the Strait of Malaka.

¹⁰¹[TN] The prince’s personal name is printed 昊 (Hạo); the French has “Hiệu.” It should be Đái 昊, Nguyễn Phúc Đái 阮福昊. The ship is a “*nhiêu thuyền*” 饒船, which Chen glosses as “official ship” (官船); the French has “bateau exempté.” [Yes, it was probably a duty-free ship.]

¹⁰²[French trans. n. 38] N.d.T. Cf. Chen Ching-ho, “The Relations between Vietnam and Hong Kong through the Efforts Made by the Vietnamese Government for Modernization during the Tự-Đức Era,” *The Journal of Institute of Asian Studies* (Soka University) 12 (March 1991): 45–74 (in Japanese).

¹⁰³[TN] Chen says the missions “gave rise to” (生じ) this trend. The French says that the missions “were marked by” the malversations of the merchants, which weakens the causal claim. Chen’s summary (point 3) repeats the causal formulation.

¹⁰⁴[Chen n. 17] Wong Lin Ken, “The Trade of Singapore 1819–69,” *Journal of the Malayan Branch, Royal Asiatic Society* 33, pt. 4 (Dec. 1960), pp. 154–157. [= French n. 39]

¹⁰⁵[TN] The indented passage is Chen’s Japanese paraphrase of Wong Lin Ken, not a direct quotation; it is translated here from Chen’s Japanese. The French says that it summarizes Wong (“que nous résumons”) and calls him “feu le Pr Wong Lin Ken” (the late Professor Wong Lin Ken); Chen does not say “late.”

Wong Lin Ken takes this information from the Governor's Letters to Bengal, 1831–67, in the SSR (Straits Settlements Records). It presumably refers to the Hạ châu mission of Ngô Văn Trung and Huang Zhongtong, who went to Singapore on the two ships *Bình Ba* and *Định Lãng* in the 2nd month of the 4th year of Minh Mạng (1823).¹⁰⁶ Wong Lin Ken points out that, whatever the report of these Vietnamese officials may have contained, it marked the beginning of the Vietnamese court's monopoly of the Singapore trade. Ordinary Vietnamese were not allowed to own arms, so those who engaged in the Singapore trade had to face, defenceless, the pirates who then infested the waters from the Gulf of Siam to the east coast of the Malay Peninsula.

According to the report of Isodore Hedde, who visited Vietnam in the spring of 1844,¹⁰⁷ [J75] the king of Vietnam bought up his country's products from the people at prices of his own choosing, loaded them on five square-rigged vessels and steamships, and sent them to Canton, Batavia and Singapore. To Singapore they carried Vietnamese and Chinese silk, green tea, nankeen,¹⁰⁸ cinnamon, rhinoceros horn, rice, sugar, salt, ivory, buffalo hides, precious woods (貴木) and gems. In return they brought back camlet¹⁰⁹ for military uniforms (a thin cloth used for overcoats), long ells (1 ell = 45 inches) of coarse cloth, tin, opium, firearms (銃器) and Indian goods.¹¹⁰ What Hedde describes here clearly refers to the overseas missions carried out on imperial orders in the 2nd and 3rd years of Thiệu Trị (1842–43) by Vũ Văn Trí, Tôn-thất Thường, Trần Tú Dĩnh, Nguyễn Công Nghĩa, Đào Trí Phú, Lê Mậu Hạch and others. Here, unexpectedly, the true nature of the overseas missions seems to be exposed. Hedde's report suggests that the Hạ châu missions of the Minh Mạng and Thiệu Trị periods were officially described as "practising ocean voyages" (演習洋程, 1832), "becoming thoroughly familiar with the sea routes and knowing the lie of the land and the customs" (諳熟海程, 且知諸形勢風俗, 1835), "purchasing goods" (採買貨項, 1840), and "practising navigation and purchasing according to the list of the Nội vụ phủ" (操演水程, 照內務府清單採辦, 1842), but were in reality a monopoly trade of the Nguyễn court. It is

¹⁰⁶[French trans. n. 40] N.d.T. This mission does not correspond exactly, since it left in the 2nd month of the 4th year of Minh Mạng (1823) and returned in the 11th month of the same year (December 1823). It would rather be that of Hồ Văn Khuê, which left in the 12th month of the 5th year of Minh Mạng (i.e. January/February 1825).

¹⁰⁷[French trans. n. 41] N.d.T. Isodore Hedde, "Notices of Cochinchina, Made during a Visit in the Spring of Eighteen Hundred and Forty-Four," *Chinese Repository* 15, pp. 113–124, cited from Wong Lin Ken, pp. 156–157.

¹⁰⁸[French trans. n. 42] N.d.T. A cotton cloth first made at Nanjing. According to an oral communication from Mr Son Nam, the spoken language of southern Vietnam has the expression *vải hạ*, meaning "southern cotton," i.e. cloth imported via Singapore.

¹⁰⁹[French trans. n. 43] N.d.T. *Camelet* (camlet), an English term, perhaps derived from the Arabic *kamla(t)*, used to designate a kind of velvet and, by extension, various substitutes made first of wool, silk and hair and later of cotton or linen.

¹¹⁰[TN] The printed article has 貴木 (precious woods) and 銃器 (firearms), agreeing with the French. The French renders "long ells (1 ell = 45 inches) of coarse cloth" as "étoffes grossières longues d'une coudée" (coarse cloth one cubit long), which misunderstands the "long ells" of the English source. The French dates the second official slogan (諳熟海程...) to 1836; the edict is dated the 11th month of Minh Mạng 16 (Dec. 1835/Jan. 1836), and Chen writes 1835.

especially striking that the exports included prohibited goods such as rice, salt, sugar and cinnamon, and that the imports included opium. Here, too, one aspect of the character of an autocratic dynasty seems to be revealed.

This monopoly trade of the Nguyễn court, however, could not put an end to the Singapore trade of Vietnamese merchants, who, being unarmed, often fell prey to Chinese pirates in the Gulf of Siam in the 1840s.¹¹¹ In the 1850s the Chinese pirates extended their activities to the waters near Singapore, but the trade between Vietnam and Singapore kept growing. Its value reached \$383,273 in 1829–30 and \$467,521 in 1844–45, and diplomatic relations between Vietnam and Singapore were good throughout that period. In 1845, however, the American frigate *Constitution* came to the port of Đà Nẵng, rescued a French missionary and took him to Singapore.¹¹² After this the Nguyễn government tightened its control of foreign trade and of the smuggling of opium, and offenders were punished with death. Because of this tightening, the Vietnamese government came to suspend diplomatic contact with the government of the Straits Settlements. When friction with France increased from around 1850, the Singapore trade of Vietnamese government ships was also stopped, and the trade of Vietnamese merchants was obstructed by every possible means. Even so, Vietnamese junks continued to sail south to Singapore. In fact, between 1844–45 and 1856–57 the trade of Vietnamese merchant ships increased by \$241,553, that is, by 52 per cent. This was a consequence of the success of French military operations in Nam Kỳ, and with the opening of Saigon by France in 1860, trade between Vietnam and Singapore entered a new phase.¹¹³

III. Where Does Hạ châu Refer To?

A survey of the passages cited above shows that in the fifty-eight years from 1788 to 1846, Nguyễn official ships went:

- to Hạ châu 18 times (1788, 1796, 1798, 1801, 1823, 1824, 1827, 1830, 1831, 1831, 1832, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1835, 1839, 1840);

¹¹¹[TN] The Japanese sentence is ambiguous in construction, but its sense is that the *merchants*, being unarmed, fell prey to pirates. (Chen has just said that ordinary Vietnamese were not allowed arms.) The French attaches “unarmed” to the court’s monopoly trade instead: “the monopoly trade of the Nguyễn, because it was not armed, was unable to reduce ...”

¹¹²[TN] Chen’s summary compresses this episode (the visit of the USS *Constitution* under Captain John Percival to Đà Nẵng in 1845 and the affair of the imprisoned French bishop Dominique Lefebvre). Accounts of what the ship actually achieved differ, and readers should check the details in Wong Lin Ken and other sources before relying on this sentence.

¹¹³[TN] Several points in this paragraph are softened or altered in the French. Chen says that violators were subject to “the extreme penalty” (極刑); the French has “sévèrement punis.” Chen says that Vietnam suspended *diplomatic* contact (外交接觸) with the Straits government; the French has “l’arrêt des relations commerciales.” Chen says that relations were good “throughout that period”; the French says they “had improved.” The French omits the date 1860 for the opening of Saigon and describes it as a free port.

- to Giang-lưu-ba (Kelapa) 11 times (1790, 1824, 1831, 1832, 1836, 1836, 1839, 1840, 1842, 1843, 1846);
- [J76] to Tân-gia-ba (Singapore) 6 times (1832, 1836, 1840, 1842, 1843, 1846);
- to Tiểu Tây Dương (Tiểu Tây) twice (1835, 1839);
- to Tân-lang-dữ (Pinang) twice (1831, 1836);
- to Tam-ba-lăng (Semarang) twice (1839, 1840);
- to Lã-tổng 呂宋 (Luzon) twice (1832, 1835);
- to the country of Nhu-phật (Johor) once (1797);
- to Goa and Malaka once (1793).¹¹⁴

Thus 18 missions went to Hạ châu and 6 to Tân-gia-ba. As mentioned above, the translation team of the Vietnamese Institute of History annotates the Hạ châu of the entry for the 8th month of *mậu-thân*, the 9th year of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh (1788), as “that is, Xanh-ga-pua or Tân-gia-ba (新嘉坡), commonly called Miền dưới,”¹¹⁵ and likewise annotates the Hạ châu of the entry for the 12th month of *mậu-ngọ*, the 19th year (1798), as Xanh-ga-pua or Tân-gia-ba.¹¹⁶

The Tân-gia-ba that appears from the entry for the 10th month of the 13th year of Minh Mạng (1832) is clearly Singapore. But there are puzzling points here that attract our attention. First, Singapore was opened as a port only in 1819. Why, then, did the Vietnamese historians take the Hạ châu that appears from 1788 onward to be Singapore? And where did that Hạ châu actually refer to? Second, after the name Tân-gia-ba appeared in 1832, the name Hạ châu continued to be used alongside it until 1840. In particular, official ships were sent to Hạ châu in the 1st month of the 13th year of Minh Mạng (1832) and to Tân-gia-ba in the 10th month of the same year, and to Hạ châu in the 1st month of the 21st year of Minh Mạng (1840) and to Tân-gia-ba in the 11th month of the same year. Why were the destinations not named consistently?¹¹⁷¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴[TN] Chen gives the count for Hạ châu as 18 but lists only 17 dates. The French translators replace Chen’s list with their own, using Western dates and printing in italics the missions they added (1826, 1829, 1830): Hạ châu, 19 missions (1788, 1796, 1799, 1801, 1823, 1825, *1826*, 1828, *1830*, 1830/31, 1831, 1832, 1832/33, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1835/36, 1839 and 1840); Kelapa, 13 (1791, 1825, *1826*, *1830*, 1832, 1832/33, 1836, 1836/37, 1839, 1840, 1842, 1844, 1846/47); Singapore, 6 (1832, 1836/37, 1840, 1842, 1844, 1846/47); “Petites Mers de l’Ouest,” 3 (*1829*, 1835/36, 1839); Pinang, 2 (1832, 1836/37); Semarang, 2 (1839, 1840); Luzon, 2 (1832, 1835); Johor, 1 (1797); Goa and Malaka, 1 (1793). Accordingly the French says “19 missions to the Hạ châu against 6 to Singapore.”

¹¹⁵[Chen n. 18] Vietnamese translation of the ĐNTL, vol. 1, p. 78, n. 1. [= French n. 44]

¹¹⁶[Chen n. 19] Ibid., p. 294, n. 2. [= French n. 45]

¹¹⁷[French trans. n. 46] N.d.T. In fact the expression Hạ châu, designating Singapore, continued to be used after this date by writers such as Cao Bá Quát (cf. his poem of 1844, translated in this volume of the *BEFEO*, p. 130) and Phạm Phú Thứ in 1863.

¹¹⁸[TN] Chen’s second example does not quite match his own chronology in Part I: the 1840 Hạ châu mission in his list is dated to the 5th month, not the 1st. (The 1st-month 1832 mission is in Chen’s Part I; see the entry for that month.) In the French, the second 1832 date is given as the 11th month; Chen has the 10th month, which matches

As a key to these questions, I wish to draw attention to John Crawford's (1783–1868) visit to Đà Nẵng and Huế in 1822. Crawford served for five years in the medical service in Bengal and was then stationed at Pinang (Tân-lang-dữ) for three years (1808–11). From 1811 to 1817 he assisted Stamford Raffles in Java, serving for a time as Resident of Jogjakarta, and in 1820 he published his well-known *History of the Indian Archipelago* (3 vols.). In the Indian government of the day, he was regarded as a rising expert on Southeast Asia. Indeed, after completing his visit to Siam and Vietnam in 1822, he became governor [Resident] of Singapore from 1823 to 1826.¹¹⁹ Crawford's visit was undertaken on the orders of the then Governor-General of India, the Marquess of Hastings. As Alastair Lamb also notes in his "Mission of Introductory" [sic], its motive was that the opening of Singapore in 1819 had created a need to investigate new markets and new trade resources in the Far East.¹²⁰ The course of Crawford's visit is recorded as follows in the second *kỷ* of the ĐNTL, in the entry for the 7th month of the 3rd year of Minh Mạng (1822) (q. 16, 20b–22a = VN trans. VI, 85):

英吉利國孟呀嚙（地名）總督遐仕定使個羅科式奉書來獻方物（烏鎗五百杆、玻璃大燈一對），船至沱灤，廣南營臣譯其書以進。書中但請通商與諸外國同，不敢請立鋪居住。命送來京。個羅科式懇請瞻拜，帝曰：彼以總督派往，非國王命，不許。所上品物亦卻之。令有司議定諸國來商專條，為商舶書示之（各專條省略），賞給遣還。

The governor-general of *Mạnh-nha-hồ* (a place name) in the country of England, Hà-sĩ-đĩnh, sent the envoy Cá-la-khoa-thác with a letter and presents of local products (500 muskets and a pair of large glass lamps). The ship arrived at Đà Nẵng, and the officials of Quảng Nam *dinh* translated the letter and forwarded it. The letter asked only to be allowed to trade on the same terms as the other foreign countries, and did not venture to ask permission to set up a trading house and reside. [The emperor] ordered that [the envoy] be brought to the capital. Cá-la-khoa-thác earnestly requested an audience. The emperor said: "He has been sent by a governor-general, not by command of a king. It is not permitted." The articles presented were also declined. The emperor ordered the responsible officials to deliberate and fix special regulations for trade by the various countries, and to write them out for the merchant ship and show them to him (the individual regulations are omitted). He was given presents and sent back.¹²¹

the Tân-gia-ba entry in Part I. The French also puts the question as "why do the Hà Nội historians wrongly interpret Hạ châu," which is more pointed than Chen's "why did the Vietnamese historians take Hạ châu to be Singapore."

¹¹⁹[Chen n. 20] A. Lamb, op. cit., pp. 236–237. [= French n. 47]

¹²⁰[Chen n. 21] Ibid., p. 227. [= French n. 48]

¹²¹[TN] The Chinese is given as printed in the article. The French romanizes 孟呀嚙 as *Mạnh-nha-hồ* (Chen: *Manh-nha-hô*). The French renders the emperor's order as "he summoned the official in charge of commercial agreements with foreigners, who drafted a text for merchant ships"; the Chinese orders the officials to deliberate and fix special

Mạnh-nha-hồ 孟呀嚙 (Chen: Manh-nha-hô) [I think this is Bangalah, the Persian term for Bengal used by the Mughals] in this passage is clearly Bengal in India, Hà-sĩ-đĩnh 遐仕定 (Chen: Hà-sĩ-dinh) is Hastings, and Cá-la-khoa-thác 個羅科式 is a transliteration of Crawford.

Crawford stayed in Huế for about three weeks from 25 September 1822. [J77] As the passage above shows, he had been sent not by the King of England but by the Governor-General of India, and so he could not obtain an audience with Minh Mạng. The Nguyễn court nevertheless treated his party courteously, gave various presents to the Governor-General and to Crawford, and explained in detail the procedures for trade and the port dues that would apply when British ships came to Vietnam to trade. Crawford's mission was therefore quite successful as a commercial survey, and he reported its results to Governor-General Hastings under seventy-one headings (pp. 115–185 of the report).¹²² During his stay in Huế, Crawford received help and advice from Vanier and Chaigneau, the Frenchmen in the service of the Nguyễn government. From the coldness with which the Nguyễn court treated them, he was able to confirm that France had not yet established any special interests in Vietnam, and this was one of the gains of his mission. In a report to the Governor-General dated 25 October of the same year, he also writes that when he called at Saigon at the end of August, the wealthy Chinese merchants there were eager to trade with the English East India Company, and that the merchants there carried on a considerable trade with China, Tonkin (northern Vietnam), Siam and, recently, Singapore and the Strait of Malaka.^{123 124}

In connection with Crawford's visit, I would draw attention to the fact that in the 2nd month [sic] of the 3rd year of Minh Mạng (1822), the *chính tuần hải đô dinh* Huang Zhongtong was ordered to go on a mission to Hạ châu.¹²⁵ As described above, Huang Zhongtong asked to go back to Gia Định first and then go down to Hạ châu. When this was refused, he insisted on going to Gia Định, now giving as his reason that he "did not know the route to Hạ châu well" (未詳下洲路). This angered Minh Mạng, and Huang was confined for several months in the Cẩm y [vệ] *dinh* 錦衣營. My own guess is that this was not necessarily, as Minh Mạng suspected, so that he could go back to Gia Định and "assemble private goods and go to trade, to enrich himself" (辦私貨前往貿易, 以肥己). After all, the Nguyễn court's missions to Hạ châu had stopped entirely since *tân-dậu*, the

regulations. The French translates 廣南營臣 as "the military official of Quảng Nam"; it means the officials of Quảng Nam *dinh*.

¹²²[Chen n. 22] Ibid., pp. 255–277. [= French n. 49]

¹²³[Chen n. 23] Ibid., p. 244. [= French n. 50]

¹²⁴[TN] The French dates Crawford's arrival to 26 September; Chen says he stayed about three weeks "from 25 September." The French misreads Chen's point about the Frenchmen Vanier and Chaigneau. It says that Crawford understood the French had not yet obtained special rights "and that he had been luckier than they." Chen says that confirming France had no special interests in Vietnam was one of the gains of Crawford's mission. The French renders 東京 (Tonkin) as "Hà Nội."

¹²⁵[TN] Chen here dates the order to the 2nd month of Minh Mạng 3; in Part I he dated it to the 7th month (七月). The French follows Chen in each place.

22nd year (1801), before Gia Long unified the three regions, and there had been none throughout the Gia Long period (1802–19). This was the first official-ship mission to Hạ châu to be planned in twenty-one years. We cannot know whether Huang Zhongtong had any contact with Crawford’s party when it came to the capital, Huế. But through the Chinese merchants of Gia Định he must at least have been well aware that Singapore had been opened. I think that the Vietnamese sea patrol really did not know the route to Singapore, which had opened only three years earlier, in 1819, and that he wanted to consult the Chinese merchants of the Gia Định area carefully before setting out.¹²⁶

Huang Zhongtong’s Hạ châu mission set out in the 2nd month of the following year, the 4th year of Minh Mạng (1823), accompanied by the Chinese merchants He Yaman 何亞滿 and Huang Yaxi 黃亞喜, and returned in the 10th month [sic] of the same year. He, Huang and the others were evidently Chinese merchants who traded with Singapore, and they clearly served as guides and go-betweens.¹²⁷ In short, the Hạ châu that Huang Zhongtong and the others reached in 1823 was probably present-day Singapore. The ĐNTL records suggest, however, that it was rather different from the Hạ châu to which Vietnamese official ships had gone in the Gia Long period.

Where, then, was the Hạ châu to which Nguyễn official ships went to procure arms and munitions in the four years 1788, 1796, 1798 and 1801, before Gia Long’s unification? First, the place name Hạ châu (Chinese Xiazhou) is not found in Chinese geographical works. I have searched the Ming and Qing geographies and sailing directions from the *Dongxiyang kao* onward, and have not been able to find it.¹²⁸ In Vietnamese sources, however, the *Đại Nam quốc âm tự vị* 大南國音字彙 of Huỳnh-Tĩnh Paulus Của, published in Saigon in 1895 (tome 1, p. 395), [J78] explains the entry Hạ châu 下洲 as “Miền dưới, Phố mới, thuộc địa Hồng-mao” (the lower region; the new port; a dependency of the Hồng mao). In Vietnamese, *miền* means district or region, and Miền Nam and Miền Bắc are short forms for Nam Kỳ (southern Vietnam) and Bắc Kỳ (northern Vietnam). *Dưới* means “lower” (Japanese *shimo* 下). That “lower” (*shimo*) can also mean the south can be seen from the example of Alessandro Valignano and the other Catholic missionaries active in Japan at the end of the sixteenth century. They divided Japan into three mission districts, Myako 都

¹²⁶[TN] Chen’s conjecture is cautious: Huang’s request “was not necessarily” (強ち...でもなさそう) the self-seeking move the emperor suspected. The French makes it categorical: “I think it was wrongly that the emperor suspected Huang.” The French also writes “since the unification ... (in 1801),” whereas Chen dates the last mission to 1801, *before* the unification of 1802. The printed article has 錦衣營 here, against 錦衣衛 in Part I.

¹²⁷[TN] Chen dates the return of the 1823 mission to the 10th month here, against the 11th month in Part I. In Part I, He Yaman and Huang Yaxi are the supernumeraries whom Huang Zhongtong substituted for the emperor’s appointees, while here Chen describes them as the Chinese merchants who guided the expedition.

¹²⁸[French trans. n. 51] N.d.T. Note, however, that there is a similar expression in Minnan: *e tsiu hu* (Mandarin *xia zhoufu*, Sino-Vietnamese *hạ châu phủ*) [下州府], which designates the regions south and west of Singapore; cf. J. J. C. Francken and C. F. M. de Grijjs, *Chineesch-Hollandsch Woordenboek* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1882), p. 731: “lagere districten (van de plaatsen ten Z. en W. van Singapore).”

(Miyako, the capital), Bungo 豐後 and Shimo 下, and called Kyūshū, apart from Bungo, "Shimo."¹²⁹ And Hông mao, as noted above, means the English.¹³⁰

Next, Wei Yuan's 魏源 *Haiguo tuzhi* (juan 9, "Southeast Ocean, 4") cites Xie Qinggao's 謝清高 *Hailu*:

番人稱其地為息辣，閩粵人謂之新州府，亦作新嘉坡。

The natives call this place Xila; the people of Fujian and Guangdong call it Xinzhoufu, also written Xinjiapo.

It also cites the *Waiguo shilüe*:

新嘉坡或稱新實力坡，或稱新埠頭。

Xinjiapo is also called Xinshilipo, or Xinbutou ["new port"].

And the section on directions (方向條) of the "Jiaoliuba zonglun" 咬啣吧總論, a guide to the island of Java written in the 5th year of Daoguang (1825) by Shangdezhe 尚德者 (Walter Henry Medhurst), says:

自海南直往到安南山，而離彼總無見山，至來近新埠頭，或曰息力。

From Hainan one sails straight to the mountains of Annam; after leaving [them], no mountain is seen at all until one comes near Xinbutou, also called Xili.^{131 132}

Xila 息辣 and Xili 息力 in these passages are both renderings of the Malay *selat* (strait), and of course refer to the Singapore Strait. *Butou* 埠頭 is also written 埔頭, as in the passage on Java (Yawa 呀瓦) from the *Meiyue tongji zhuan* 每月統紀傳¹³³ cited in the *Haiguo tuzhi* (juan 13, "Southeast Ocean: Island Countries, 3"): "The setting up of *butou* by Tang people [Chinese] who

¹²⁹[Chen n. 24] Kōda Shigetomo 幸田成友, *Nichiō tsūkōshi* 日歐通交史 (Tokyo, 1942 [Shōwa 17]), p. 94. [French n. 52 gives the author as "Kōda Seiyu (Narutomo)" and the place of publication as Kyoto; Chen gives Tokyo.]

¹³⁰[TN] The French simplifies Chen's argument. It says directly that *durói* "designates the South." Chen argues by analogy: "lower" (*shimo*) could also mean "south," as the Japanese mission usage shows. The Japanese transcription writes the dictionary's author as "Huỳnh-tĩnh Paulus Cúa" and the Vietnamese as "Miền duôi"; the French forms are used here.

¹³¹[Chen n. 25] My annotated edition of "Jiaoliuba zonglun," *Shigaku* 22, no. 1, p. 74. [French n. 53 gives p. 73.]

¹³²[TN] The French romanizes 新埠頭 both as Xinbutou and as "Xinfutou"/"Xinfuzhou"; 埠 is *bu*, and the form Xinbutou is used here. The French renders 息辣/息力 as meaning "of course Singapore"; Chen says they refer to the Singapore Strait. The Medhurst passage reads 而離彼, "after leaving it [Annam]."

¹³³[French trans. n. 54] N.d.T. A journal published by Charles Gutzlaff in Canton under the pseudonym Aihanzhe, "He who loves the Han" (first issue 1833) [the *Dongxiyang kao meiyue tongji zhuan* 東西洋考每月統記傳]; cf. Roswell S. Britton, *The Chinese Periodical Press 1800–1912* (Shanghai, Hong Kong and Singapore: Kelly & Walsh, 1933), pp. 23–24, pl. 14.

went to the great island of Java [呀哇 Yawa] began in the Ming dynasty" (唐人之到呀哇大洲立埔頭者，自明朝始). It means a wharf, or a port open to trade.

In these passages, the other names for Singapore, Xinzhoufu 新州府 and Xinbutou 新埠頭, correspond, as Professor Xu Yunqiao says in a note to his preface to Li Zhongjue's 李鍾珏 *Xinjiapo fengtu ji* 新嘉坡風土記, to the Thai *Muang Mai* ("new town," 新州).¹³⁴ The names Xinzhoufu and Xinbutou that were customary among Chinese merchants can thus be understood as deriving from the Thai name Muang Mai. What is noteworthy, however, is that the *Haiguo tuzhi* (same juan) also cites the *Dili beikao* 地理備考 as follows:

又新埠頭，一名布路檳榔，在馬拉加海峽之間，長六十里，寬三十里，地多肥饒，草木茂盛。

Further, Xinbutou, also called Bulu Binglang, lies in the Strait of Malaka. It is sixty li long and thirty li wide; its land is largely fertile and its vegetation luxuriant.

"Bulu Binglang" 布路檳榔 is clearly a rendering of Pulo Penang (Tân-lang-dŭr, i.e. Pinang), and this shows that Chinese merchants also called Pinang Xinbudao 新埠島 ("new-port island"). In short, from the late eighteenth century Pinang was called Xinbudao, and from the 1820s Singapore was called Xinbutou. One is an "island" (*dao* 島) and the other a "head" (*tou* 頭), but both are new "ports" (*bu* 埠 or 埔) built by the English. I believe that this confusing fact is connected with the confusion in the ĐNTL, where Hq châu refers sometimes to Pinang and sometimes to Singapore.¹³⁵

As is well known, Francis Light concluded an agreement with the Sultan of Kedah in 1786 and obtained the cession of the island of Pinang. From then on Pinang held an important position as a trading base of the English East India Company. After the opening of Singapore in 1819, Pinang, Malaka and Singapore were formed into the Straits Settlements in 1826, and the seat of government remained at Pinang until it moved to Singapore in 1836.¹³⁶ [J79] Malaka, for its part, passed through a Portuguese period (1511–1641) and a Dutch period (1641–1795; 1818–24) and became British territory for good under the Anglo-Dutch Treaty of 1824. Joginder Singh Jessy points out that when Francis Light and his partner James Scott strongly urged the East India Company to

¹³⁴[Chen n. 26] Li Zhongjue 李鍾珏, *Xinjiapo fengtu ji* 新嘉坡風土記, Nanyang zhenben wenxian 南洋珍本文獻 1 (Singapore, Mingguo 36 [1947]). [= French n. 55. The French adds the date of composition, 1887.]

¹³⁵[TN] The French garbles the preceding paragraph. It writes that Xu "says in a note that the Thai expression Muang Mai is the equivalent of Xinzhu, 'new region,' and explains its origin by the fact that the Chinese merchants habitually use the expression Xinfuzhou or Xinbutou." That reverses the direction of derivation: Chen says the Chinese names can be understood as deriving from the Thai. The French romanizes 布路檳榔 as "Bulao Binglang"; the pinyin is Bulu. The French presents Chen's inference that Pinang was called Xinbudao as something one "understands clearly" from the quotation.

¹³⁶[TN] Chen dates the transfer of the seat of the Straits Settlements government from Pinang to Singapore to 1836, and the French follows him. The date usually given is 1832.

acquire Pinang, they were concerned about developments in Vietnam and Burma. In Vietnam, the struggle of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh and the Pigneau de Béhaine faction against the Tây Sơn regime (the movement to unify Vietnam) was making progress, raising the possibility that France would occupy Cochinchina. In Burma under Bodawpaya, France was actively seeking concessions.¹³⁷¹³⁸¹³⁹ Apart from such calculations, we must also recognize that Pinang was at that time the nearest source of military supplies and other goods for Nguyễn Phúc Ánh's camp in Vietnam.

Tổng Phúc Ngoạn 宋福玩 and Dương Văn Châu 楊文珠 were sent by the Nguyễn court as envoys to the Siamese court in the 8th and 9th years of Gia Long (1809–10). In the section on the sea route along the coast (涯海水程) of the *Xiêm-la-quốc lộ-trình tập-lục* 暹羅國路程集錄, which they compiled, the following explanation is given under Cù-lao Cau 岫嶠棹:

此硯大地，山崎疊嶂，林木茂盛，有花郎城官鎮守，多居民商賈，有造給板艘六隻以防惡黨，諸國商艘常能泊入。

This is a large landmass with layered peaks and luxuriant forests.¹⁴⁰ There is a fort guarded by Hoa-lang officials, and many inhabitants engage in trade. Six plank boats have been built and provided to guard against bandits, and the merchant boats of all countries regularly put in there.¹⁴¹

In Vietnamese, *cù-lao* means an island and *cau* the areca palm (檳榔), so Cù-lao Cau of course refers to Tân-lang-dữ (Pinang) [檳榔嶼 = "Betel Islet"]. The Nguyễn side thus knew that the island was guarded by Hoa-lang 花郎 officials (the British authorities) and that six patrol boats were kept constantly ready against pirates.

I next wish to consider where the Nguyễn official ships actually went on the Hạ châu missions of 1796, 1798 and 1801. According to the ĐNTL passages cited above, the mission of 1796 (*bính-*

¹³⁷[Chen n. 27] Joginder Singh Jessy, op. cit., p. 122.

¹³⁸[French trans. n. 56] N.d.T. Cf. Philippe Preschez, "Les relations entre la France et la Birmanie (1723–1896)," *France-Asie* 21, no. 3, nos. 189–190 (spring–summer 1967): 296–297.

¹³⁹[TN] The French misrepresents Jessy's point as reported by Chen. It states as facts that, at the time Light and Scott were urging the acquisition of Pinang, "the French were trying, on the one hand, to occupy the country [Vietnam] and, on the other, to obtain concessions in Burma." Chen reports that Light and Scott were motivated by British concern at the *possibility* of a French occupation of Cochinchina and at French moves in Burma. The French also adds dates for Bodawpaya (1781–1818) and the name of the dynasty (Alaungpaya).

¹⁴⁰ Claude couldn't figure out the second character in this line. The original article in Japanese has 硯 whereas Claude thought it might be 硯. Chen Ching-ho published a version of this text, and I think it is the first character that appears there. While that character is usually pronounced "*phèn*," in that text the character is used to denote the Vietnamese word "*hòn*," a classifier for an island, as this text mixes classical Chinese and Nôm.

¹⁴¹[Chen n. 28] Tổng Phúc Ngoạn 宋福玩 and Dương Văn Châu 楊文珠, comps., *Xiêm-la-quốc lộ-trình tập-lục* 暹羅國路程集錄, annotated by Chen Ching-ho 陳荊和 and Kimura Sōkichi 木村宗吉, *Dongnanya shiliao zhuankan* 東南亞史料專刊 2 (Hong Kong, 1966), p. 56. [= French n. 57]

thìn, 17th year) sent the *cai đội* Ba-lang-hy and Ba-la-di to Hạ châu to buy arms. Both men are annotated “both Hồng mao men” (均紅毛人), but here “both Phú-lãng-sa men” (均富浪沙人), that is, both Frenchmen, would be correct. Both were Frenchmen who had followed the Bishop of Adran, Pigneau de Béhaine, into the service of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh.¹⁴² Ba-lang-hy may be the Ba-nê-y 吧泥依 (given the name Nguyễn Văn Thắng 阮文勝) who appears in the *Chính biên liệt truyện sơ tập* (q. 28). Ba-la-di is clearly Laurent Barisy (Barizy). According to a note in Lamb’s commentary on Roberts’s account of his visit to Vietnam in 1804, Barisy was born in Brittany in 1769, joined Nguyễn Phúc Ánh’s camp in 1793, and took part in many battles against the Tây Sơn. His main contribution to the Nguyễn, however, was his talent for procuring military supplies from abroad. He went to India, Malaka and Manila many times for this purpose, and the Hạ châu mission of 1796 was naturally one of these overseas trips.¹⁴³

Next, Ô-li-vi (O-li-vi), who was ordered to Hạ châu in 1798 (mậu-ngọ, 19th year), was Olivier de Puymanel, who, like L. Barisy, served Nguyễn Phúc Ánh. Born in 1768, he deserted the French navy in 1788 and came to Indochina. He soon rose to a high position in Nguyễn Phúc Ánh’s army and seems to have enjoyed his full confidence.¹⁴⁴ Of both men the ĐNTL says only that they “went to Hạ châu to purchase arms” and gives no details. In fact, the missions of Barisy and Olivier in 1796–98 were caught up in the effects of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe, and what happened was far from what the ĐNTL describes. [J80] A. Lamb gives the following account:¹⁴⁵

“In August 1797 the British frigate *Nonsuch*, Captain Thomas commanding, while cruising off Penang captured the Annamese merchant ship *Armida*, taking it with cargo of sugar as a prize of war. It was true that the *Armida* was commanded by a Frenchman, L. Barisy; but the business was that of Nguyen Anh who was trading with India by way of the Danish settlement of Tranquebar, where the firm of Harrop and Stevenson acted as agents for the Annamese. Captain Thomas took the *Armida* into Penang harbour and, despite Barisy’s protests, sold by auction both the ship and cargo. Barisy, in high

¹⁴²[TN] The French misreads 従って (“following [Pigneau]”) as “according to” the Bishop of Adran: “D’après l’évêque d’Adran, ... ils étaient au service de Nguyễn Phúc Ánh.”

¹⁴³[Chen n. 29] A. Lamb, op. cit., p. 181, n. 2. [= French n. 58]

¹⁴⁴[Chen n. 30] Ibid., p. 180, n. 2. [= French n. 59]

¹⁴⁵[TN] Chen gives Lamb’s account in his own Japanese translation or paraphrase. The French translators replaced it with Lamb’s original English, and that English is reproduced here from the French edition. Chen’s Japanese version differs slightly. In the second passage, he omits the sentence “These arguments appear to have had weight in Calcutta.” In the third passage, he adds that no proper reply had been received even by 1803 (1803年に至るもまともな返事がなかった), a statement that does not appear in the English as quoted by the French; it may come from elsewhere in Lamb. Chen also presents the third passage as saying that the settlement of the *Armida* affair “dragged on.”

dudgeon, then made his way to Calcutta to seek redress from the Governor general, Sir John Shore, who upheld the action of Captain Thomas."¹⁴⁶¹⁴⁷

"In 1798 another Frenchman in Annamese service, Olivier de Puymanel, came to Calcutta to reinforce Barisy's pleadings. Olivier de Puymanel argued that the Annamese had always treated with respect vessels which arrived in their ports flying the British flag. Moreover, he pointed out that Annam was tributary of China; and British actions against the Annamese might produce Chinese reprisals on British trade in Canton. These arguments appear to have had weight in Calcutta; but the Governor General was reluctant to make a decision and referred the whole question to London."¹⁴⁸

Olivier did not return to Vietnam from this journey. He died of dysentery at Malaka in 1799.¹⁴⁹

"Meanwhile the Annamese continued to be annoyed by what they considered a British outrage. In 1799 Nguyen Anh had sent letters to the Indian Government and, by way of the Danes, to King George III on this matter. Neither letter seems to have reached its destination."¹⁵⁰

According to Lamb, however, the *Armida* did eventually return to Saigon and compensation was paid for the loss of the cargo, but it is not clear whether this happened before Roberts's visit to Vietnam in 1803–04.¹⁵¹

In light of these events, the dispatch of Barisy (Ba-la-di) to Hạ châu once more in 1801 (*tân-dậu*, 22nd year) "to purchase artillery" may also have had something to do with the *Armida* affair. According to Lamb, however, early in 1801, while Nguyễn Phúc Ánh was away at the front, Barisy quarrelled with a powerful general and was arrested and punished with the cangue. He was soon released and regained Nguyễn Phúc Ánh's trust. In the second half of that year Barisy took part in the campaign against the Tây Sơn and in the capture of Huế (Thuận Hóa 順化), and he died the following year, 1802. There is thus some doubt whether Barisy really went to Hạ châu in the summer of 1801. In his last years, however, he is said to have been the Vietnamese agent of the

¹⁴⁶[Chen n. 31] Ibid., p. 191.

¹⁴⁷[French trans. n. 60] N.d.T. See also Suzanne Karpelès, "Un cas de droit maritime international en 1797," *Bulletin de la Société des études indochinoises* 24 (1948): 125–131.

¹⁴⁸[Chen n. 32] Ibid., pp. 191–192. [= French n. 61]

¹⁴⁹[Chen n. 33] Ibid., p. 180, n. 2. [= French n. 62. The French says he died "on the way back"; Chen says he "did not return from this journey."]

¹⁵⁰[TN] The French cites this passage to Lamb, p. 192 (French n. 63), a reference not in Chen's notes.

¹⁵¹[Chen n. 34] Ibid., p. 192, n. 2. [= French n. 64]

Madras firm of Abbot & Maitland, which did a profitable business supplying the Nguyễn Phúc Ánh camp with arms, military stores, uniforms and the like.¹⁵²¹⁵³

Let us put together what actually happened on the so-called Hạ châu missions of Laurent Barisy, Olivier Puymanel and others between 1796 and 1801. The *Armida*, a merchant ship of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh's camp with Barisy on board, was captured off Pinang by a British frigate and sold at auction in Pinang. Barisy and [J81] Puymanel went all the way to Calcutta and negotiated repeatedly with the East India Company authorities to settle the affair. And Puymanel died of illness at Malaka in 1799. Taking these facts together, the Hạ châu of the ĐNTL originally referred to Pinang and Malaka (which belonged to the East India Company from 1795 to 1818). Next, the voyage of the two ships *Bình Ba* and *Định Lãng* in the 4th year of Minh Mạng (1823) was the first dispatch after the opening of Singapore, and its destination was probably Singapore. Yet it was still treated as a "Hạ châu mission." This means that the Nguyễn historiographers should be understood to have used Hạ châu as a collective name for all the British possessions in the Strait of Malaka. Minh Mạng's edict of the 13th year of Minh Mạng (1832), which speaks of "the islands of Hạ châu, whose soil is poor and stony" (下洲諸島，土地礧瘠), is evidence of this. Later usage points the same way. In the 13th year of Minh Mạng (1832), official ships were dispatched separately to Hạ châu in the 1st month and to Tân-gia-ba in the 10th month. We may infer from this that Tân-gia-ba designated Singapore alone, while Hạ châu designated the Straits Settlements, including not only Singapore but also Pinang and Malaka. It would be wrong to put this down simply to carelessness on the part of the Nguyễn historiographers.

This is, however, only the general rule, and we must note that there were a fair number of exceptions. For example, in the entry for the 11th month of the 17th year of Minh Mạng (1836), the shipwrecked British seamen were taken to the "*Hạ châu phụ đầu*" 下洲埠頭 (wharf of Hạ châu). If we recall that Singapore was also called "Xinbutou" among Chinese merchants, this is undoubtedly Singapore. There are also cases, such as the entry for the 11th month of the 12th year of Minh Mạng (1831), in which Tân-lang-dữ and Hạ châu are distinguished. And there are cases, such as the entry for the 11th month of the 17th year of Minh Mạng (1836), in which the name Hạ châu is not used and the destinations of the official ships are given as Tân-gia-ba and Tân-lang-dữ.¹⁵⁴

(Manuscript completed 25 November 1989)

¹⁵²[Chen n. 35] Ibid., p. 181, n. 2. [= French n. 65]

¹⁵³[TN] Chen writes "Huế (Thuận Hóa 順化)"; the French has "Huế (Thuận An)," which is the port of Huế, not the city.

¹⁵⁴[TN] Two of Chen's citations here do not match Part I. The shipwreck entry is dated in Part I to the 12th month of Minh Mạng 17, not the 11th. And the French gives the second example as "the 11th month of the 11th year of Minh Mạng (1831)"; the entry that distinguishes Tân-lang-dữ from Hạ châu is that of the 11th month of the 12th year (1831), as Chen has it. The French also says that Chen's edict of 1832 dates from "the 1st year of his reign (1832)," a slip for the 13th year. The French calls Singapore "la Ville du lion," a flourish not in the Japanese.

*[French edition: Translated by Claudine SALMON with the collaboration of SHIBATA Shintarō
and TẠ Trọng Hiệp.¹⁵⁵]*

¹⁵⁵[**French trans., closing note**] “We thank P. Souyri, who kindly read over the translation.”

The Author's Summary (摘要)

[The following summary appears at the end of the Japanese article (p. 83) under the heading 阮朝初期の「下洲公務」に就いて（摘要）. It was not included in the French translation.]

- 1) In the first, second and third records (*kỷ*) of the *Đại Nam thực lục chính biên*, that is, the records of the three reigns of Gia Long, Minh Mạng and Thiệu Trị, covering roughly sixty years (from the 1780s to the 1840s), “Hạ châu” often appears, in the records of Vietnam’s relations with various parts of Southeast Asia, as a place to which Nguyễn official ships went on official business.
- 2) Before the Nguyễn unified the three regions (*tam kỳ*), the purpose of the “Hạ châu missions” was purely the procurement of arms and military supplies. After unification, in the Gia Long years (1802–20), there is no record of official ships being sent to Hạ châu. The missions to Hạ châu and other places resumed in the 4th year of Minh Mạng (1823) and continued until the 6th year of Thiệu Trị (1846). According to the *Thực lục*, their main purposes were the navigational training of naval personnel, the gathering of international information, and the procurement of goods and articles required by the Nội vụ phủ. In reality, however, they were also a form of official trade run by the court. Other purposes included the sending back of captured pirates, the repatriation of Westerners staying in Vietnam, the dispatch of students, and the purchase of steamships.
- 3) In order to secure important goods and to monopolize foreign trade, from the 8th year of Gia Long (1809) the Nguyễn government prohibited the sale abroad of domestic rice and of important goods such as gold and silver, copper coins, salt, *kỳ nam*, and agarwood; it prohibited Vietnamese merchants and resident Qing merchants from going to Hạ châu or Siam to trade on their own authority; and it barred Siamese and Hạ châu merchant ships from entering ports north of Quảng Ngãi. But as the government’s Hạ châu missions developed, a pernicious trend arose: Vietnamese and Qing merchants in Nam Kỳ competed to go to Hạ châu, smuggling out grain and smuggling in opium in return. Because this proved hard to correct, it became the turning point that led the next emperor, Tự Đức, to turn his attention to Hong Kong, which had newly come into being in 1842 as a British colony and free port.¹⁵⁶
- 4) In the fifty-eight years from 1788 to 1846, Nguyễn official ships were sent to Hạ châu 18 times and to Tân-gia-ba 6 times. The Vietnamese translation of the *Đại Nam thực lục* by the translation team of the Vietnamese Institute of History, however, makes the mistake of identifying the “Hạ châu” in the *Thực lục* entries of 1788 and 1898 [sic; read 1798] with Tân-gia-ba (Tan-gia-ba, i.e. Singapore). (As is well known, Singapore was opened as a port in 1819.) The “Tân-gia-ba” that appears from the entry for the 10th month of the 13th year of

¹⁵⁶ Claude couldn’t understand the characters for *kỳ nam* here (琦楠). This is a type of high-grade agarwood, and is usually written as 奇楠 (also written 棋楠、伽楠).

Minh Mạng (1832) is clearly Singapore. But even after this name appeared, the name Hạ châu remained in use alongside it until 1840. For example, in the 21st year of Minh Mạng (1840), official ships were sent to Hạ châu in the 1st month and to Tân-gia-ba in the 11th month.

- 5) An examination of the various cases in the *Thực lục* suggests the following. Before the opening of Singapore, the Nguyễn historiographers used Hạ châu to refer to Pinang (opened 1786) and Malaka (belonging to the English East India Company 1795–1818). After the opening of Singapore, they used “Tân-gia-ba” to refer to Singapore alone, while Hạ châu referred to the Straits Settlements, including not only Singapore but also Pinang and Malaka.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁷[TN] Two inconsistencies with the body of the article should be noted. The summary dates the second erroneous Vietnamese annotation to “1898,” a slip for 1798. And, as in Part III, it cites a Hạ châu mission in the 1st month of 1840, whereas the body dates the 1840 Hạ châu mission to the 5th month. The summary also states Chen’s conclusion about the purpose of the missions more directly than the body: the missions were “in reality also a form of official trade run by the court” (実は宮廷による官営貿易の為でもあった).

Appendix A. Principal Differences between the Japanese Original and the French Translation

The notes record every divergence found. The list below brings together the ones that affect the substance of Chen's argument or the facts he reports. Differences of romanization are listed separately in Appendix B.

1. Material added in the French translation

- Translators' notes (N.d.T.), bibliographical expansions, references to the Vietnamese translation of the ĐNTL, and Western-calendar conversions of lunar dates.
- Five entries Chen had not quoted: 1826 (12th month of MM 6, to Kelapa and Hạ châu), 1829 (to Tiểu Tây Dương), 1830 (1st month, to Hạ châu), 1830 (8th month, to Luzon, diverted to Kelapa) and 1832 (4th month, to Luzon). The first four are printed in italics in the French Part III list, which was revised accordingly (19 missions to Hạ châu instead of 18). The 1832 Luzon mission was already counted by Chen.
- Lamb's original English was substituted for Chen's Japanese version of Lamb's account of the *Armida* affair.
- In Part II, the claim that the missions also escorted home Chinese officials whose ship had run aground (1833).

2. Material omitted in the French translation

- The author's one-page summary (摘要, p. 83).
- Chen's paragraph of commentary on the 1809 trade regulations (duties on Hạ châu ships, restriction to ports south of Quảng Ngãi, export bans, travel ban on resident Qing).
- The sentence noting that Ba-la-di's 1801 mission was his second.
- One of the four ships of the 1824 mission (*Bình Dương*); Hạ châu in the third 1809 provision; Siam and Hà Tiên in the 1825 rice-import measure; the width of the *Điện Phi*; the death of Hoàng Văn Đàn on the 1832–33 voyage; the date 1860 for the opening of Saigon.

3. Mistranslations that change Chen's argument

- **The concept of Hạ châu.** At the end of the account of the 1823 mission, Chen says the recriminations suggest a change in the *concept of Hạ châu as a destination*, which is the thesis of Part III. The French has "the official conception of these missions changed."
- **Whitewash.** Chen calls the ĐNTL's stated purpose of the 1823 mission a "whitewash" (粉飾). The French has "the ĐNTL do not tell the whole story."

- **Causation in Part II.** Chen says that *as the missions developed*, rice and opium smuggling became a problem, and that the missions *gave rise to* this trend. The French makes the 1809 ban the cause of the missions and says the missions “were marked by” the malversations.
- **Xu Yunqiao on Johor.** Chen reports that Xu read 烏丁礁林 as Ujong Tanah *and* located it at Johor Lama. The French presents Chen as disagreeing with Xu, and its N.d.T. 12 then sides with Xu against a disagreement that is not in the original.
- **Huang Zhongtong affair (1822).** The French misreads the sequence of events and the content of Minh Mạng’s edict. It turns Huang’s request into an unauthorized return to Gia Định, turns his suspected intention into accomplished private trade, and gives “some tens of days” for “ten-odd days.” It also reverses who was punished: it says Ngô’s deception was discovered, where Chen says Huang’s was.
- **Imperial edicts vs. merchant certificates (1832).** The emperor replaced edicts with merchant-ship certificates because a routine training voyage did not merit an imperial command. The French turns this into a conditional rule about decisions “not touching the affairs of state.”
- **Minh Mạng’s 1832 comment on rice.** “The goods obtained in exchange are worthless” becomes, in the French, “the price it obtains is not constant.”
- **Rice regulations of 1824.** 盜賣 (“illicit sale”) is rendered as if it referred to pirates.
- **Crawfurd and the French in Huế.** Chen says that confirming France had no special interests in Vietnam was one of Crawfurd’s gains; the French says Crawfurd “had been luckier than they.”
- **Huang Zhongtong’s motive.** Chen’s cautious “not necessarily” becomes “it was wrongly that the emperor suspected him.”
- **Jessy on Pinang.** British *concern* at a possible French occupation of Cochinchina becomes, in the French, a statement that the French were trying to occupy the country.
- **Xu Yunqiao on Muang Mai.** Chen derives the Chinese names Xinzhoufu/Xinbutou *from* the Thai Muang Mai; the French reverses the direction.
- **Wong Lin Ken / Hedde.** The French attaches “unarmed” to the court monopoly rather than to the merchants. It softens “the extreme penalty” to “severely punished” and turns the suspension of diplomatic contact into a suspension of commercial relations. It renders “long ells” as “one cubit long.”

4. *Factual slips in the French*

- The *Điện Phi* cost more than 280,000 strings, not 28,000.
- Crawfurd’s report, item 141, not 41.

- Đinh-mùi is the 8th, not 9th, year (1787); ất-tý is the 6th, not 5th, year (1785) of Nguyễn Phúc Ánh.
- In Part III the French gives the 1832 Singapore mission as the 11th month (Chen: 10th); cites the 1831 Pinang/Hạ châu entry as "11th year" (read 12th); and calls the 1832 edict "the 1st year of his reign."
- Lê Mậu Hạng (1843) was vice-commander, not commander; Vũ Đình Ý (1846) belonged to the Ministry of Works, not Finance; Ngô Phúc Hội was thị lang, not a clerk, of the Ministry of Works, and sailed on the *Bình Hải*.
- Barisy took part in the capture of Huế (Thuận Hóa), not Thuận An.

5. *Inconsistencies in Chen's own text*

- The date of the order to Huang Zhongtong is given as the 7th month of 1822 in Part I and the 2nd month in Part III. The return of the 1823 mission is given as the 11th month in Part I and the 10th month in Part III. He Yaman and Huang Yaxi are Huang's unauthorized substitutes in Part I but the guiding merchants in Part III.
- The 1835 *Phấn Bằg* mission is dated to the 9th month in the chronology but to the 6th month in the discussion of its return.
- The count of 18 missions to Hạ châu is supported by only 17 listed dates. The example in Part III and in the summary of a Hạ châu mission in the 1st month of 1840 does not match the chronology in Part I (5th month).
- The shipwreck entry is dated to the 12th month of MM 17 in Part I, but cited as the 11th month in Part III.
- The summary has "1898" for 1798. The 1839 list is dated to the 1st month by Chen and to the 10th month by the French. Chen prints 內政府 for 內務府 in the 1842 entry and 段格 for 段恪 in Part II.

Appendix B. Names and Terms Whose Romanization Does Not Match the Characters

As requested, the romanizations of the French translation are kept in the text. Checks against scans of both printed articles showed that many apparent mismatches came from the OCR copies first used for this translation, not from the authors or translators. On the Japanese side, the printed characters agree with the French in: 鄭進才 (Trịnh), 陳武客 (Khách), 曾光蘆 (Lu), 阿冰[木+哥]濯 (A-băng Cà-trạc), 巴道以啞/目荳余, 衛尉, 鄧亞養, 威風, 黎文饒, 陳曰偁 (Xướng), 油瓶, 武宰 (Tê), 雲鵬 (Vân Điêu), 仙璃, 哺移助, 潘顯達, 青鸞, 慶和, 暹羅, 遐仕定 and 孟呀嚙. On the French side, the printed text has the correct forms of names the OCR had garbled, such as Giang-luu-ba, Pa-đơ-chi, Thanh Tước, Phấn Bằng, Định Dương, Tĩnh Ba, cẩu y vệ, Tường Hạc, Cao Hữu Tấn, Phan Tĩnh, Trần Đại Bản, Đỗ Mậu Thường, Trần Tú Dĩnh, Vụ Phi, Vân Phi, Hương Phi, khí cơ, phụ đầu, Xinzhoufu and Nguyễn Tri Phương. The table lists the cases that remain, where the printed French romanization does not correspond to the standard reading of the characters Chen printed. Some may be Chen's errors rather than the French translators', and all should be checked against the ĐNTL before citation.

French form (used in text)	Characters printed by Chen	Reading of the characters	Remarks
Quảng-nôi-vê (1793)	睇啲鳴	Hoảng-nột-ô	Chen: Qùang-nói-vê
Pa-đơ-chi (1793)	巴哆吱	—	Chen: Pa-dơ-chê
Huang Zhongtong (Hoàng Trung Đồng)	黃忠全	Hoàng Trung Toàn	Probably 黃忠全 (= 同) in the ĐNTL
Đại-đồng (1825)	大全	Đại Toàn	Probably 大全, as above
Sái Văn Quý	蔡雲貴	Sái/Thái Văn Quý	—
Định Lăng (ship)	定浪	Định Lãng	Tone only
bính (ship class, 1832)	平字	Bình	French reading 丙 fits the naming system
cách quan	革員	cách viên	—
thuế thuyền thuế ngạch điều lệ	商船稅額條例	thương thuyền thuế ngạch điều lệ	—
Hà Tông Quyền	何權	Hà Quyền	Chen omits 宗
Đại Trọng (1835)	陳大忠	Trần Đại Trung	French omits surname
chính biên / phó biên	正辦 / 副辦	chính (chánh) biện / phó biện	Corrected in text
Trần Danh Bưu (1839)	陳彪	Trần Bưu	Chen probably omits 名

French form (used in text)	Characters printed by Chen	Reading of the characters	Remarks
Nguyễn Túc Long	阮德隆	Nguyễn Đức Long	—
Nguyễn Do	阮猷	Nguyễn Du	—
An Thái Thú (post)	安泰守	An Thái thủ (post)	French reads 守 as part of the name
Hiệu (prince, 1837)	昊	Hạo	Check ĐNTL
Xinfutou / Xinfuzhou	新埠頭	Xinbutou	Xinbutou used in text
Bulao Binglang	布路檳榔	Bulu Binglang	Corrected to Bulu in text
Kōda Seiyu (Narutomo)	幸田成友	Kōda Shigetomo	French reading of the Japanese name