1 Introduction

I chose the intertwined memory-building initiatives of 1928–9 and 2009–14 to kick off my study of multilayered diplomatic history because each is a manifestation of the intimate relationship between academic history and politically motivated uses of the past. In this book I aim to highlight the ways in which historical sources, materiality, and narrative tropes work together to construct what is understood as Japanese early modern foreign relations. A study of Murakami Naojirō's archival diplomacy provides the framework for the overarching argument of *Translating Negotiations*, which is that a multitude of factors and actors shape historiography and the way the past is represented in the intertwined environments of history and memory.

The primary argument of this book concerns how academic historians translated and constructed early modern Japan's progressive foreign relations. Knowledge of early modern relations was neither simply transmitted in words, meanings, and discourses, translated from one context to another, nor transferred from the archival material to the textbook. Plural actors ranging from seventeenth-century authors to twentieth-century translators coproduced ideas about Japanese foreign relations beginning in the pivotal decades of the late sixteenth century, when maritime trade with Ming China expanded and contacts with other Asian powers and European stakeholders multiplied. As a certain type of Japanese interaction with the outside world – such as the abovementioned transpacific contact – was a recurring topic of Murakami's work, his extensive scholarship requires being contextualized by his understanding of and involvement in the diplomacy and geopolitics of his time. I do so by examining the document-based empiricism of Murakami and his colleagues and by looking beyond their scholarly productions.

The secondary argument is that the selective highlighting of early modern primary sources led to the foregrounding of maritime expansion, foreign commerce, and diplomacy. The tangible archive (by which I mean collections, images, and material objects including architecture

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and monuments as opposed to unrecorded practices and oral traditions), which created and continues to create biases and epistemic ignorance, was key in this process. Taking a closer look at the polyvocal archive of foreign relations, I explore how multiple actors from different time periods coconstructed historiographical knowledge about early modern Japanese foreign relations and maritime expansion. After the implementation of the empirical method in Japan in the 1880s, such knowledge constructions based on archival research data gradually came to justify Japanese hegemony in Asia by purposefully accentuating select aspects of the past and silencing others. The tangible archive lay the foundation for a narrative of foreign relations that privileged the state and 'great' men while excluding other actors from accessible knowledge repositories and source editions. As a result, this process of negotiating the tangible archives of imperialism perpetuated unequal power relations and contributed to archival practices that silenced the large majority of historical actors.[1]

It is my specific aim to recover pasts overwritten, silenced, and lost by global intellectual trajectories and the unequal power relations intrinsic to any scientific knowledge production.[2] This is also my way of contributing to a global history of ideas that neither negates nor downplays power relations, gender, or Indigenous questions.[3] Over recent decades, postcolonial theoreticians, decolonial thinkers, gender scholars, and global intellectual historians, among others, have improved our understanding of what has become known as epistemic violence within the broader realm of scientific colonialism.[4] I suggest adding the notion of historiographical violence, which has cast a long shadow on research in

[1] For a discussion of archival practices as systematic violence, see Marisa J. Fuentes, *Dispossessed Lives: Enslaved Women, Violence, and the Archive* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016).

[2] Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1970). To emphasize the multiplicity of worlds and knowledge systems and to stimulate awareness for implicit ethnocentrism, I apply the concept of concurrences throughout this study. For the usefulness of concurrences in global history, see Gunlög Fur, 'Concurrences as a Methodology for Discerning Concurrent Histories,' in Diana Brydon, Peter Forsgren, and Gunlög Fur, eds., *Concurrent Imaginaries, Postcolonial Worlds: Toward Revised Histories* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 33–75.

[3] I use 'Indigenous' with uppercase for Indigenous people and cultures past and present and 'indigenous' with lowercase when referring to the subject matter.

[4] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?,' in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, eds., *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), 271–313; Walter Mignolo, *Desobediencia Epistémica: Retórica de la Modernidad, Lógica de la Colonialidad y Gramática de la Descolonialidad* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo, 2010), 35–40; Walter Mignolo, *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the humanities in East and Southeast Asia.[5] By historiographical violence I mean the narratives that position Europeans and Japanese as the far more important or even sole makers of history while simultaneously ignoring Indigenous actors' voices and regional practices of engaging with the past. This process happened in parallel with discipline specialization in history, geography, Sinology, and anthropology, to name just a few, and lent authority to the various academic and political agendas.[6] Modern historical science served to elevate the nation state and its elite members.[7] Nation states that aspired to modernization crafted national histories in a process that made heavy use of both mythmaking and the silencing of subaltern pasts.[8]

An extensive body of scholarship has explored the complicit role of historical studies and its spatiotemporal subdisciplines in Meiji Japan's imperial projects. Margaret Mehl and Lisa Yoshikawa have traced how state-sponsored academic historians aimed to make the Japanese public aware of the nation's history while fostering patriotism.[9] Joshua Fogel's keen focus on exploring Sino-Japanese interactions has demonstrated how books, translations, objects, and individuals (be they travelers, scholars, businessmen, or artists) forged ties between Japan and China and subsequently shaped the thinking about the two historical entities.[10] Several others, including David Mervart and Michael Facius, have noted the ontological importance of Chinese Studies in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Japan, respectively, and highlighted the intrinsic connections between the traditional training in classical China, modern

[5] Throughout this book I use the term 'humanities' as generic translation for *bungaku*, to refer to the disciplines taught in faculties of letters, liberal arts colleges, and cultural studies departments.

[6] Margaret Mehl, 'The European Model and the Archive in Japan: Inspiration or Legitimation?,' *History of the Human Sciences* 26, no. 4 (2013): 107–27.

[7] See contributions to George Steinmetz, ed., *Sociology and Empire: The Imperial Entanglements of a Discipline* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013) and, in particular, the article by Ou-Byung Chae, 'Japanese Colonial Structure in Korea in Comparative Perspective,' 396–414, where he shows that Japanese historical scholarship was in permanent dialogue with other disciplines.

[8] Ann Laura Stoler, 'Tense and Tender Ties: The Politics of Comparison in North American History and (Post)colonial Studies,' *Journal of American History* 88, no. 3 (2001): 829–65.

[9] Margaret Mehl, *History and the State in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999); Lisa Yoshikawa, *Making History Matter: Kuroita Katsumi and the Construction of Imperial Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017).

[10] See essays in Joshua A. Fogel, *Between China and Japan: The Writings of Joshua Fogel*, vol. 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

historical science, and foreign relations.[11] Satō Yūki has drawn attention to the importance of historical sources (*komonjo*) and their systematic collection, as well as how Meiji-period debates about a 'real (or true) history' (*seishi*) determined what was considered relevant and hence worthy of the attention of academic historians.[12] The works of Yijang Zhong and Seiji Shirane point to how history was one of the many disciplines complicit with national and emerging colonial objectives at the turn of the twentieth century.[13] What I want to add to existing scholarship is how the early modern past was narrated by Japanese scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. My focus lies on the Japanese historiography of foreign and diplomatic relations (*gaikō* or the *taigai kankei*) with Europeans during the Edo period (1600–1868).[14]

Foreign relations enjoyed popularity as a field of study since academic history was first established in Japan at the end of the nineteenth century. A major shift in its historiography occurred in the 1970s, when studies on topics including tributary missions to Edo, the pitfalls of the closed country (*sakoku*) narrative, and nineteenth-century treaty negotiations surged. Since then, a wealth of research has underlined the special nature of the Tokugawa *bakufu*'s geopolitics in Asia and explored how Japanese

[11] Michael Facius, *China Übersetzen. Globalisierung und Chinesisches Wissen in Japan im 19. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/Main: Campus Verlag, 2017); David Mervart, 'Meiji Japan's China Solution to Tokugawa Japan's China Problem,' *Japan Forum* 27, no. 4 (2015): 544–58. For China as reference point in Tokugawa Japan, see Harry D. Harootunian, 'The Function of China in Tokugawa Thought,' in Akira Iriye, ed., *The Chinese and the Japanese: Essays in Political and Cultural Interactions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 9–36.

[12] Satō Yūki 佐藤雄基, '明治期の史料再訪と古文書学の成立' Meijiki no shiryō saihō to komonjogaku no seiritsu (Source gathering and the development of paleography in the Meiji period), in Matsukawa Yusuka, ed., 近代日本のヒストリオグラフィー *Kindai nihon no historiogurafii* (Historiography of modern Japan) (Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 2015), 27–57; Satō Yūki, '日本中世史は何の役に立つのか:史学史的考察と個人的覚書' Nihon chūseishi ha nan no yaku ni tatsu no ka: shigakushiteki kōsatsu to kojinteki oboegaki (What is the utility of medieval Japanese history? Historiographical and personal reflections), *Shien* 79, no. 2 (2019): 1–26.

[13] Yijang Zhong, 'Formation of History as a Modern Discipline in Meiji Japan,' *Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series* 191 (2012): 4; Seiji Shirane, *Imperial Gateway: Colonial Taiwan and Japan's Expansion in South China and Southeast Asia, 1895–1945* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2022), 66–9.

[14] For an overview of pre–Second World War writers and publications, see data collected at Kyushu University by Furukawa Yuki 古川祐貴, www2.lit.kyushu-u.ac.jp/~his_jap/premodernpaleography/bunken-kinsei.html (accessed December 15, 2020). The list is based on Nakada Yasunao 中田易直, 近世日本対外関係文献目録 *Kinsei nihon taigai kankei bunken mokuroku* (A bibliography of early modern Japanese foreign relations) (Tokyo: Tōsui shobō, 1999); Tashiro Kazui and Susan Downing Videen, 'Foreign Relations during the Edo Period: Sakoku Reexamined,' *Journal of Japanese Studies* 8, no. 2 (1982): 283–306.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stakeholders managed complex foreign politics and international trade.[15] While scholars are right to emphasize the importance of neighboring Asian territories such as Chosŏn Korea and the Ryūkyū Kingdom for strengthening the authority of the Tokugawa as overlords during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, I argue that early seventeenth-century contacts with European trading nations were of unparalleled historiographical and epistemological significance. Historians like Murakami molded history through deliberate linguistic, temporal, and spatial translations. For a better understanding of how scholars tied hegemonic knowledge to historiographical processes, it will be imperative to investigate the unjust technologies they applied.[16]

Asymmetrical narratives are not always the result of interpretations derived from explicit power differentials. In many cases, practices that highlight and obscure are unconscious processes that play out over longer periods of time. Tackling such historiographical practices in global intellectual history requires acknowledgment of the close relationship between selectiveness, translation, and meta-narratives. For the historiography of Japanese early modern foreign relations, this means disentangling *gaikō* narratives based on modernization discourses from the Sinocentric frame of formal tributary relations. While Murakami's

[15] I shall limit myself here to a selection of the most influential surveys of the past four decades, beginning with Arano Yasunori 荒野泰典, '日本型華夷秩序の形成' Nihongata ka'i chitsujo no keisei (The development of a Japanese order of civilized and barbarian), in Amino Yoshihiko and Asao Naohiro, eds., 日本の社会史ー列島内外の交通と国家 *Nihon no shakaishi. Rettō naigai no kōtsū to kokka* (A social history of Japan: Foreign and domestic navigation and the state), vol. 1 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1987); Tanaka Takeo 田中健夫, ed., 前近代の日本と東アジア *Zenkindai no nihon to higashiajia* (Japan and East Asia in the early modern period) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1995); Takase Kōichirō 高瀬弘一郎, キリシタン時代の貿易と外交 *Kirishitan jidai no bōeki to gaikō* (Trade and diplomacy during the Christian era) (Tokyo: Yagi Shoten, 2002); Ikeuchi Satoshi 池内敏, 大君外交と 「武威」 近世日本の国際秩序と朝鮮観 *Taikun gaikō to 'bui'. Kinsei nihon no kokusai chitsujo to chōsenkan* (Overlord diplomacy and 'military authority.' Early modern Japan's international system and the perception of Korea) (Nagoya: Nagoya daigaku shuppankai, 2006).

[16] I understand knowledge as a multilayered construct broadly defined as the sum of academic and expert knowledge, particularly skills, popular discourses, and popular knowledge, as suggested in the volume by Lissa Roberts, Simon Schaffer, Kapil Raj, and James Delbourgo, eds., *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770–1820* (Sagamore Beach: Science History Publications, 2009). See also Johann Östling, Erling Sandmo, David Larsson Heidenblad, Anna Nilsson Hammar, and Kari H. Nordberg, eds., 'The History of Knowledge and the Circulation of Knowledge. An Introduction,' in *Circulation of Knowledge: Explorations in the History of Knowledge* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2018), 9–36. In approximating and becoming aware of the complex relationship between historical narratives, the archive, and power, I took much inspiration from the work of Michel-Rolph Trouillot in the making of Haitian history. Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2015).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contribution to the history of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century foreign relations primarily featured interactions with Europe and Europeans in Southeast Asia, the impact and afterlife of his scholarship only can be fully grasped in the context of a centuries-long tradition of perceiving the cultural and political histories of East Asia through the lens of a China-centered universe of shared classical texts and practices, sometimes referred to as the Sinosphere.[17] In English-language scholarship, the overemphasis on China-centrism in foreign relations and civilization discourse was shaped by the work of John K. Fairbank in the 1950s and 1960s.[18] Yet, while Fairbank stressed the importance of using diplomatic documents, the very Chinese sources on which he based his research were selected for him by others.[19] This resulted in misinterpretation and in an oversimplification of China's claims to universal rule that paid hardly any attention to the contradictions and complexities that came, for instance, with Manchu rule and their creative adaption as foreign rulers to the existing Han protocol. Hence, there are obvious, although contingent, parallels when it comes to notions of hierarchy in foreign relations. Both in the case of Cold War area studies *a la* Fairbank and Murakami's prewar historiography of early modern foreign relations, biases derive from source selection and translatory choices. While Murakami's scholarship led to an overemphasis on the position of Europe within early modern Japanese political developments, Fairbank's work essentialized the role of tributary relations and Chinese protocol in the East Asian world order prior to the twentieth century. To complicate things even further, it must also be firmly stated that while these foreign relations myths are still apparent in English-language scholarship, they gained no ground in Japanese scholarship. Japanese scholars could turn to a vast archive of engaging with and gazing at China to forge their own narratives.

[17] Joshua A. Fogel, *Articulating the Sinosphere. Sino-Japanese Relations in Space and Time* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 9.

[18] Ssu-yü Teng and John K Fairbank, *Research Guide for China's Response to the West: A Documentary Survey, 1839–1923* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954); John K Fairbank, ed., *The Chinese World Order: Traditional China's Foreign Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968).

[19] The Chinese diplomatic documents that Fairbank consulted with the ambition of including the Chinese side were, to a large extent, part of a published source collection. Jiang Tingfu, *A Collection of Major Historical Documents on Modern China's Foreign Relations* (*Jindai Zhongguo waijiaoshi ziliao jiyao*) (Changsha, 1932–4). Cf. Henrietta Harrison, 'The Qianlong Emperor's Letter to George III and the Early-Twentieth-Century Origins of Ideas about Traditional China's Foreign Relations,' *American Historical Review* 122, no. 3 (2017): 680–701, here 697. For an updated discussion of imperial China's foreign relations, see Angela Schottenhammer, 'Foreign Trade,' in Debin Ma and Richard von Glahn, eds., *The Cambridge Economic History of China*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 637–75.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A Note on Terminology and Concepts

A few years ago, I posed what I thought was the provocative question of whether Murakami was a "global historian avant la lettre."[20] In retrospect, suggesting that Murakami was ahead of his time does seem more naïve than provocative.[21] It would, of course, be an anachronism to dub Murakami a global historian, by which I mean someone who looked at comparisons and connections beyond the nation, and positioned his empirical research productively to advance and nuance historical thinking. While Murakami shared most of the methods and views of his colleagues in Japanese history, I felt the need to emphasize that he had a different research focus. In a period when Historical Studies was compartmentalized by nations and eras, Murakami's research crossed thematic, disciplinary, and chronological boundaries. The fact that Murakami acquired expertise in various fields including foreign languages and translation, while remaining relatively unknown outside the realm of early modern history, provides an interesting insight into his scholarly career. For instance, while he is today best known for his pioneering efforts to further the study of Christianity in Japan, contemporaries referred to Murakami as a scholar of *kōryūshi* (history of foreign interactions) or *kōtsūshi* (history of communication or trade).[22] And while the differences between Murakami and the recent cohort of global historians are blatant when it comes to ethnocentric biases or questions of positionality, there can be no doubt that he internationalized Japanese history. His commitment to the empiricist tradition added important details to the knowledge of past global connections and ultimately made historical processes in East Asia comparable to that of other world regions.

Engaging with questions of connections and comparability throughout this book, I use global history instead of related labels such as world history to describe my work. To be sure, depending on the context and

[20] I refer here to my presentation at the Global Japan Seminar, Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, University of Tokyo (Tōbunken) on June 14, 2019.

[21] Michael Facius has shown how already in 1896 Mitsukuri Genpachi, a contemporary of Murakami at Tōdai, articulated world historical thinking. Michael Facius, 'A Rankean Moment in Japan: The Persona of the Historian and the Globalization of the Discipline, c.1900,' *Modern Intellectual History* (2020): 1–24.

[22] The term *kōtsūshi* (行通史) was used in the correspondence between the Imperial Academy of Japan, the Japanese Embassy in the Netherlands, and the Algemeen Rijksarchief. See files in Nihon gakushiin, Nichiran kankei shorui, Taishō 14–Shōwa 5. The Japanese Wikipedia entry about Murakami Naojirō referred to him as a specialist in the history of Japanese–European communication (*nichiō tsūkōshi* 日欧通行史), relations with Southeast Asia (*tōnan ajia kankeishi*, 東南アジア関係史), and the history of Christianity (in Japan) (*kirisutokyō shi*), https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E6%9D%91%E4%B8%8A%E7%9B%B4%E6%AC%A1%E9%83%8E (accessed September 9, 2021).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nature of the scholarship, world history and global history have overlapping meanings, with both fields exploring the interactions between peoples in large-scale historical processes.[23] Although the meanings of the terms are fluid, an ever-increasing wealth of literature has discussed their different parameters since the 1990s. In the interest of space, I would like to limit myself to stressing that key differences in the two approaches lie in perspective and methodology, with recent global historians using multilingual sources to promote a bottom-up understanding of history and explanations that favor institutions other than the state and powerful stakeholders. These developments have led to a shift in questions regarding which processes and whose past we study, and how we engage with those who have been traditionally left out.[24] In Japanese, *sekaishi* is almost interchangeably used with the twenty-first-century neologism *gurobaru historii*.[25] Certainly Murakami did not see himself as a practitioner of *sekaishi*, nor did he understand the world as completely interconnected through globalization.[26] Still, his work influenced later research in global intellectual history and studies of seventeenth-century encounters and enabled conceptual contributions to research in global diplomacy. In short, Murakami's work laid the foundation for securing Japan a fixed place and consistent presence in recent scholarship in global early modernity.

Early modern is yet another term that appears frequently in this book. While aware of the problem of teleology and even embedded paradoxes in the vocabulary of early modernity that synthesizes the past and stands for a limited set of ideas,[27] most scholars acknowledge its utility for a

[23] Trends up to 2010 are summarized in Daniel Woolf, *A Global History of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[24] Simon J. Potter and Jonathan Saha, 'Global History, Imperial History and Connected Histories of Empire,' *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 16, no. 1 (2015): 1–15.; Sven Beckert and Dominic Sachsenmaier, *Global History Globally: Research and Practice around the World* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2018); Romain Bertrand and Guillaume Calafat, 'La Micro-Histoire Globale: Affaire(s) à Suivre,' *Annales* 73, no. 1 (2018): 3–18.

[25] Haneda Masashi 羽田正, 新しい世界史へ: 地球市民のための構想 *Atarashii sekaishi he. Chikyū shimin no tame no kōsō* (Towards a new world history: Considerations for the citizens of the world) (Tokyo: Iwanami, 2011).

[26] The limited and today highly contested definition of global history as the 'study of globalization' emerged at the end of the twentieth century. Bruce Mazlish, 'Comparing Global History to World History,' *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 28, no. 3 (1998): 385–95.

[27] For the limits of using early modern as periodization, see Jack Goldstone, 'The Problem of the "Early Modern" World,' *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 41, no. 3 (1998): 249–84.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

polycentric period of profound transformations.[28] As a temporal marker, it is largely accepted with flexible start and end dates. For Europe and the Atlantic world, early modern refers to the period after 1492 to the late eighteenth century; for Southeast Asia, it is, with some exceptions, more or less equivalent to the period of colonial expansion; for Chinese history, it competes with other labels such as late imperial;[29] and for Japan, it denotes the period between the unification process that was concluded with the establishment of the Tokugawa shogunate in 1603 and the Meiji Restoration. The term 'early modernity' itself is a product of the early twentieth century and the global spread of ideas about what constituted the period that was distinct from the archaic or feudal era, including the Middle Ages, and preceded the contemporary world. In Japan, the term *kinsei* (近世) for the period between 1570 and 1868 was already firmly established in late nineteenth-century scholarly discourse, while its equivalent 'early modern' was rarely in use in other historiography until decades later.[30] Conceptually, *kinsei* for 'early modern' is a coproduced temporal label based on Sino-Japanese and European understandings of time. The way I use early modern in this book reflects an understanding of the intensified connectivity of the period and a recognition of the effects of long-distance commerce and great empire-building.

Spatial categories, too, necessitate a discussion of how they are used. In general, I avoid contested concepts such as West/Western or East/Eastern except in cases when they were used by Murakami or in the primary sources. The most frequently appearing spatial category in this book is the Japanese term *nan'yō* ('southern sea'). I will discuss its etymology and its implications for Southeast Asia and the Pacific Ocean in detail in Chapter 5. Here it should be underlined that the idea

[28] Alan Strathern, 'Global Early Modernity and the Problem of What Came Before,' *Past & Present* 238, no. suppl 13 (2018): 317–44.

[29] The great Japanese sinologist Naitō Konan used the term *kinseishi*, which later became applied for the early modern period in Japan, for periodizing Chinese history from the late Song period onwards. See Fogel, *Between China and Japan*, 67.

[30] The Japanese journalist and historian Tokutomi Sohō 徳富蘇峰 (1863–1957), an advocate of Europeanism, used 'kinsei' in his extensive series of Japanese history. See Tokutomi Sohō, 近世日本国民史 *Kinsei nihon kokuminshi* (A people's history of early modern Japan) (1918–52), which appeared in more than one hundred issues in the Kokumin shinbun, later Tokyo nichinichi shinbun. See also Michael Facius, 'Terms of Government: Early Modern Japanese Concepts of Rulership and Political Geography in Translation,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 82, no. 3 (2021): 521–37. David Howell has recently framed the introduction to the New Cambridge History of Japan around a discussion of the shifts in using 'kinsei' and 'early modernity.' He shows how the term 'kinsei' in Japan has already been used as a temporal marker during the Tokugawa period and appeared as an historiographical term in the early twentieth century. See David L. Howell, 'Genealogies of Japanese Early Modernity,' in David L. Howell, ed., *The New Cambridge History of Japan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024), 1–12.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the *nan'yō* was more than a geographical category describing the maritime region south of China and Japan. Within the history of Japanese imperialism, *nan'yō* was intrinsically linked to the trope of expansion. Jeremy Yellen summarizes the importance of the geopolitical concept as 'imagining centrality' and underlines that ideas of territorial expansion were important long before the articulation of the doctrine of Japan as a 'liberator' in a Greater East Asian Coprosperity Sphere.[31] In a quest to find a way to expand southwards, as expressed in the propaganda of what the historian Yano Tōru called *nanshinron*, the Japanese Empire combined efforts to challenge the physical and intellectual domination of the West. From the 1880s onwards, the southern sea (*nan'yō*) was thus systematically exploited for Japanese military and civil economic needs. Historians like Murakami helped to frame the imagined geography of the *nan'yō* as a region for broader Japanese engagement (as described for the Sinosphere by David Ambaras in terms of spatiality, social construction of space, and contesting and promoting of borders and boundaries).[32] Murakami did so by making knowledge accessible about former colonial powers that Japanese leaders sought to replace.

Finally, some technical notes are due. Direct quotations from the source material are indicated with double quotation marks. For clarity, Japanese characters are provided for names and key terms at first mention or when necessary to avoid confusion. All titles of publications in East Asian languages will be provided in their original script, followed by a transcription to the Latin alphabet and a translation to English at first mention in the footnotes. The only exception to this format is Murakami's publications that are listed with complete bilingual bibliographical data in Table 1.1 and are thus always abbreviated in the footnotes. For Chinese titles I use pinyin without the tone markers. All translations are mine except where otherwise stated.

Why Murakami Naojirō?

Murakami Naojirō has shaped the field of early modern Japanese foreign relations like no one before or after him. His multiple foreign-language skills would become his main asset and support his extensive publishing efforts. Largely focusing on European Japanese contacts, Murakami's lifelong gathering of records of foreign relations, most of them neither available in Japan nor written in Japanese, made archival material in

[31] Jeremy A. Yellen, *The Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere: When Total Empire Met Total War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2019), 4.

[32] David Ambaras, *Japan's Imperial Underworlds: Intimate Encounters at the Borders of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

multiple languages accessible to scholars and students, as well as to the political elite and the public.[33] Editions and books in his name added to his lasting reputation as an expert who covered the entire history of early modern Japanese foreign relations, while his compilations of translated historical sources provided research possibilities and offered interpretations to future generations.

Murakami Naojirō was a historian of the second generation of professionally trained Japanese academic historians.[34] He had left his samurai family home in Kyushu at a young age to study in Kyoto and Tokyo. In 1892 he was admitted to Tokyo Imperial University (hereafter University of Tokyo or Tōdai), where he was educated in literature and letters (*bungaku*).[35] In the mid-Meiji-period atmosphere of progress and change, he developed a keen interest in the history of Japanese exchange processes with Europeans. Soon after his graduation, he became involved in large-scale government-sponsored historiographical projects. In 1896, he was sent on a source-gathering mission to Taiwan at a time when the island had just been occupied by the victorious Meiji Empire the previous year. Three years later, he began a three-year-long systematic search for sources in libraries and archives in Europe.

The results of Murakami's extensive archival research overseas laid the foundation for the Department for Foreign Manuscripts Related to Japan (now Overseas Materials Section) at the Historiographical Institute (Shiryō hensanjo) of the University of Tokyo.[36] The preservation of primary sources as close as possible to their original form and the constant act of translating have been the key tasks of the department's staff ever since the establishment of the institute.[37] During the first decade of the twentieth century, Murakami spent several years as historiographical officer at the Historiographical Institute. In his day and age, newly discovered material was converted into research sources. Murakami's source translations from Spanish, Portuguese, Latin, Dutch, English, and classical Chinese to Japanese left a lasting terminological imprint on the way seventeenth-century Japanese encounters with

[33] A selection of Murakami's source translations includes *Yaso kaishi nihon tsūshin* (1927); *Ikoku nikki* (1911); *Ikoku ōfuku shokanshū* (1929); *Don Rodorigo nihon kenbunroku; Visukaino kingintō tanken hōkoku* (1929); two volumes of *Shōyaku batabiajō nisshi* (1937–8); and three volumes of *Nagasaki oranda shōkan no nikki* (1956–8). See the List of Murakami's Publications.

[34] Mehl, *History and the State*, 87–95. [35] See Figure 2.1.

[36] The Historiographical Office was established in 1869; in 1888, its researchers transferred to the Imperial University. For the Overseas Material Section, see www.hi.u-tokyo.ac.jp/en/tokushu/ (accessed August 2, 2023).

[37] Today the Historiographical Institute uses state-of-the-art digitization technology to preserve different types of historical material.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Europe and Southeast Asia have been narrated and retranslated. Given that straightforward European biases, such as Murakami's repeated claim that Spain and Portugal introduced civilization to the East, have been blissfully ignored by later generations, it remains crucial to question how linguistic translation and related processes played out in the aftermath of his data collection and to critically examine knowledge production from the perspective of politically motivated, imperial agendas.[38]

Murakami studied and worked in an environment where sources concerning the state, including foreign and diplomatic history, were prioritized.[39] The methods of verifiable empiricism increased the historian's authority. His understanding of the past was informed by the necessity of repositioning Japan with the help of the Western teleological history-writing that had replaced the cyclical model of Chinese dynastic chronicles that were prevalent in Japan until the mid-nineteenth history.[40] Japanese historians invented their own 'regimes of historicity,' to paraphrase François Hartog, whose analysis primarily focuses on teleological narratives that emphasize progress and linear development and the past's connection to the present and future.[41] Reluctant to accept European universal history as a model for the history of the Japanese state and society, Japanese historians created a unique methodology that was nonetheless profoundly shaped by the spirit of historicism. Historicism refers to the scientific study of historical sources and is usually associated with nineteenth-century German historians such as Leopold von Ranke and his disciples. In addition to holding a strong belief that a thorough study of archival sources would succeed in establishing historical facts, representatives of historicism defined the past in terms of progress. Yet, it is important to note that academic history in Japan was also influenced by Chinese, French, British, and American

[38] For the quote concerning civilization, see the preface of Murakami, *Nichiran 300nen no shinkō* (1915), preface (jo). This stand-alone publication was originally published in 1914 in a volume entitled *Nihon to Oranda* edited by the Nichiran kyōkai (Dutch-Japanese Association).

[39] Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); Stephen Vlastos, *Mirror of Modernity: Invented Traditions of Modern Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); Mark R. Peattie and Ramon H. Myers, eds., *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895–1945* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987). The volume edited by Peattie and Myers has sometimes been critiqued for drawing a too benevolent picture of the Japanese Empire and thereby ignoring various aspects of violence.

[40] Christopher L. Hill, *National History and the World of Nations: Capital, State and the Rhetoric of History in Japan, France and the United States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 14–23.

[41] François Hartog, *Régimes d'historicité. Présentisme et Expériences du Temps* (Paris: Seuil, 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

traditions.[42] Murakami followed traditional text criticism in his source compilations through the empirical method and the principles of *kōshōgaku* (考証学, evidentiary learning, based on a neo-Confucian model) applied to the study of ancient texts in classical Chinese. What the two approaches have in common is their exclusive focus on the written word.[43] The positivist nature of Murakami's work contributed to his image as an objective scholar whose selective strategies and heavy European bias were never openly discussed.[44]

Murakami's professional career developed toward the end of the Meiji period when history was becoming increasingly politicized in Japan's rise as an empire. When leaving the dark and dusty stacks of Tōdai's Historiographical Institute in 1908 for a position as professor and director of the Tokyo Foreign Language Academy (today known as Tokyo Gaidai), Murakami turned from a historian translating sources about past diplomatic negotiation processes into a public figure negotiating Japan's imperial presence in Asia. Ever after, Murakami deliberately highlighted his connections to the world outside Japan and his profound knowledge about it to frame both his career and identity. Later posts in university leadership, as dean at the newly founded Imperial University in Taipei (Taihoku in Japanese) (1929–35) and as the fourth president of Tokyo's Sophia University, which he undertook in his eighties (1946–53), added to his international profile. His versatile involvement in historiographical, archival, and curricular tasks within both Historical Studies and foreign-language education and his conversion to Catholicism evoke an image of a complex person with multiple ties to the government and imperial institutions.

An appropriate designation that both addresses Murakami's empirical achievements for the history of foreign relations and his involvement in diplomatic circles, while at the same time neatly framing his pragmatic character, is 'scholar diplomat.'[45] During large parts of his career,

[42] Georg G. Iggers, 'The Professionalization of Historical Studies and the Guiding Assumptions of Modern Historical Thought,' in Lloyd Kramer and Sarah Maza, eds., *A Companion to Western Historical Thought* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Online Library, 2002), 229–30.

[43] Mehl, *History*, 108, describes Murakami's generation of Japanese historians of being of "over-critical attitude, which accepts nothing that is not mentioned in the primary documents."

[44] Shimizu's recent critique is a rare exception. Shimizu Yūko 清水有子, '徳川政権期の日本・スペイン外交文書' *Tokugawa seikenki no nihon-spain gaikō monjo* (Japanese–Spanish foreign relations sources during Tokugawa rule) (2021): 37–61, www.f.Waseda.Jp/Yohashi/37-61(清水原稿).Pdf.

[45] The term 'scholar diplomat' usually refers to the figure of a professional or career diplomat, an ambassador or high-ranking representative of a state, who engages with

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Murakami worked across the three pillars of diplomacy – negotiation, representation, and intelligence gathering – and served his country both at home and abroad. In the late 1890s, the Japanese Imperial Regime assigned him to collect material to write early modern Japan into the history of international relations. Government institutions such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Taiwan Government-General enlisted him in archival diplomacy and commissioned and financed clearly defined knowledge-gathering far into the 1930s.

One aspect that needs to be addressed in the process of offering new, nuanced insights into the epistemes' structuring power and knowledge about past relations is Murakami's closeness to imperial institutions involved in Japan's colonial expansion in Asia. It is impossible to describe his role in a few sentences. As a prolific writer and representative of elite educational institutions, Murakami does not fit into any of the prominent groups involved in the overseas expansion of the Japanese Empire. He was neither among the politicians, journalists, and scientists who openly promoted military and economic expansion and intellectual leadership in Asia, nor did he belong to the larger, often voiceless group of Japanese emigrants who built, expanded, and maintained the empire.[46] As a translator and educator, he entertained close ties to government offices including the Foreign Ministry and the Taiwanese Governor-General. Intentionality aside, the following chapters will provide evidence to say that he was an imperialist. He benefited from his state-assigned positions, was on the state's pay roll, collaborated with institutions complicit in imperial expansion, and created narratives that at the very least could be appropriated by the expansionist Japanese Empire. Murakami's biography shows how boundaries between intellectual curiosity and active involvement in the construction of history are blurred. His translations of Western European blueprints contributed to the way we see Japan in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as a strong Asian nation that owes its glory to great men and merchants. His publications left no doubt about which country was historically legitimized to dominate the southern seas beyond Japan. Essential to this epistemological

academia. Scholar diplomats in the twenty-first century hold professorships at renowned universities and write books. In the late 1900s, people like Ernest M. Satow contributed to history with writing academically acclaimed books. A reverse case is that of Edwin O. Reischauer, who as trained scholar of Japanese Studies was appointed ambassador of the United States to Japan in 1961 under the Kennedy administration.

[46] For the role of overseas migrants to the formation of the Japanese Empire, see Eiichiro Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier. Japanese America and Settler Colonialism in the Construction of Japan's Borderless Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2019). For outspoken expansionists, see Martin Dusinberre, 'J. R. Seeley and Japan's Pacific Expansion,' *Historical Journal* 64, no. 1 (2021): 70–97.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

process is the implicit link between political views of expansion and the scholarly conceptualizations of *nan'yō* (here Southeast Asia and the Pacific) and *gaikō* (here diplomatic relations).[47]

When assessing Murakami's relationship with the state, it is important to remember that his freedom of thought was constrained by concrete work tasks that he received from superiors at the Historiographical Institute and government institutions. There can be no doubt, however, that he had agency in shaping narratives through both thematic and terminological choices as well as his positioning of archival material. Alessandro Stanziani's study of the role of archives in modern state-building and his contention that many pre–Second World War national histories were written to justify the expansionist reality of empire are also crucially relevant for the Japanese Empire.[48] Taking history-making from the late Meiji period to the early post–Second World War era as its point of departure, *Negotiating Imperialism* aims to challenge some of the biases and concepts that still dominate global histories of early modern diplomacy.[49]

Beyond a Scholar's Biography: Translation and the Archive

This book is neither a conventional biography of a Japanese historian nor a survey of his impressive oeuvre that comprised over twenty volumes of source editions, six research monographs, and close to one hundred articles and book chapters. Although such a study of Murakami's life would be valuable for filling knowledge gaps and shedding light on underrepresented aspects of Japanese historiography, I feared that my attempt would easily be misread, either as hagiography or undue criticism. As someone who first engaged with Murakami in Osaka as a history undergraduate in 2006, I am biased. Murakami's critical edition of the

[47] Robert Tierney has argued that Japanese colonialism in Southeast Asia was built upon imperial mimicry and the use of Western-style economic penetration. Robert Thomas Tierney, *Tropics of Savagery. The Culture of Japanese Empire in Comparative Frame* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 147–81.

[48] Alessandro Stanziani, *Eurocentrism and the Politics of Global History* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 76–80.

[49] Halvard Leira, 'A Conceptual History of Diplomacy,' in Costas M. Constantinou, Pauline Kerr, and Paul Sharp, eds., *The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy* (London: Sage Publications, 2016), 37. While equally complex, early modern diplomacy differs from what Auslin has described as "being at the same time hard-hearted and visionary, realistic and utopian" for the more recent past. See Michael R. Auslin, *Negotiating with Imperialism. The Unequal Treaties and the Culture of Japanese Diplomacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 12.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ikoku nikki shō kōchū (Extracts from the diary of foreign countries and collection of the correspondence with foreign lands, with notes and supplements) was my initial contact with Japanese primary sources. Before long, owing to my research on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Japanese trade and diplomacy in Southeast Asia, Murakami's compilations and translations evolved into my personal canon. At the same time, I became increasingly puzzled by the challenge to identify which parts of his editions were translations and which were not. Having developed a keen interest in the question of how translations generate new knowledge, I decided to opt for an entangled biography. I believe that my identity and training – a non-Japanese, female historian specializing in early modern Asian and diplomatic relations with a profound engagement with Murakami and the institutions he helped build up – qualify me to turn this endeavor into a survey of coproduced knowledge, with a specific focus on the historian as translator.[50]

I have chosen the method of entangled biography for my analysis of multifaceted connections among scholars, sources, and narratives of foreign relations and overseas expansion.[51] While conventional biographies of scholars portray the life stages and professional achievements of one scholar, this entangled biography provides a more inclusive picture of whom Murakami interacted with and how his multiple roles shaped his thinking. Murakami is the glue of the manuscript but not of the narrative. Murakami may be the protagonist, but he is not the only one. Entangled throughout his biography – in multiple ways – are people of a variety of backgrounds, including scholars he actually met as well as the historical heroes and villains of his books, and the authors of the archival sources he engaged with.[52] The latter point resonates with the awareness – informed by Dominick LaCapra's concept of 'transference' – that historians "adopt patterns and ideas from the people [of the past]

[50] Scholars from science and technology studies acknowledge coproduction as the result of scientific ideas evolving together with popular representations, discourses, and the meaning of both ideas and objects. As a result, the actors receive special attention in evaluating knowledge production and circulation. Applied to historical knowledge, this means that narratives of the past are shaped not only by the dissemination of academic research but also by popular discourse, which itself is largely influenced by media. See Sheila Jasanoff, *States of Knowledge. The Co-production of Science and Social Order* (London: Routledge, 2004).

[51] For lived history as a method and its appeal for global history, see Laura Almagor, Haakon A. Ikonomou, and Gunvor Simonsen, eds., *Global Biographies. Lived History as a Method* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2022).

[52] For a plea of biography as an approach for historical research beyond individual lives, see Lois W. Banner, 'Biography as History,' *American Historical Review* 114, no. 3 (2009): 579–86.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

they are writing about."[53] Exploring knowledge over space and time, the book contextualizes a large body of scholarly work within relevant discourses, trends, and environments and offers opportunities for novel understandings. However, as Murakami's scholarship remains the center of attention, so does the risk of creating new biases. As the voices of Murakami and his peers will be amplified, the thoughts and actions of many silenced actors will inevitably be eclipsed. However, what I can avoid is an essentialization of Murakami as a Japanese scholar of a different time. I will do so by extending the focus upon two defining elements of his work: translation and the archive. Combining the agency of translations with archival positions forces me to work reflexively when interpreting the multilingual data. Both the politics of doing and publishing research and the social practices embodied by the researcher are dominant factors in knowledge production.[54] The proposed entangled biography approach is thus not just an appropriate method to highlight (dis)connections but also an effective way of reflecting on the sociolinguistic dynamics behind subject and object positions.

Translation has emerged as a vibrant field for historians of ideas. Over the past decade, global intellectual historians have addressed the need to pay closer attention to the specifics of translation in premodern knowledge transfer.[55] Scholars of Japanese history have examined the cross-linguistic complexities to which translators, interpreters, and intermediaries were exposed between the fifteenth and the mid-nineteenth centuries.[56] The shared insights of scholars of both Japanese and intellectual history are relevant for a better understanding of the nexus between translations and narratives of later centuries. Translation processes not only went far beyond the literary 'translatio' of written texts but also changed dynamically over the centuries, decades, or even years. In the history of early modern foreign relations, translations are the

[53] Dominick LaCapra, *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983), 31. According to LaCapra, 'transference' constitutes the displacement of feeling from one context to another.

[54] Mats Alvesson and Kaj Sköldberg, *Reflexive Methodology. New Vistas for Qualitative Research* (Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, 2018), 10–11.

[55] Martin Mulsow, 'New Perspectives on Global Intellectual History,' *Global Intellectual History* 2, no. 1 (2017): 1–2; Carlo Ginzburg promoted an 'ethnophilological' intervention in this context. Carlo Ginzburg, 'Ethnophilology: Two Case Studies,' *Global Intellectual History* 2, no. 1 (2017): 3–17.

[56] In addition to Fogel's *Between Japan and China*, see Lissa Roberts, 'Frontier Tales: Tokugawa Japan in Translation,' in Lissa Roberts, Simon Schaffer, Kapil Raj, and James Delbourgo, eds., *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770–1820* (Sagamore Beach: Science History Publications, 2009), 1–47; David Mervart, 'The Republic of Letters Comes to Nagasaki: Record of a Translator's Struggle,' *Journal of Transcultural Studies* 6, no. 2 (2015): 8–37.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

product of a combination of factors including disparities between different scripts, previous translation processes, changes in linguistic conventions, and pressures from multiple audiences of different backgrounds to name but four. Yet, when Murakami translated a seventeenth-century letter originally written in Spanish (Castilian), which survived as part of moralistic travel writings in Italian, to Japanese, to name just one random example, he did not comment on any of these issues. He never mentioned that a certain term may have had different connotations or noted that its meaning may have changed, let alone considered the possibility that it may have been untranslatable.[57] Finding a quasi-equivalent was the accepted practice of twentieth-century Japanese scholars committed to contributing to an internationally comprehensive lexicon.[58] This book wants to achieve greater awareness of such multilayered complexities.

Archival moments constitute another important aspect of Murakami's biography. The search for and unearthing of historical documents from archives and libraries around the world formed his entire career. He believed in the historian's duty to invest in the process of recovering the past. The historical philosopher Herman Paul speaks of a time and place-specific meso level "characterized by [the historian's] specific habits, virtues, skills and competencies" as an intermediate position between the scholar's self-fashioning and the macro approach focusing on context.[59] Passionate commitment to often painstaking archival hunts could easily turn into an obsession as most historians would confirm. To be sure, I share Murakami's excitement for working with archival manuscripts in their original form, a feeling I am reminded of every time I am referring to microfilms or digitized resources. The multisensual experience of working with physical archives that hold unpublished documents and rare books was a key part of my training as an early modern historian. My own archival moment is intrinsically linked to the smell and dust of the Historiographical Institute of the University of Tokyo (*Shiryō hensanjo*), Murakami's home institution in the early 1900s. Spending many quiet hours hiding among rare prints and *shashinshū* (hardback facsimiles of handwritten manuscripts) in library stacks, I had two essential insights: first, that all historians create their

[57] Monica Juneja and Margrit Pernau, 'Lost in Translation? Transcending Boundaries in Comparative History,' in Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, eds., *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 105–29.

[58] For multilayered translation of key concepts in history, see Hans-Martin Krämer, Tino Schölz, and Sebastian Conrad, eds., *Geschichtswissenschaft in Japan. Themen, Ansätze und Theorien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

[59] Herman Paul, 'Introduction. Scholarly Personae: What They Are and Why the Matter,' in Herman Paul, ed., *How to Be a Historian: Scholarly Personae in Historical Studies, 1800–2000* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019), 1–14 (here 3; 7).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

own archive; and second, that all historians make implicit comparisons.[60] As trivial as these insights may seem, they are valuable when trying to understand how historians use the past and provide a way to bridge the gap between different generations of historians and historical actors.

In my early attempts at decoding Japanese paleography at the Historiographical Institute as a PhD student, I noticed the different recording and archiving practices of East Asia as opposed to Europe, between cyclic dynastic genealogies, on the one hand, and linear teleological chronicles, on the other. My initial challenges in researching Japanese maritime trade in the sixteenth century, due to a lack of commensurable source material, miraculously solved themselves once I turned to the realm of diplomacy. Suddenly I found all those diplomatic letters, ceremonial manuals, and official reports that allowed sophisticated comparisons with material I had previously found in colonial archives in Europe. Or so I thought. It turned out that large parts of what appeared to be original Japanese primary sources were in fact translations of European accounts.

Murakami's scholarship authorized the primacy of foreign relations, represented through primary sources, and underscored the agency of great men, rulers, intellectuals, and the commercial and maritime elite in significant world historical processes. For these purposes, he applied implicit comparisons, for instance, between the Japanese seagoing merchant Yamada Nagamasa and Christopher Columbus. These comparisons were a way of embellishing certain characteristics while remaining true to historical sources and the historian's craft. Implicit comparisons are key to understanding how Murakami engaged with Western scholarship when interpreting his source material. I coined the term 'implicit comparisons' for his strategy of converging Japanese and Western premodern pasts to create the narrative that early modern Japan was on a par with expanding European empires. This historiographical dynamic of overemphasizing a small group of elite actors was part of the narrative strategy for telling the history of early modern Japanese foreign relations.[61]

[60] Jürgen Kocka, 'Comparison and Beyond,' *History and Theory* 42, no. 1 (2003): 30–44. For the recent transformation of the nature of a researcher's archive, see 'The Siloeing of Knowledge' in Ian Milligan, *The Transformation of Historical Research in the Digital Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022).

[61] An interesting parallel is the 'Momoyama history myth' described by Morgan Pitelka. In the 1880s, selectively picked factual evidence was used to create an image of a glorious period of cultural and material exchange of Toyotomi Hideyoshi's reign. In the introduction to *Japanese Tea Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2003), Pitelka dispels the myth about *cha no yu* (Japanese tea ceremony). The Momyama history myth refers to the Momoyama period (1568–1600), named after the location of Toyotomi Hideyoshi's castle in Fushimi, Kyoto, and has become a spatial and temporal shorthand for the unification process under Oda Nobunaga, Toyotomi Hideyoshi, and Tokugawa Ieyasu.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

More recently, my take on the role of the archive in creating asymmetrical versions of the past has been stimulated by decolonial scholarship questioning the traditional archive.[62] With hindsight, I realize that the Japanese archive made sense to me because it used a familiar language and the historiographical referents I had been looking for. Japan's official early modern encounters with the outside world were modeled on European empires' experiences of maritime expansion, merchant capitalism, individual agency, and emerging sovereign foreign relations. In addition to providing implicit comparisons of narrative tropes, European ways of 'doing history' also served as a methodological blueprint: publication genres, editorial tools such as annotations, appendices, and the choice of terminology lent more authority to Japanese history as it followed the professional standards of its German, British, and Spanish role models. Printed editions of primary sources, either in their original wording and spelling with annotations, or as modern transcriptions, helped academic historians in document-based societies to establish new corpora of knowledge. These editions emerged as auxiliary tools to support the search for the true nature of historical events while often striving to be all-encompassing. In Japan, large volumes of classical Japanese and Chinese-language material were collected in the repositories of temples and the libraries of local elites. In addition, non-Sinic sources were translated or at least annotated in Japanese.

The story of hegemonic knowledge is old. The attention to the violent technology of document-based, state-, male-, and literate-centric history-writing of European and Japanese imperialisms is not entirely new either. What is novel is the question of how the historical profession as was practiced in Murakami's era and is practiced today created hierarchies in how history ought to be studied. Although most of today's historians are less focused on the state or males, they continue to practice writing of the past mainly by relying on written sources, and thereby neglect oral traditions and kinetic practices – both of which are more difficult to capture in the rapidly growing global digital archive. The critique of methodological nationalism must thus be extended to the choice of sources, archives, research frames, and the questions asked. Martin Dusinberre's *Mooring the Global Archive* discusses the historians' relationship with the archive and transparency and identifies archival traps that pose greater risk to historians active in the era of digitization and artificial intelligence.[63] This book will

[62] Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge. The British in India* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 3; Rachel Buchanan, 'Decolonizing the Archives: The Work of New Zealand's Waitangi Tribunal,' *Public History Review* 14 (2007): 44–63.

[63] Martin Dusinberre, *Mooring the Global Archive: A Japanese Ship and Its Migrant Histories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023), 6-31.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

engage in particular the issue of historians' fixation on the written word most directly in Chapter 6 and the Epilogue.

Writing between Times: Notes on Temporalities and Analytical Frames

In addition to archival considerations and a critical eye on translations, the topic of this book requires moving between different periods with an experimental take on temporality.[64] By this I neither mean to question the value of chronology, nor to suggest a confrontation between circular and linear time. Addressing the cultural and linguistic dimensions of early modern records of cross-cultural negotiations, I study different concepts of temporality in the translations of later centuries. Perceptions of temporality are directly linked to translation and have always framed how people make sense of the past. In the early twentieth century, Murakami, his colleagues, and his students provided the conceptual and empirical framework for understanding early modern Japanese foreign relations, including the role of Japanese towns (*nihonmachi*) in Southeast Asian port cities, and generated myriad studies on the European–Japanese encounter. In the Japanese historiography of foreign relations, the struggle with key historical terms is also one of accommodating temporal layers resulting from multidirectional and multilingual translation processes between the late sixteenth and the early twentieth centuries.[65] My job in the 2020s is to connect the dots between the historical stages, the archive, the classroom, and the memorial plaques at tourist sites.

Clarity and context are key for a smooth engagement with the storyline of the book, which constantly shifts between three periods. In the following chapters, I will indicate the shifts from one period to another whenever possible. Here, I will introduce the three periods to prepare the reader for a journey traversing different timeframes. The first period covers the six decades between roughly 1580 and 1640 and serves as the thematic context for historiographical publications on Japanese foreign exchange under Toyotomi Hideyoshi and the early Tokugawa shogunate.[66] This period is often referred to with ambiguous labels,

[64] For temporalities and periodization, see Dan Edelstein, Stefanos Geroulanos, and Natasha Wheatley, eds., *Power and Time. Temporalities in Conflict and the Making of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020). See also Merry Wiesner-Hanks, ed., *Gendered Temporalities in the Early Modern World* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018).

[65] Murakami, 'Azuchi Momoyama jidai no kirisutokyō,' *Nihon rekishi chiri gakkai* (1914). The title hints at Murakami's theoretical reflection on a specific period of change.

[66] Ronald P. Toby, *Engaging the Other. 'Japan' and Its Alter Egos, 1550–1850* (Leiden: Brill, 2019).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

including Japan's 'Christian century' (studied under the label of *kirishitan* history in Japan)[67] or the '*namban* ("southern barbarian") era,' thereby expressing a view of an emblematic period of change and foreign influence.[68] In Japanese periodization, the time between 1570 and 1600 has sometimes been called the Momoyama period, while for the time after 1600, historians speak of the Edo or Tokugawa period, which has been described as the beginning of the 'early modern' period in Japan. The emblematic episodes and key historical actors that shape the tropes of the historical imagination and historiography of later centuries that I address in my study derive from this period.

Murakami's active years as a historian, translator, and diplomatic agent, beginning in the mid-Meiji period of the late 1890s and continuing until the Shōwa years of the 1950s, constitute the second period. This period coincides with the time of the Japanese Empire, a heterogeneous historical period that covers the end of the Meiji-era emperor system, the Russo-Japanese War, and the liberal spirit of the Taishō democracy (1912–26) that brought about societal change, most prominently in the political system. It also covers the increasing aggressions of the jingoistic imperialism of the early Shōwa era (1926–89) that saw the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, which culminated in the Asia-Pacific War with widespread operations by the Japanese military stretching from Thailand to Hawai'i (*nan'yō*), and finally the early postwar rebuilding phase. During the entire period, academic history contributed to the formation of nationalist and imperialist ideologies.[69] For my study, this period is the most prominent stage of the narration.

The third period relevant for the argument of this book encompasses the first two decades of the twenty-first century. From a purely historiographical vantage point, this can be described as the period in which the historical scholarship of Murakami's generation was revisited, in the sense that it was consulted in a search for answers to questions raised by a new type of integrated global history-writing. I suggest the term 'age

[67] Dauril Alden, James S. Cummins, and Michael Cooper, eds., *Charles R. Boxer: An Uncommon Life: Soldier, Historian, Teacher, Collector, Traveller* (Macao: Fundação Oriente, 2001).

[68] Charles R. Boxer, *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549–1650* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951); George Elison, *Deus Destroyed. The Image of Christianity in Early Modern Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).

[69] Nagahara Keiji, 'The Sengoku Daimyo and the Kandaka System,' in Nagahara Keiji, John Whitney Hall, Kozo Yamamura, eds., *Japan before Tokugawa. Political Consolidation and Economic Growth, 1500 to 1650* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981), 27–63; John S. Brownlee, *Japanese Historians and the National Myths, 1600–1945: The Age of the Gods and Emperor Jinmu* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997); Junichi Isomae, *Reimagining Early Modern Japan: Beyond the Invented/Imagined Modern Nation*, trans. Yijang Zhong (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of reflexive global history' for the period, to denote when a nuanced take on connections and frictions developed alongside an increased output of innovative studies and a truly global dialogue about the content and form of history-writing among scholars engaging in this type of scholarship. Results are manifold yet prominently represented by global intellectual history inspired by gender studies and decolonizing approaches. For the history of foreign relations, pleas to nuance and democratize materialized in polyvocal, multi-archival, and plurilingual research projects and with an increasing focus on global diplomacy. Since the early 2000s, diplomatic history has become more inclusive. Diplomacy is no longer exclusively understood as official negotiation or formal exchange of envoys and letters. The highly symbolic ceremonial and ad hoc actions by nonestablished parties often inherent in asymmetrical foreign relations are now regarded as equally important aspects of global diplomacy.[70] This third period also covers the time of my active years as an academic, first as a student and later as a scholar of history and Japanese Studies. The trends described above left institutional and epistemic imprints on the way I do and write history. I explicitly include this period to stress how my own institutional entanglements had an impact on how I came to tell stories about global historical and historiographical connections.

In addition to crossing time periods and using the key concepts defined further above, I apply three different analytical frames in this book. The first one is that of entangled biography, which has already been introduced. It operates on the assumption that the personal connections among scholars as well as the transferential connections with historical actors are of ontological importance and engender ideas and interpretations. The links between scholars and historical actors are multidirectional and based on both physical and metaphysical encounters, creating connections among scholars, sources, and narratives that form the basis for an entangled biography.

The second concept is empirical imperialism. Closely related to what has been identified as 'scholarly' or 'scientific colonialism,'[71] which

[70] Diana Carrió-Invernizzi, 'A New Diplomatic History and the Networks of Spanish Diplomacy in the Baroque Era,' *International History Review* 36, no. 4 (2014): 603–18; Nadine Amsler, Henrietta Harrison, and Christian Windler, 'Introduction: Eurasian Diplomacies around 1800: Transformation and Persistence,' *International History Review* 41, no. 5 (2019): 943–6; Birgit Tremml-Werner and Lisa Hellman, 'Merely "Ad Hoc" Diplomacy? A Global Historical Comparison of Early Modern Japanese–Spanish and Qing-Russian Foreign Relations,' *Diplomatica. A Journal of Diplomacy and Society* 2, no. 1 (2020): 57–78.

[71] Laurelyn Whitt, *Science, Colonialism, and Indigenous Peoples: The Cultural Politics of Law and Knowledge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). The concept of scholarly colonialism builds upon Aníbal Quijano's and Walter Mignolo's ideas about the ongoing colonial dominance over knowledge. See Aníbal Quijano, 'Colonialidad del

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

emerged in Japan during the interwar period, empirical imperialism points to more subtle forms of knowledge creation. It moreover encompasses circulation practices that were supported by asymmetrical power relations in which imperial institutions conquered various forms of data and knowledge and controlled the dissemination and spread of information. Such practices have been interpreted in recent scholarship of the Japanese Empire as either mimicking other imperial powers or educational avant-gardism.[72] The spirit of empirical imperialism encouraged the creation of valuable knowledge and resulted in internationally acknowledged theoretical and intellectual contributions across the humanities; hence it has had a lasting impact on existing narratives. The legacy of empirical imperialism is closely intertwined with language and the question of how narratives operate in institutional environments.

The third analytical concept is implicit comparison. As noted above, historical-writing rarely happens without comparative thinking. Implicit comparisons are less outspoken than explicit comparisons that strive to explain cultural differences. Many of the early modern writers Murakami engaged with – the most famous example being Luis Frois – employed comparison as cognitive processes either to make sense of the complex and unfamiliar circumstances or to translate their observations and findings for distant, often European, readers.[73] Although Murakami's comparative thinking was not as clearly articulated as Frois's juxtapositions, it does not mean that his references to historical actors and events from European history were unintended. A mix of examples introduced in this book will demonstrate how implicit comparisons were one of Murakami's key methodologies. Featuring in his work in multiple ways, including how material was chosen and how information was placed, implicit comparisons had a lasting effect on the sociology of knowledge.[74]

Poder, Cultura y Conocimiento in America Latina,' *Anuario Mariateguiano* 9 (1997): 113–21.

[72] Robert Eskildsen, *Transforming Empire in Japan and East Asia: The Taiwan Expedition and the Birth of Japanese Imperialism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019); Peter Duus, *The Abacus and the Sword. The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895–1910* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998). Duus pointed out that Japanese colonial thought drew from various Euro-American imperialist ideologies.

[73] Luís Fróis, *Tratado Das Contradições e Diferenças de Costumes Entre a Europa e o Japão*, ed. Loureiro Rui Manuel (Lisboa: Livros de Bordo, 2019); Murakami, *Yaso kaishi nihon tsūshin* (1927).

[74] Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (London: Routledge, 1984), 170. He argued that habitus is unconsciously created by an interplay of individual action and social structures. In *Logics of Practice* (pp. 54–5) he moreover described the processes by which the objects and methods of scientific inquiry are shaped by social determinants and by 'logics' that are often not reflected and unconscious.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1.1 *List of Murakami's publications.*

Year	Title
1896	往時の西洋書中にある日本人名地名の読方 Ōji no seiyōsho chū ni aru nihon jinmei chimei no yomikata [How to read Japanese names and place names in historical western sources] in 史学雑誌 (hereafter: Shigaku zasshi) 7/6, 67-71
1896	古書古文書に見ゆる欧語の出処 Kosho komonjo ni miyuru ōgo no shussho [The origin of European terms as seen in historical manuscripts] in Shigaku zasshi 7/6, 72-79
1897	台湾新港社文書 Taiwan shinkōsha monjo [The manuscripts of the Shinkan people of Taiwan] Shigaku zasshi 8/7, 64-73
1899	The Diary of Richard Cocks. Cape Merchant in the English Factory in Japan, 1615-1622 with correspondence. Japanese edition with additional notes, 2 vols. (Tokyo)
1900	Letters written by the English residents in Japan, 1611-1623, with other documents on the English trading settlement in Japan in the seventeenth century (edited with Murakawa Kengo) (Tokyo)
1901	大友・大村・有馬三家使節の感謝状 Ōtomo, Ōmura, Arima sanke shisetsu no kanshajō [A letter of gratitude from the embassies of Ōtomo, Ōmura and Arima] in Shigaku zasshi 12/4, 72-80
1902	シマンカス文書 Shimankasu monjo [The Simancas sources] in Shigaku zasshi 13/9, 67-70
1903	大友・大村・有馬三侯の西伊遣使に関する新史料 Ōtomo, Ōmura, Arima sankō no seii kenshi ni kansuru shin shiryō in Shigaku zasshi 14/3-4
1903	ロンドンの古文書 Murakami Noajirō, 'Rondon no Komonjokan [Archival sources in London] in Shigaku zasshi 14/9, tsuiroku
1903	往時の西洋交通が国語に及ぼしたる影響 Ōji no seiyō kōtsū ga kokugo ni oyoboshitaru eikyō [The influence of past exchange with the West on the Japanese language] in Shigaku zasshi 14/10, 1-33
1904	往時の平戸港 Ōji no Hiradokō [The port of Hirado in the past] in 歴史と地理 (hereafter; Rekishi to chiri) 6/1-2
1904	外交史料採訪録 一一六 Gaikō shiryō saihō roku 1-6 [Research records about diplomatic sources 1-6] in Rekishi to chiri 6/10-12
1905	外交史料採訪録七 Gaikō shiryō saihō roku 7 [Research records about diplomatic sources 7] in Rekishi to chiri 7/1
1906	外交史料採訪録八 Gaikō shiryō saihō roku 8 [Research records about diplomatic sources 8] in Rekishi to chiri 8/12
1906	The influence of the early Intercourse with Europe on the Japanese Language (Tokyo: Sanshūsha)*
1908	伴天連の話 Bateren no hanashi [The missionaries's story] in 東亜之光 (Tōa no hikari) 3/7
1911	異国日記抄校註 Ikoku Nikki Shō kōchū [Extracts from the Diary of Foreign Countries and Collection of the Correspondence with Foreign Lands, with notes and supplements] (Tokyo: Sanshūsha)
1911	信長と耶蘇教 Nobunaga to yasokyō [Nobunaga and Christianity) in Ogawa Taichirō and Murata Kyūkō, eds., 織田信長 Oda Nobunaga (Tokyo: Ryūbunkan)

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1.1 (*cont.*)

Year	Title
1914	安土桃山時代の基督教 Azuchi momoyama jidai no kirisutokyō [Christianity during the Azuchi Momyama period] in Nihon rekishi chiri gakkai ed., 安土桃山時代論 Azuchi momoyama jidairon (Tokyo: Jinyūsha)
1914	日蘭三百年の親交 Nichiran 300nen no shinkō [Three hundred years of friendly relations between Japan and Holland] in 日蘭協会 ed. (hereafter: Nichiran kyōkai), 日本と和蘭 Nihon to Oranda
1915	日蘭三百年の親交 (訂正再版) Nichiran 300nen no shinkō teisei saihan [Three hundred years of friendly relations between Japan and Holland, corrected republication] (Tokyo: Fuzanbō)*
1916	三百年前の日米関係 Sanbyaku nen mae no nichibei kankei [Japanese-American relations three hundred years ago] in 明治聖徳記念学会紀要 (Meiji seitoku kinengakkai) 6
1917	貿易史上の平戸 Bōekishijō no Hirado [The Commercial History of Hirado] (Tokyo: Nihon gakujutsu fukyūkan)*
1917	Japan's Early Attempts to Establish Commercial Relations with Mexico in. H. Morse Stephens and Herbert E. Bolton. ed., The pacific ocean in history; papers and addresses presented at the Panama-Pacific historical congress (New York : The Macmillan Company)
1922	300年前前の日英両国の関係 Sanbyaku nen mae no nichiei ryōkoku no kankei [The relations between Japan and England three hundred years ago] in Osaka Asahi shinbun
1922	我国に於ける西洋語学の研究 Waga kuni ni okeru seiyō gogaku no kenkyū [Research about the study of western languages in Japan] in 教授在職二十五年記念文集 Kyōju zaishoku nijugo shūnen kinen bunshū
1923	Ranald MacDonald: The Narrative of His Early Life on the Columbia under the Hudson's Bay Company's Regime; of His Experiences in the Pacific Whale Fishery; and of His Great Adventure to Japan; with a Sketch of His Later Life on the Western Frontier, 1824-1894 , edited together with Lewis Williams (Washington: Spokane)
1924	シーボルト先生渡来の目的と日本に於ける交友 Shiiboruto sensei torai no mokuteki to nihon ni okeru kōyū [The aim of Dr. Siebold's visit and his friendship in Japan] in シーボルト先生渡来百年記念論文集 Shiiboruto sensei torai hyakunen kinen ronbunshū
1925	呂宋の入貢を促したる秀吉の書簡について Ruson no nyūkō wo unagashitaru Hideyoshi no shokan ni tsuite [About a letter in which Hideyoshi demands tribute from Luzon]', *Shigaku zasshi* 36/5
1925	モンタヌスの日本誌を読む: 和田博士訳書読後の感 Montanusu no nihonshi wo yomu. Wada hakase yakusho dokugo no kan [Reading Montanus's Memories of Japan (= Atlas Japannensis) Impressions after reading the translation by Dr. Wada] in 東京日日新聞 (Tokyo nichinichi shinbun) undated
1925	新村出博士著「南蛮広記」Shinmura Izuru hakasecho 'Nanban kōki' [Dr. Shinmura Izuru's 'Nanban kōki') in 時事新報 (Jiji shinpō) undated
1926	南蛮貿易と切支丹宗門 Nanban bōeki to kirishitan shūmon [Nanban trade and Christianity] in 新小説 (Shinshōsetsu) 31/7
1926	耶蘇会年報第一巻 *Yasokai nenpō [The Annual Letters of the Jesuits]* (Nagasaki: Nagasaki shiyakushokan)
1926	日本耶蘇会刊行書物解題 Nihon yasokai kankō shomotsu kaidai [Introduction to the books from the Jesuit Mission Press in Japan] in 反響 (Hankyō) 1/4 added to the reprint of Satow, The Jesuit Mission Press in Japan, 1591-1610.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1.1 (*cont.*)

Year	Title
1926	竜江院のカテキ様 Ryūkōin no kateki sama [The statue of Erasmus at the Ryūkō temple] in Shigaku zasshi 37/7
1926	竜江院の貨狄様に就いて Ryūkōin no kateki sama ni tsuite [About the statue of Erasmus at the Ryūkō temple] 考古学雑誌 (Kōkogaku zasshi) 16/7
1926	大日本貿易史上に特筆大書すべき上総国岩和田港 'Nihon bōekishi jō ni tokuhitsu taisho subeki Kazusa no kuni Iwadakō' [The port of Iwada in Kazawa as particularly noteworthy in the great history of Japanese trade)' in 日西交通発祥記念碑建立趣意書 Nissei kōtsū hasshō kinenhi konryū shuisho
1927	耶蘇会士日本通信京畿編下巻 Yaso kaishi nihon tsūshin keikihen gekan [Jesuit correspondence from Japan] (stand-alone source translation) vol. 1 (Tokyo: Sunnansha)
1927	再び竜江院の貨狄様に就いて Futatabi Ryūkōin no kateki sama ni tsuite |Yet again about the statue of Erasmus at the Ryūkō temple] in Shigaku zasshi 38/9, 93-96
1927	再び竜江院の貨狄様に就いて Futatabi Ryūkōin no kateki sama ni tsuite [Yet again about the statue of Erasmus at the Ryūkō temple] in Kōkogaku zasshi 17/10
1927	Education in Japan,' in First Pan Pacific Conference on Education, Rehabilitation, Reclamation and Recreation: called by the President of the United States of America in conformity with a joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and held under the auspices of the Department of the Interior at Honolulu, Hawaii, April 11 to 16, 1927: report of the proceedings, 33-34.
1928	耶蘇会士日本通信京畿編下巻 Yaso kaishi nihon tsūshin keikihen gekan [Japanese correspondence of the Jesuits] (stand-alone source translation), vol. 2 (Tokyo: Sunnansha)
1929	ドン・ロドリゴ日本見聞録 ビスカイノ金銀島探検報告 Don Rodorigo nihon kenbunroku; Visukaino kingintō tanken hōkoku [Don Rodrigo's Relación del Japón, Vizcaíno's reports from the expeditions to the gold and silver isles] (Tokyo: Sunnansha) (stand-alone source translation) (Tokyo: Sunnansha)
1929	寛永鎖国前に於る日本人の南洋発展 Kan'ei sakoku mae ni okeru nihonjin no nan'yō hatten [The progress of the Japanese in Southeast Asia prior to the closing of the country in the Kan'ei era] in 台湾日日新報 Taiwan nichinichi shinpō, June
1929	異国往復書翰集・ 増訂異國日記抄 Ikoku Ōfuku shokanshū, zōtei ikoku nikki shō (Collection of the correspondence with foreign countries and The Diary of Foreign Countries with Annotations) (Tokyo: Sunnansha)
1930	ゼーランヂャ城築史話 Zeeranja chikujō shiwa [Historical account of Fort Zeelandia] in 台湾文化史説 Taiwan bunka shisetsu [The history of Taiwanese culture] (hereafter:Taiwan bunka shisetsu)
1930	蘭人の蕃社教化 Ranjin no bansha kyōka [Dutch education of the indigenous people] in Taiwan bunka shisetsu
1930	台湾蕃語文書 Taiwan bango monjo [Indigenous Taiwanese manuscripts] in Taiwan bunka shisetsu
1930	台湾文化三百年記念会に就いて Taiwan bunka sanbyakunen kinenkai ni tsuite [Notes on the three hundredth anniversary of Taiwanese culture] in 台湾時報 (herafter: Taiwan jihō) 132
1930	The Bilingual Formosan Manuscripts (Taipei)
1931	台湾蕃語文書の研究 Taiwan bango monjo no kenkyū [Research about Taiwanese indigenous manuscripts] in Taiwan kyōiku 343
1931	'Jilong de hongmao cheng zhi 基隆的紅毛城址 [The Site of the Dutch Castle at Keelung],' tr. Hsu Hsien-yao

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1.1 (*cont.*)

Year	Title
	許賢瑤, *Taipei Historical Documents Committee* 117 (1996 [1931]), 127–38.
1931	基隆の紅毛城址 Kiirun no kōmō jōshi [The ruins of the Dutch castle in Keelung] in Taiwan jihō 144
1932	蘭人台湾占拠の目的 Ranjin Taiwan senkyo no mokuteki [The aim of the Dutch occupation of Taiwan] in 全国中等学校地理歴史科教員第九回協議会及台湾南支旅行報告 Zenkoku chūtō gakkō chiri rekishika kyōin dai kyūkai kyōgikai oyobi taiwan nanshi ryokō hōkoku
1933	澎湖島に於けるオランダ人 Hōkotō ni okeru orandajin [The Dutch on Penghu Island/Pescadores] in Taiwan jihō 158
1933	台湾屈指の史跡「基隆の今昔」について Taiwan kusshi no shiseki "Kiirun no konjaku" ni tsuite [Significant historical sites of Taiwan, about the past and present of Jilong] in 台湾日日新報 (hereafter: Taiwan nichinichi shinbun), 1933/07/07
1933	ジャガタラの長崎人 Jakatara no Nagasakijin [People from Nagasaki in Jakarta] in 長崎談叢第十三輯 Nagasaki dansō 13
1933	Sinkan Manuscripts 新港文書, Memoirs of the Faculty of Literature and Politics (Taipei: Taihoku Imperial University), Vol. 2, No. 1
1934	総督府博物館の女人木像に就いて Sōtokufu hakubutsukan no nyonin mokuzō ni tsuite [About the wooden female stature in the Museum of the Government General] in 科学の台湾 (Kagaku no Taiwan) 2/1
1934	ジャカタラの日本人 Jakatara no nihonjin [The Japanese of Jakarta] in 台北帝国大学史学科研究年報 (herafter: Taihoku teikoku daigaku shigakuka kenkyū nenpō) 1
1934	オランダ史料に現はれたる山田長政 Oranda shiryō ni arawareru Yamada Nagamasa [Yamada Nagasaki appearing in Dutch sources] 台北帝国大学記念講演集第三輯 Taihoku teikoku daigaku kinen kōenshū 3
1934	イスパニアの台湾占拠 Isupania no Taiwan senkyo [Spain's occupation of Taiwan] 科学の台湾 (Kagaku no Taiwan) 2/5-6
1935	長崎市史 Nagasaki shishi [Urban history of Nagasaki] in 通交貿易編西洋諸国部 Tsūkō bōeki hen seiyō shokokubu [Foreign trade volume, western countries] (Nagasaki: Nagasaki shiyakusho)
1935	吉利支丹宗門の興廢 Kirishitan shūmon no kōhai [The rise and fall of Christianity] in 国史研究会篇「日本歴史」 Nihon Rekishi (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten)
1935	南洋の日本町 Nan'yō no nihonmachi [Japanese towns in Southeast Asia] in 歴史教育 (herafter: Rekishi kyōiku) 10/2
1935	ジャカタラの日本人補遺 Jakatara ni nihonjin hoi [Supplement to The Japanese of Jakarta] in Taihoku teikoku daigaku shigakuka kenkyū nenpō 2
1935	鄭氏以前の台湾 Teishi izen no Taiwan [Taiwan before the Zheng] 東洋 (hereafter: Tōyō), special editon on Taiwan
1936	耶蘇会士日本通信 豊後篇上巻 Yaso kaishi nihon tsūshin Bungo hen jōkan [Jesuit Letters from Japan. Bungo edition 1] (Tokyo: Teikoku kyōikukai shuppanbu)
1936	近代文化と大友宗麟 Kindai bunka to Ōtomo Sōrin [Early modern culture and Ōtomo Sōrin] in 大分教育 (Oita kyōiku) 608
1936	大友宗麟と耶蘇会の社会事業 Ōtomo Sōrin to yaso kaishi no shakai jigyō [Otomo Sōrin and the Jesuit charity work] in 国史教育 (Kokushi kyōiku) 2/4
1936	耶蘇会士日本通信豊後篇下巻 Yaso kaishi nihon tsūshin Bungo hen gekan [Jesuit Letters from Japan. Bungo edition 2] (Tokyo: Teikoku kyōikukai shuppanbu)

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1.1 (*cont.*)

Year	Title
1936	海外の日本史料 Kaigai no nihon shiryō [Foreign sources on Japan] in Rekishi kyōiku 11/7
1937	抄訳バタビア城日誌上巻 Shōyaku Batabiajō nisshi, jōkan [Abbriviated translation of the Diary of Batavia Castle, vol. 1] (Tokyo: Nichiran kōtsū shiryō kenkyūkai)
1937	我が南洋発展の今昔 Waga nan'yō hatten no konjaku [The past and present of our expansion in Southeast Asia] in 文明協会ニューズ (Bunmei kyōkai nyūzu) 126
1937	抄訳バタビア城日誌中巻 Shōyaku Batabiajō nisshi, chūkan [Abbreviated translation of the Diary of Batavia Castle, vol. 2] (Tokyo: Nichiran kōtsū shiryō kenkyūkai)
1938	出島蘭館日誌 Dejima rankan nisshi [Daily records of the Dutch factory on Deshima], 3 vols (Tokyo: Bunmei kyōkai hakkō)
1939	昔の澳門 Mukashi no Macao [Macao in the past] in 東洋 Tōyō 42/1
1939	ポルトガル交通が我国に及ぼしたる影響 Porutogaru kōtsū ga waga kuni ni oyoboshitaru eikyō [The influence of communication with Portugal on our country] in東西交涉史論 Tōzai kōshō shiron, jōkan, vol. 1.
1939	ジャカタラの日本町 Jakatara no nihonmachi [The Japanese town in Jakarta] in 国史回顧会紀要 (Kokushi kaikokai kiyō) 39
1939	呂宋大守・ロドリゴと日比､日墨関係 Ruson taishu Don Rodorigo to nippi, nichiboku kankei [The relations between Japan and the Philippines and Japan and Mexico during the reign of Luzon Governor Don Rodrigo] in 南洋 Nan'yō 25/6
1939	耶蘇会の日本年報 Yasokai no nihon nenpō [Jesuit annual reports from Japan] in カトリック研究 Katorikku kenkyū published as monograph in 1943
1939	蘭船エラスムス Ransen Erasumusu [The Dutch vessel Erasmus] in 日蘭協会会報 Nichiran kyōkai kaihō 1
1939	The Japanese at Batavia in the 17th Century in Monumenta Nipponica 2/2
1940	伊東マンショ Itō Mansho [Itō Mancio] in 冨山房国史辞典 Fuzanbō kokushi jiten vol. 1
1940	セスタ講とサンタマリヤの御組とについて Sesutakō to Santa Maria no onkumi to ni tsuite [About the religious community of Sexta and Santa Maria] in キリシタン文化研究第二回例会講演速記録 Kirishitan bunka kenkyūjo dai ni kai reikai kōen sokkiroku
1940	竜光院の貨狄像 Ryūkōin no katekizō [The statue of Erasmus in Ryūkōin temple] in 伝説 (Densetsu) 1/7
1940	蘭商館出島移転の前後 Ranshōkan dejima iten no zengo [Before and after the translocation of the Dutch factory to Deshima] in Nichiran kyōkai kaihō 2
1940	切支丹屋敷 Kirishitan yashiki [Christian residences] in カトリック大辞典 (herafter: Katorikku daijiten) 1
1940	教皇庁に派遣された日本使節 Kyōkōchō ni haken sareta nihon shisetsu [The delegation sent to the papal palace] in Katorikku daijiten 1
1940	伊達政宗の南欧遣使 Date Masamune no nan'ō kenshi [Date Masamune's embassy to southern Europe] Katorikku daijiten 1
1940	切支丹学校 Kirishitan gakkō [Christian schools] in Katorikku daijiten 1
1940	イエズス会の日本通信 Iezusukai no nihon tsūshin [Jesuit letters from Japan] in Katorikku daijiten 1
1940	対外交易の史的回顧 Taigai kōeki no shiteki kaikō [Historical reflections on the Overseas trade] published as 啓明会第百回講演集 (100th lecture collection of the Keimei teacher's association)*

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1.1 (*cont.*)

Year	Title
1940	海外の日本史料 Kaigai no nihon shiryō [Japanese sources abroad] in Tokyo Asahi shinbun 1940/12/21
1940	Portugal e o Japão (Tokyo: Kokusai bunka shinkōkai)*
1941	和蘭人の伝へた山田長政の事蹟 Orandajin no tsutaeta Yamada Nagamasa no jiseki [Evidence about Yamada Nagamasa provided by the Dutch] in Nichiran kyōkai kaihō 3
1941	日本南洋移民史の一齣 Nihon nan'yō imin no hitokoma [A Site of Japanese emigration to Southeast Asia) in 大南洋 (Tai nan'yō) ed. Taiheiyō kyōkai
1941	ドン・ロドリゴ日本見聞録；ビスカイノ金銀島探検報告 Don Rodorigo nihon kenbunroku; Visukaino kingintō tanken hōkoku (Tokyo: Okugawa shoten)
1941	日本科学史の研究史料について Nihon kagakushi no kenkyū shiryō ni tsuite [About research sources in Japanese history of science] in 科学史研究 (Kagakushi kenkyū) 1
1942	蘭領印度史エイクマン・スターペル原書 Ranryō indoshi eikuman, staaperu gensho [The manuscript of the history of the Dutch Indies by Eijkman and Stapel], translation together with Hara Tetsurou 原徹郎 (Tokyo: Tōa kenkyūsho)
1942	吉利支丹伝道 Kirishitan dendō [The Christian mission] in Fuzanbō kokushi jiten 3
1942	切支丹屋敷 Kirishitan yashiki [Christian residences] in Fuzanbō kokushi jiten 3
1942	耶蘇会の日本年報 Yasokai no nihon nenpō [Jesuits' annual reports from Japan] in Katorikku kenkyū 2 / 1-5
1942	イタリヤの古文書館を訪ねてItaria no komonjokan wo tazunete [Visiting the Italian Archives] in 日伊文化研究 (Nichii bunka kenkyū) 5
1942	日本と葡萄牙 Nihon to porutogaru (Japan and Portugal) (Tokyo: Nippo kyōkai)
1942	六昆王山田長政 Rokkonō Yamada Nagamasa (Tokyo: Asahi shimbunsha)*
1942	Portugal e o Japão (Tokyo: Nippo kyōkai)
1942	Kirishitan kenkyū no kaikō キリシタン研究の 回顧 [Reflections on Research on Christianity] キリシタン研究 (Kirishitan kenkyū) vol. 1
1942	南蛮医学の伝来について Nanban igaku no denrai ni tsuite [The arrival of European medical science] in 日本医学史雑誌 (Nihon Igakushi zasshi) 1306
1942	An Old Church Calender in Japanese in Monumenta Nipponica 5/1
1943	耶蘇会の日本年報第 一輯 Yasokai no nihon nenpō, vol. 1 [Jesuit annual reports from Japan] (Tokyo: Takubundō)
1943	オランダの東印度征略史 Oranda no higashi indo seiryakushi [A history of conquest of the Dutch East Indies] in 西南太平洋 (Seinan taiheiyō) ed. Mainichi Shimbunsha
1943	エボラの大司教と金屏風 Ebora daishikyō to kinbyōbu [The golden folding screen of the archbishop of Evora] in 日葡交通論叢 (Nippo kōtsu ronsō) ed. Nippo kyōkai
1943	西欧諸国東洋侵略の起源 Seiōshokoku tōyō shinryaku no kigen [The beginning of European conquest in the East] in 南方文化講座 (Nanpō bunka kōza) (Tokyo: Sanseidō)
1943	日比交渉の史的考察 Nippi kōshō no shiteki kōsatsu [Historical explorations about Japanese-Philippine negotiations] in 国際文化 (Kokusai bunka) 28
1943	ジャカタラ文 Jakatara fumi [Letters from Jakarta] in Fuzanbō kokushi jiten 4

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1.1 (*cont.*)

Year	Title
1943	The Jesuit Seminary of Azuchi in Monumenta Nipponica 6/1,2
1944	耶蘇会の日本年報 Yasokai no nihon nenpō [Jesuit annual reports from Japan] vol. 2 (Tokyo: Takubundō 拓文堂)
1944	ドミニカの説教について Dominika no sekkyō [The Dominicans' sermon] in Kirishitan kenkyū 2
1945	日本と比律賓 Nihon to firipin (Japan and the Philippines) (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha)*
1948	ラウレス博士の新著高山右近の生涯 Rauresu hakase no shincho Takayama Ukon no shōgai [The life of Takayama Ukon by Dr. Laures] in 望楼 (Bōrō) 3/3
1949	アンジロウの書翰 Anjirou no shokan (honyaku) [Anjiro's letter (translation) = first Japanese Christian] (Tokyo: Shinkeisha)
1950	教皇シスト五世より高山右近宛の書簡 Kyōkō Shisuto gosei yori Takayama Ukon ate no shokan [A Letter by Pope Sixtus V. to Takayama Ukon] in Shigaku zasshi 59/5, 50-51
1955	海外の日本史料研究の促進を望む Kaigai no nihon shiryō kenkyū no sokushin wo nozomu [Hoping for progress in the research in foreign sources about Japan] in 西洋史通信 (Seiyōshi tsūshin) 2
1956	長崎オランダ商館の日記第 一輯 Nagasaki oranda shōkan no nikki, dai isshū [The diaryof the Dutch factory in Nagasaki, vol. 1) (Tokyo: Iwanami)
1957	長崎オランダ商館の日記 第二輯 Nagasaki oranda shōkan no nikki, dai nisshū [The diary of the Dutch factory in Nagasaki, vol. 2) (Tokyo: Iwanami)
1958	長崎オランダ商館の日記第 三輯 Nagasaki oranda shōkan no nikki, dai sanshū [The diaryof the Dutch factory in Nagasaki, vol. 3) (Tokyo: Iwanami)
1966	Republication of The Jesuit Correspondence of Japan 1-2, Don Rodorigo nihon kenbunroku; Visukaino kingintō tanken hōkoku, and Ikoku Ōfuku Shokan, zōtei ikoku nikki shō in the Ikoku sōsho series 異国叢書再刊 (Tokyo: Yūshōdō)
1967	外交史料採訪録 Gaikō shiryō saihō roku [A record on the collection of foreign relations manuscripts] *in Kirishitan Kenkyū* 12 (1967): 45–101.

This list is largely based on the biography provided in *Kirishitan Bunka Kenkyūkai Kaihō* キリシタン文化研究会会報 9, no. 4 (1967): 44–8. It does not include contributions to extensive source collections such as the *Dai nihon shiryō* or *Taiwan zongdufu gongwen lei zuan* 臺灣總督府公文類纂. See https://tais.ith.sinica.edu.tw.

Overview of Murakami's Publication

Many of the manuscripts that Murakami collected and copied in Europe between 1899 and 1902 would be edited for the *Dai nihon shiryō* (Japanese historical documents[75]) at the Historiographical Institute.

[75] This is the English title used in the older editions. Since 2021 the translation provided at the website of the Historiographical Institute is 'Chronological Source Books of Japanese History.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

While these large-scale editions provided encyclopedic knowledge for Japanese audiences, Murakami's English-language stand-alone editions made important inroads into Japanese Studies. In 1899, he contributed to an all-English edition of the diary of Richard Cocks, the English merchant resident in the Japanese port of Hirado during the 1610s and 1620s. In 1923, he coedited a volume on the memories of the US-American whaler Ranald Macdonald, who spent several years in late Tokugawa Japan after drifting onto the coast outside Ezo (present-day Hokkaido) in 1848 and was later sent to Nagasaki by Japanese officials, where he served as one of the first teachers of English. After 1940, Murakami's contributions to the newly founded *Monumenta Nipponica*, the official journal of the Christian history study group at Sophia University in Tokyo, reached an ever-increasing number of students in Japanese Studies.

Overview of Chapters

This book is organized into five empirical chapters plus a prologue, a theoretical introduction, and an epilogue. Together these eight sections document how the history of early modern foreign and diplomatic relations is shaped by multiple and multistaged translations. The monograph encourages the rethinking of Asian connections beyond regional boundaries, national history-writing, and temporal labels. Chapter 2 lays out Murakami Naojirō's curriculum vitae as a 'translator historian' and a 'scholar diplomat.' Largely chronologically organized, the chapter follows a thematic approach that emphasizes the entangled nature of his life and work. Introducing noteworthy episodes from his academic and personal life, it addresses the question of what implications his multiple agendas, tasks, and ambitions had for historical scholarship and for the legacy of the study of Japanese foreign relations. For this purpose, I assembled elements from Murakami's scholarship, university administration records, newspaper articles, and the memories of colleagues and family members. While the absence of substantial autotestimonies poses certain problems, the richness of the available sources helps to nuance the picture.

Chapter 3 scrutinizes the theme of formal diplomatic relations by reflecting on the untranslatability of the Japanese concept of *gaikō*, which left a firm imprint on general narratives despite its semiotic ambiguity. The chapter considers translation processes and linguistic aspects such as etymology. It demonstrates that the history of early modern Japan's engagement with the outside world was shaped by a collaborative relationship between foreign politics, imperial repertoires, and education.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This point is substantiated by a cross-reading of a wide variety of multi-archival and multilingual source materials ranging from sixteenth-century diplomatic letters, colonial reports, notes from the Ministry of Foreign Relations, and interwar imperial scholarship, to mass media articles and popular history books.

Chapter 4 approaches Murakami's scholarship through entangled biographies in order to investigate the imperialist dynamics behind historical writing. The chapter focuses on the intertwined nature of history and diplomacy in the first half of the twentieth century when historical research and publication practices were firmly established. Murakami's habitus as scholar diplomat was influenced by a variety of people and institutions from different countries, time periods, and linguistic backgrounds, all connected through the (meta-)physical space of the traveling archive of foreign relations.

Chapters 5 and 6 explain how the silencing of Taiwan and Indigenous Taiwanese pasts was engineered and reflect on Murakami's priorities and methodologies (molding through translation, reliance on European archival sources, overemphasis on the written archive, and a constant focus on expansion). Chapter 5 follows Murakami to Taiwan and traces the genealogy of the southern seas by looking at the establishment of the *nan'yō* history department at the Imperial University in Taipei. As its first professor, Murakami made significant contributions to the curriculum and the conceptual history of the subject. The outsider perspective that he incorporated into the *nan'yō* history narrative curriculum would eventually translate into the history of Southeast Asia; it would survive as a scientific legacy of Japanese imperial empiricism and as an ahistorical overemphasis on the colonial period and colonial archives in the history of the entire region until the present day. I discuss, among other things, the limited attention given to Taiwan as part of the larger narrative of maritime relations in the *nan'yō*, and I consider what conclusions can be drawn from this almost-absence of discourse.

Chapter 6 remains in Taiwan and addresses the moral dilemmas of Murakami's ignorance of the island's Aboriginal past. Elaborating on Murakami's disinterest in the historiography of the Other, the chapter gathers evidence for refuting the notion of benevolent Japanese colonialism and proposes ways of nuancing global history by contextualizing and materializing silences. The chapter zooms in on the narration of an incident of early modern foreign relations and examines how Murakami and other historians exaggerated the significance of the incident for the sake of underlining the narrative of Japanese imperial expansion. It also discusses how the pasts and voices of Taiwan's Indigenous peoples can be traced within one-sided hegemonic narratives that

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

overemphasized outside influences. This chapter took much inspiration from the rich body of recent work on the Japanese Empire's engagement with colonial subjects. Together, the two final chapters make two important interventions. First, they add to the discussion of how colonial and even archival violence can be tackled when writing nonsovereign people into global intellectual history. Second, by locating the island as a bridge between the Sinosphere and Southeast Asia in imperial Japanese historiography, they provide the needed background for deconstructing the notion of a unique East Asian maritime past within early modern global history.

The Epilogue reevaluates the legacy of Murakami's scholarship to initiate further discussions about comparison as method, on the one hand, and academic history that continues to overemphasize the written archive partially because its practitioners fail to deliver on the promise of transparency, on the other.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press