5 Nan'yōshi
How to Position Japan in Southeast Asian History

Founded by the Japanese Taiwan Government-General in 1928, Taihoku Imperial University, also known as Taihoku Teikoku University (hereafter TIU), was an institutional hallmark of Japanese empirical imperialism. As the first professor of *Nan'yōshi* (The history of the southern seas), Murakami helped define Japan's historical ties with Southeast Asia while, at the same time, contributing to Taiwan's exclusion from a broader history of Southeast Asia.[1] The latter process had to do with both practical regional subdivisions and conscious thematic choices. Being at the forefront of editing projects for early modern Taiwanese history, his work provided future Taiwanese historians with reference works on their past. One of them was the prominent Taiwanese historian Ts'ao Yung-ho (曹永和, 1920–2014) who regularly acknowledged his intellectual indebtedness to Japanese scholarship.[2] When tirelessly promoting the study of the history of Taiwan as 'island history' (臺灣島史觀, *Taiwan dao shi guan*), in order to break away from the constraints of the patronizing Han Chinese development aid narrative, Ts'ao placed strong emphasis on Japanese scholarship.[3] The tendency

[1] For the profile of the history departments of Taipei and Seoul Imperial Universities, see Sakai Tetsuya 酒井哲哉 and Matsuda Toshihiko 松田利彦, eds., 帝国日本と植民地大学 *Teikoku nihon to shokuminchi daigaku* (The Japanese Empire and its colonial universities) (Tokyo: Yumani shobō, 2014).

[2] Ann Heylen, 'The Transnational in Taiwan History: A Preliminary Exploration,' *Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies* 36, no. 1 (2010): 9–33 (here: 17–18). For a more recent study, see Li Cheng-ji and Li Yun-lin, eds., *Riben shidai de lishi jiyi* (The history records of the Japanese era) (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2020).

[3] Ts'ao Yung-ho 曹永和, *Taiwan zaoqi lishi yanjiu xuji* 台湾早期歷史研究続集 (Collection of research on Taiwan's early history) (Taibei: Lianjing, 2000), 473–8. The hegemonic Han discourse criticized by Ts'ao is sometimes referred to as 'bentu (本土) chauvinism.' Ts'ao was a polyglot bibliophile and librarian at National Taiwan University. He has been credited for documenting the history of Dutch Formosa and for his commitment to international exchange. He informally began his studies in the 1940s under the then Taipei-based Japanese historian Iwao Seiichi, after having failed the entrance exam for TIU. See Leonard Blussé, ed., *Around and about Formosa: Essays in Honor of Professor Ts'ao Yung-Ho* (Taipei: Ts'ao Yung-ho Foundation for Culture and Education, 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

remains strong even today given that researchers and students in Taiwan often use Murakami's translations instead of originals.[4] Ann Heylen has long highlighted the colonial legacy of the study of Taiwanese pasts, arguing that historians draw too heavily on materials accumulated and left behind by the Japanese colonial regime.[5]

Like the previous chapters, this chapter deals with a concrete aspect of knowledge creation, more precisely, the coloniality of historiographical knowledge. Murakami's contributions to Taiwanese and Southeast Asian history are classic examples of colonial knowledge in need of reassessment. A necessary first step in this process is to map out Japanese and European empirical imperialism in the historiography of early modern Taiwan. The subsequent critical analysis of colonial knowledge and other hegemonic orientations in Taiwanese history will scrutinize the methods, silences, concepts, and language of knowledge creation by Murakami from a decolonial perspective.[6] The results will ideally assist in the process of creating autonomous knowledge as a next step (which lamentably lies beyond my own competencies and is thus beyond the scope of this book), as demanded by decoloniality scholars such as Syed Farid Alatas.[7]

Speaking of 'Taiwanese history' necessitates acknowledging that the term itself – its meaning and the issue of who claimed sovereignty over narratives – has long been contested. As is the case with any postcolonial setting, numerous unresolved controversies complicate the historiography of Taiwan.[8] The concept of a 'history of Taiwan' is loaded because of the disagreement about whether Taiwan should or can be studied as an independent entity or as part of 'Greater China.' Related questions concern the agency of Taiwanese Chinese (*huaren*, 華人) and Taiwan Indigenous (*yuanzhumin*, 原住民) within the island's history, with both heterogenous groups negotiating the politics of their history among themselves and with others. As successor of a Japanese Imperial

[4] The Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica published *Studies of Sinkang Manuscripts* in 2010 with an English introduction on the Siraya language and an article explaining the characteristics of the manuscripts. Its author, Paul Jen-kuei Li, emphasizes the linguistic contributions of Ogawa Naoyoshi 小川尚義 and Tsuchida Shigeru 土田滋 while barely mentioning Murakami.

[5] Heylen, 'Trans-national,' 17–18.

[6] With regard to the treatment and neglect of colonialism, I have been inspired by Bhambra and Holmwood's novel way of framing Western sociologists. See Gurminder Bhambra and John Holmwood, *Colonialism and Modern Social Theory* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2021).

[7] Syed Farid Alatas, 'Knowledge Hegemonies and Autonomous Knowledge,' *Third World Quarterly* (2022): 1–18.

[8] Given that the National Taiwan University is the successor of a Japanese Imperial University, and as such inherited some of its education agendas, the role of its history curricula remains contested.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

University, as such inheriting some of its educational agendas, the role of history curricula at the National Taiwan University remains contested. When I speak of Taiwan's past or Taiwanese history in this book, I aim to be reasonably inclusive and aware of the context of power imbalances and ulterior motives of the parties who wrote the region's history.

It could be argued that the frameworks of decolonization and decoloniality have been criticized for replicating the Eurocentric gaze because of their emphasis on violence and inclusion/exclusion.[9] As a European scholar with an educational background in Japan, I am admittedly not immune to such allegations. However, I feel that historians with a solid training in contextualized source criticism have to contribute to debates that have been dominated by social scientists and philosophers, including those about how to incorporate Indigenous voices with oral traditions into historical narratives. My background in critical global history enables me to scrutinize the available historiography and theoretical knowledge and to complement findings with close readings of voluminous and sometimes fragmentary written sources in multiple languages. In the remaining two chapters I will thus offer suggestions as to how we can include Indigenous voices and agencies using conventional historical methodologies, when feasible, and how we should attempt to incorporate other practices without obfuscating hegemonic frames or other inequities.

Zeroing in on Murakami's role in inaugurating the southern seas history department (*Nan'yōshi*) and his tenure as dean at the Faculty of Letters at Taihoku Imperial University, this chapter combines comparative and genealogical approaches to the epistemological foundation of the Eurocentric discourse of progress and development about seventeenth-century Taiwan and Southeast Asia. I argue that conspicuous absences in the historical record are key to recognizing how specific research traditions and their primary archives reveal the lasting effects of empirical imperialism. The dominant historical perception of a passive Taiwan – albeit situated at the crossroads between East and Southeast Asia – that was never regionally integrated and always internationally irrelevant has its discursive origins in early twentieth-century scholarship.[10] Japanese colonial historians could not recognize that the island

[9] Olúfémi Táíwò, *Against Decolonisation: Taking African Agency Seriously* (London: Hurst, 2022). The concept of decoloniality appeared first during workshops of Latin Americanists, including Immanuel Wallerstein and Anibal Quijano, in the 2000s. Decolonial thinking has since promoted academic and activist approaches to study previously colonized areas and their position in the modern world against the background of unequal and exploitative structures.

[10] Yokoda Kiyoko 横田きよ子, '日本における「台湾」の呼称の変遷について: 主に近世を対象として' Nihon ni okeru 'Taiwan' no koshō no hensen ni tsuite. Omoni kinsei wo

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

had an autonomous past because they applied a conventional narrative of linear progress.[11] The epistemic asymmetries they created unjustifiably hampered Taiwan's integration into the story of early modern colonialism. Hence, Taiwan's silenced pasts remain to this day a challenge to global history's operating principles of comparison and connection.[12] Murakami's research and his later position as first chair in southern seas history at the Imperial University in Taipei led to the creation of an extensive written archive that was silent about those who were believed to have no history.[13] Murakami's educational methodology favored linguistic research and paleography.[14] His emphasis on primary sources and his categorization of 'barbarian languages' (*bango*) displayed his disinterest in the history of Indigenous communities and their cultural techniques. While Chapter 6 will address silenced and forgotten pasts more closely, the current chapter zooms in on the development of the institutionalized history of *nan'yō* by providing empirical examples that will shed further light on larger questions of empirical imperialism. The examples include trends in the historiography of Zheng Chenggong, the geography and invented etymology of the *nan'yō*, and the educational capital of the *nan'yō* history program.

Taiwan between Colonial and Global History

Most global history narratives of Taiwan focus on global trade and warfare. They commonly paint a picture of alternating connections and ruptures and are practically silent about Indigenous agency. As generations of scholars regarded the colonial encounter in Taiwan, a mountainous island situated 200 km southeast of the Chinese coastal province of Fujian – as less formative for the history of Southeast Asia – has made it difficult to map Taiwan's role in the history of expansion in

taishō toshite (The changing designations of 'Taiwan' in Japan: With a focus on the early modern period), 海港都市研究 *Journal of Port Cities Studies* 4 (2009): 163–83. The internationalized moniker *Formosa* is believed to have originated from a popular myth, which attributes the naming of Ilha Formosa to the crew of a passing Portuguese ship, impressed by the beauty of its landscape of green mountains.

[11] Matsuoka Tadasu 松岡格, 台湾原住民社会の地方化: マイノリティの20世紀 *Taiwan genjūmin shakai no chihōka. Mainoritii no 20 seiki* (The regionalization of the Indigenous people of Taiwan. Minorities in the twentieth century) (Tokyo: Kenbun shuppan, 2012).

[12] Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010); Trouillot, *Silencing the Past.*

[13] Eric R. Wolf, *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).

[14] Murakami, 'Taiwan bango monjo no kenkyū,' *Taiwan kyōiku* 343 (1931).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the macro region.[15] By that I do not mean that the island is missing on maps by European or Asian cartographers and maritime explorers. Instead I aim to explore why the early modern history of the island has traditionally had a one-sided focus.

In 1897, Murakami's mentor, Ludwig Riess, published a long essay entitled 'History of Formosa' in a journal distributed by the German Association for East Asian Natural History and Ethnology. Being an organization founded in 1873 by German merchants, diplomats, and *o-yatoi gaikokujin* (foreign experts invited by the Meiji government) based in Japan, the venue is not without expansionist implications.[16] Riess concluded his account with a reference to Japanese historian Inagaki Manjirō, a student and admirer of British imperial historian John Robert Seeley, author of the *Expansion of England* (1883). Riess urged Japan to take the initiative to write the history of Taiwan at a time when scholars focused on the idea of expansion and were driven by the desire to establish Japan's historical roots in maritime Asia. Their mindset reflected the late nineteenth-century doctrine of Japan's southern expansion known as *nanshin* (南進).[17] The *nanshin* perceptions were rooted in late 1880s popular novels promoting Japanese intervention to rescue the Filipino population from Spanish oppression.[18]

From my viewpoint as a global historian, the historical imagination of Taiwan and the surrounding Southeast Asian seascape seems full of contradictions and thus requires more context and reflection. Historical geographers and anthropologists, with their respective political agendas, are still debating whether the aboriginal Austronesian population either lost or never possessed seafaring skills.[19] Disagreement on when

[15] Timothy Brook, *Mr. Selden's Map of China: Decoding the Secrets of a Vanished Cartographer* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 11; for Chinese cartography, see Cordell Yee, 'Chinese Cartography among the Arts: Objectivity, Subjectivity, Representation,' in J. B. Harley and David Woodward, eds., *The History of Cartography* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1994), vol. II, bk. 2, 128–69.

[16] Ludwig Riess, 'Geschichte der Insel Formosa,' *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 6 (1897): 405–47.

[17] Yano, '*Nanshin*'; Yanagida Izumi 柳田泉于, 海洋文学と南進思想 *Kaiyō bungaku to nanshin shisō* (Sea stories and ideologies of southern expansion) (Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Kyōkai, 1942).

[18] Motoe Terami-Wada, *The Japanese in the Philippines, 1880s–1890s* (Manila: National Historical Commission of the Philippines, 2015), 12. These texts include books such as Suganuma Tadakaze 菅沼貞風, 新日本図南之夢 *Shin nihon zunan no yume* (Dream of New Japan's aspiration to the south seas) (1888) and Fukumoto Nichinan 福本日南, 比律賓群島に於ける日本人 *Hiripin guntō ni okeru nihonjin* (The Japanese in the Philippines) (1889), which includes a historical survey of relations between Japan and the Philippines.

[19] Aware of debates about the use of 'Indigenous' ('Indigenes') and the negative connotations of Aboriginal (Aborigines), I primarily use 'Indigenous/Indigenes' despite the interchangeable use of the terms in other English-language scholarship on Taiwan.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(sometime between 15,000 and 5,500 years ago) and from where the Austronesian population arrived has led to different theories about the origins of the Aboriginal Taiwanese. While archeological and genetic findings suggest migratory waves from China, oral accounts of the Taiwan Aboriginals (hereafter Indigenes[20]) refer to the south as the place of their ancestors' origin.[21] Another topic of debate is the time and intensity of the Indigenous population's contact with the continent. Chinese historical records suggest that fishermen from China arrived via Penghu archipelago (澎湖群島, Pescadores in European sources) in southwest Taiwan following the seasonal mullet migration along the Eastern Ocean Route via Luzon to the Moluccas no earlier than the thirteenth century CE. However, prior to the late sixteenth century, contacts remained sporadic. It was not until the seventeenth century that the Han Chinese population of Taiwan increased with commercial expansion. This was also the time when increasing Indigenous participation in maritime trade attracted Japanese, Spanish, and Dutch seafarers to the island.

Merchants of the Dutch East India Company (VOC) established a trading outpost in 1624 in the sandy area around present-day Anping. With the help of Fujianese settlers, the Dutch turned the area surrounding Taoyouan into a transit point in the intra-Asian trade between China, Japan, and insular Southeast Asia.[22] This would become the first large territorial entity in Asia over which the Dutch claimed sovereignty. Before long, Japanese and Spanish merchants and officials began to contest Dutch operations. Spaniards from the Philippines set up their own fort in Tamsui (near present-day Taipei) in 1626, while Japanese seafaring merchants, supported by Kyushu officials, resisted Dutch attempts to control all Taiwan-based trade. From the mid-1620s to the mid-1640s, Taiwan regularly witnessed armed conflicts between foreign competitors, as well as between foreigners and Indigenous groups. By 1650, after Japanese and Spanish rival foreign powers had withdrawn, the island was populated with roughly 100,000 multiethnic Indigenes and 15,000 Chinese settlers. The Dutch hoped for a peaceful

[20] The English terms 'Native Taiwanese' and 'Formosans' are sometimes used to refer to the heterogeneous Yuanzhumin. The noted anthropologist and linguist Raleigh Ferrell (1933–2019) classified the Indigenous population into three main ethnolinguistic and six cultural groups. For an overview of complex Indigenous matters in the twentieth century, see Hsin-hui Chiu, *The Colonial 'Civilizing Process' in Dutch Formosa, 1624–1662* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 5–6. Michael Rudolph, *Taiwans Multi-Ethnische Gesellschaft und die Bewegung der Ureinwohner. Assimilation oder Kulturelle Revitalisierung?* (Schwerte: Villigst Perspektiven, 2003).

[21] Michael Stainton, 'The Politics of Taiwan Aboriginal Origin,' in Murray A. Rubinstein, ed., *Taiwan: A New History* (London: Routledge, 1999), 26–44.

[22] Chiu, *Colonial 'Civilizing Mission,'* 3–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

collaboration with all the residents to counter threats of intervention from Fujian in southern China, where the Zheng clan – known for controlling tens of thousands of seafarers and pirates and the major sea routes in the China Seas – repeatedly voiced their territorial interest in Taiwan.

In 1661, Zheng Chenggong, under pressure from the advancing Manchu troops in southern China, led his troops to Taiwan where he eventually defeated the Dutch in early 1662 with the help of both Chinese and Indigenous populations. This was the beginning of Zheng rule, also known as the Kingdom of Tungning (1661–83), which was located in the western part of the island. After his death in 1662, his son Zheng Jing succeeded him as the king of Tungning and continued to consolidate Taiwan as the last Han Chinese stronghold against the Qing, whose force eventually conquered Taiwan in 1683.[23] The two decades became known as Zheng rule over Taiwan (1662–83) and are considered by Han Chinese nationalist historians as a short break from colonial rule.[24]

Murakami's legacy within Japanese colonial source-gathering and editing efforts lives on in two areas: the *Sinkan Manuscripts* and the main body of Taiwan Historic Materials.[25] The *Sinkan Manuscripts* refer to documents written in Latin script in a largely extinct Indigenous language. Sinkan was the name of a village of Siraya Indigenes who inhabited villages in the southern plains. Murakami discovered some of these manuscripts that had been composed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries during his first visit to the island in 1896/7 and built upon this collection during his tenure at TIU. These distinct manuscripts and Murakami's role in their dissemination will be the topic of

[23] For the heroization of Zheng Chenggong in both Taiwan and Mainland China, see Andrade, *How Taiwan*, ch. X, fn. 7; Ralph Croizier, *Koxinga and Chinese Nationalism: History, Myth, and the Hero* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977). For the Zheng maritime trading network, see Cheng-heng Lu, 'Between Bureaucrats and Bandits: The Rise of Zheng Zhilong and His Organization, the Zheng Ministry (Zheng Bu),' in Tonio Andrade and Xing Hang, eds., *Sea Rovers, Silver, and Samurai. Maritime East Asia in Global History, 1550–1700* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016), 132–55. The topic was first addressed by Charles Boxer. See Charles R. Boxer, 'The Rise and Fall of Nicholas Iquan,' *T'ien Hsia Monthly* 11 (1941): 401–39.

[24] Henry Shin-Shan Tsai, *Maritime Taiwan. Historical Encounters with the East and the West* (London: Routledge, 2009).

[25] Yeh mentioned that Murakami's research is sometimes regarded as the birth of modern Taiwanese history. His considerable contribution includes the Sinkan manuscripts and twenty-seven volumes of 臺灣總督府公文類纂 *Taiwan sōtoku fūkō ruisan* (The manuscripts of Taiwan historic materials) including material concerning the Dutch and the Spanish colonial period with annotations. Yeh Pi-ling 葉碧苓, '村上直次郎的臺灣史研究' Murakami Naojirō de taiwanshi yanjiu, 國史館學術集刊 *Guoshiguan xueshu* 17 (2008): 1–2. For a complete list of Murakami's contributions, see https://onlinearchives.th.gov.tw/index.php?act=Archive (accessed June 9, 2023). The latter are not stand-alone publications and thus not included in Murakami's bibliography.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chapter 6.[26] As far as other historical manuscripts are concerned, Murakami gained a reputation for meticulously collecting and translating Dutch records produced at Fort of Zeelandia, from where the Dutch governor general ruled the southern part of the island between 1624 and 1662.[27] Both the primary sources themselves and the way Murakami framed and interpreted them are of invaluable importance for my project of understanding the processes of writing, translating, and reconceptualizing the history of Taiwan. The overarching aim of the chapter is to understand how Murakami shaped the study of Taiwan's premodern history – actively and passively, directly and indirectly, implicitly and explicitly. The two subordinated aims are to examine why Taiwan is underrepresented in the global history of Southeast Asian maritime connections and to foster an awareness of processes of inclusion and exclusion.[28]

(De)colonizing Taiwanese History

Over the past decade, scholars have made attempts to decolonize Taiwan's history by stressing Indigenous perspectives and experiences.[29] In showing how Indigenous peoples resisted the extension of the modern state under global capitalism, prominently represented by Japanese colonial rule in the first half of the twentieth century in the case of Taiwan, they have contributed to the discussion of creating epistemic justice.[30] Their accounts emphasize the multilayered nature of Taiwanese history by boosting Indigenous voices that were often silenced in the Dutch and

[26] In 1933, Murakami published a collection of 101 manuscripts as Sinkan manuscripts with Taihoku Imperial University. The Sinkan manuscripts were republished by Nakamura Takashi and translated into Chinese after the war.

[27] Murakami, '基隆的紅毛城址' Jilong de hongmao cheng zhi (The site of the Dutch castle at Kelang), trans. Hsu Hsien-yao 許賢瑤, *Taipei Historical Documents Committee* 117 (1996 [1931]): 127–38.

[28] Gary D. Rawnsley, 'Taiwan's Soft Power and Public Diplomacy,' *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs* 43, no. 3 (2014): 161–74.

[29] Peter Kang, 臺灣原住民史：政策篇(一) *Taiwan yuan zhu minshi: zhengce pian yi* (The history of the Formosan Aborigines: Policy formulation I: The periods of Dutch, Spanish, and Ming Cheng) (Nantou: Taiwan Historica, 2005). Tonio Andrade, *How Taiwan Became Chinese. Dutch, Spanish, and Han Colonization in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), www.gutenberg-e.org/andrade/index.html (accessed June 15, 2021). Hsin-hui Chiu, *The Colonial 'Civilizing Process' in Dutch Formosa, 1624–1662* (Leiden: Brill, 2008). Paul D. Barclay, *Outcasts of Empire. Japan's Rule on Taiwan's 'Savage Border,' 1874–1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017).

[30] Kirsty Reid and Fiona Paisly, eds., *Sources and Methods in History of Colonialism* (London: Routledge, 2017).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Japanese colonial archives.[31] Kirsten Ziomek employed oral history and material objects to complement historiographical knowledge of marginalized Indigenous communities, capturing forgotten realities of people under imperial Japanese rule.[32] Her work is an overdue corrective to earlier historiography that excluded the island's Indigenous past from larger-than-local narratives.[33]

Murakami's 'achievements' in Taiwanese history must always be seen in the light of his colonial *and* Eurocentric approach to interpreting the island's past and both temporal and institutional situatedness of his work.[34] Hence, while acknowledging that Murakami colonized Taiwanese history, I do not intend to negate Murakami's intellectual contributions nor judge them by current academic ethics. I also acknowledge the limitations he faced due to the rigid disciplinary boundaries between history and anthropology that existed at the beginning of the twentieth century. The former was mostly concerned with the rise of nations, while the latter traced the evolutionary trajectory of mankind. Hence, Murakami's focus on colonial powers in Taiwan reflected his view that political processes leading to protostate formation were important. What is more, a major part of his lasting contributions (including the production, collection, placing, and publication of data) were the result of a scholarship funded by an imperial regime. Hence, Murakami's contract work for the Taiwan Government-General by definition cannot be separated from power relations.[35]

[31] Kuan-Hsing Chen, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010). Chen points out that the decolonialization movements in East Asia did not start immediately after independence, nor has the 'imperialization of the subject' (*kominkan*, Japanization), which transformed the colonized people in Taiwan and Korea into Japan's imperial subjects fully been scrutinized.

[32] Kirsten L. Ziomek, *Lost Histories. Recovering the Lives of Japan's Colonial Peoples* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019).

[33] Ping-Hui Liao, 'Postcolonial Studies in Taiwan: Issues in Critical Debates,' *Postcolonial Studies* 2, no. 2 (1999): 199–211. Ping-Hui Liao summarizes the critiques of Taiwanese scholars, including translinguality as a unique feature in the languages of Taiwan as an argument to debunk the ethnocentrism of colonial regimes.

[34] Yeh Pi-ling, 'Murakami Naojirō de taiwan shi jiangjiu,' *Guoshiguan xueshu* 17 (2014): 1–35. For a discussion of the topics integrating pre-twentieth-century Taiwan into world history, see Robert Eskildsen, 'Taiwan: A Periphery in Search of a Narrative,' *Journal of Asian Studies* 64, no. 2 (2005): 281–94.

[35] The theoretical discussion has been influenced by Hayden White's work on the literary nature of historical discourse. White demonstrated how consciousness with the historical past is always mediated by textual means. White, *Metahistory*. On circumstantial impact and historical narratives, see Reinhart Koselleck, 'Standortbindung und Zeitlichkeit. Ein Beitrag zur Historiographischen Erschließung der Geschichtlichen Welt,' in Reinhart Koselleck, Wolfgang J. Mommsen, and Jörn Rüsen, eds., *Objektivität und Parteilichkeit* (München: dtv, 1977), 17–46.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the 1890s, two diseases afflicted Japan and its fledgling empire: One, the *nanshin netsu* (southern advance fever), was characterized by growing interest in the *nan'yō* and a potential southward expansion. The other, milder *rekishi netsu* (history fever), motivated journalists and scholars to emphasize precedents of a strong and expanding Japanese Empire. Stories of the past were linked to contemporary indirect leadership claims and were ideological harbingers for Pan-Asian aspirations. In this spirit, the Government-General's Office for Historiographical Source Collection of Taiwan (台湾史編纂事務) commissioned Murakami to collect sources on Taiwanese history in Xiamen (Amoy), Fuzhou, and Hong Kong in autumn 1896.[36] Murakami, equipped with the state of the art in reading historical sources, was assigned a temporary position as historiographical officer for Taiwanese history. His task was to unearth scientifically valuable material that would demonstrate Japan's seventeenth-century presence in the southern seas. In so doing, Murakami helped conquer knowledge and control its dissemination.[37] Seiji Shirane's recent work, *Imperial Gateway*, is rich in such examples demonstrating the links between knowledge creation and geopolitics with Taiwan as the base for continued southward imperial expansion until the end of Japanese colonial rule in 1945.[38] In this spirit, and inspired by the example of European colonialism in Asia, Murakami coordinated empirical imperialism from Taipei and thereby shaped an image of early modern Japan's superior role in Asia, which could be used to legitimize the actions of the new colonial power.[39] Both implicit comparison and empirical imperialism let him to position Taiwan in the narrative of early modern encounters not as an active agent of foreign relations but rather as a passive object.

[36] 台湾史編纂事務嘱託員村上真次郎ヲ史料蒐集ノ為清国厦門等ヘ差遣ノ件 *Taiwanshi hensan jimu shokutakuin Murakami Naojirō wo shiryō shūshū no tame shinkoku amoi nado he saken no ken* (About the dispatch of Murakami Naojirō, part-time historiographical officer for the history of Taiwan to Amoy to collect historical manuscripts), Ministry of Education, Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce, Ministry of Colonization, Kobun Zassan, Vol. 25, 1896, 26/09/1896. Cf. JACAR, Ref.A04010032000 (accessed December 23, 2021).

[37] Ambaras, *Japan's Imperial Underworlds*; Botsman, *Power and Punishment*; Hée, *Imperiales Wissen*.

[38] Shirane, *Imperial Gateway*.

[39] Shimpei Gotō, 'The Administration of Formosa (Taiwan),' in Shigenobu Okuma, ed., *Fifty Years of New Japan*, vol. 2 (London: Smith, Elder, 1909), 530–53. Gotō Shinpei, chief of the Civil Administration Bureau, referred to the island as the 'colonization university' for Japan's rule overseas. Cf. Ching, *Becoming Japanese*, 17.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Great Men of Taiwan's Trade and Foreign Relations

In two authoritative source canons of diplomatic history edited by Murakami, the *Ikoku nikki shō* (1911) and the *Ikoku ōfuku shokanshū* (1929), Taiwan was close to absent. Now, while Japanese interventions abroad – no matter how clumsy or improvised – were interpreted as acts of foreign relations of an early modern polity, Taiwanese interventions abroad – as when Suetsugu Heizō took a delegation of Taiwanese Indigenes to Edo in 1627 – were not perceived as anything near that.[40] Indeed, the Indigenous population of Taiwan had no centralized political power, and their trips abroad happened more seldomly. Yet, are these reasons enough to deny them diplomatic agency? On the rare occasions when Murakami referred to Taiwan in the compilations, he approached the history of the island through the territorial concept of Takasago-koku (高砂国).[41] Takasago-koku had been used for the island by some Japanese seafarers and rulers since the thirteenth century and throughout the Edo period, while some seventeenth-century sources also speak of Takayama.[42] While the colonial administration did not use Takayama or Takasago for contemporary affairs, other institutions continued to use it.[43] The fact that Japanese anthropologists employed the term Takasago-zoku (高砂族) for the Indigenous populations as late as the 1930s

[40] In her detailed study on the commercial exchange between Macau and Nagasaki, Oka Mihoko portrayed Suetsugu's investment in Taiwan trade in the 1620s. Oka Mihoko, 'A Great Merchant in Nagasaki in the 17th Century. Suetsugu Heizō II and the System of Respondência,' *Bulletin of Portuguese/Japanese Studies* 2 (2001): 37–56.

[41] Historically, several Sino-Japanese toponyms are used for the island, including 高砂 (Takasago), 高山 (Takayama), 多加佐古 (Takasago), 夷州 (Ishū), 琉求 (Ryūkyū), 小琉球 (Shōryūkyū). The last one was also occasionally in use for Luzon. See Shimizu Yūko 清水有子, '豊臣期南蛮宛て国書の料紙・封式試論' Toyotomi ki nanban ate kokusho no ryōshi, fūshiki shiron (Preliminary study on the writing material and seal employed in state letters to the namban during the Toyotomi period), in Matsukata Fuyuko, ed., 国書がむすぶ外交 *Kokusho ga musubu gaikō* (Correspondence between crowns: Diplomatic practices in the China seas, 1400–1850) (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 2019), 100.

[42] Both terms were found in Japanese documents from the sixteenth century; less common in Japan was the Ming Chinese labeling of Ryūkyū Minor (小琉球, Xiao Liuqiu). Although originating from a geographical confusion, the latter term underlines the regional bonds of the East China Seas spanning via the Taiwan Strait to the Kingdom of Ryūkyū, today known as Okinawa. A small island off the southwestern coast of Taiwan still carries the toponym Ryūkyū Minor.

[43] In modern speech, 'Takasago' became associated with the Indigenous soldiers recruited by the Japanese army before and during the Second World War, known as Takasago Volunteers. The Takasago Volunteers included members of the Amis, today the largest Indigenous group, who served in Japanese battles in tropical Southeast Asia. See Ching, *Becoming Japanese*, 2–3; Barclay, *Outcasts*, 30.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

underlines a clear temporal dimension that highlighted a premodern, pre-Japanese past.[44]

Indeed, premodern Taiwan played an ambiguous role for imperial Japan's self-perception, as the master narrative of outward-looking early modern foreign relations showed. This narrative, which also became popular in global history, positions Japanese historical actors, often with a progressive maritime background, as people with clear political and economic agendas both abroad and at home. Arima Harunobu (有馬晴信, 1567–1612), the lord of Shimabara, who traveled to Taiwan in 1609 (Keichō 14), was one of them. Harunobu was a Catholic convert, one of the sponsors of the Tenshō mission to Europe (1582–90), and part of a group whose members have frequently been labeled 'Christian *daimyō*'.[45] He fought in Hideyoshi's campaigns in Kyushu and Korea and traveled on behalf of the Tokugawa *bakufu* to Takasago to investigate future trade opportunities in a period when the island emerged as a popular location for Sino-Japanese trade.[46] Arriving in Taiwan with a letter (書状, *shojō*) for a local authority by Tokugawa Ieyasu, Harunobu sought to levy tribute from the locals. When the Indigenous population refused and attacked, the Japanese delegation rapidly returned to Japan. Back home, Harunobu's opaque business deals with Portuguese merchants from Macau and internal competition with *bakufu* officials effectively led to his death sentence in 1612.[47] Nevertheless, history remembers him along with the likes of Yamada Nagamasa as an agent of change through commercial relations with the outside world. Yamada Nagamasa, by the way, arrived in Taiwan on the vessel of merchants from Sunpu equipped with a *shuinjō* trading license from the Tokugawa *bakufu* in the year of Arima's death and thus several years before his adventures in Siam began.[48]

In 1616, Nagasaki governor (長崎代官, *Nagasaki daikan*) Murayama Tōan (村山等安, ?–1619), another 'Christian *daimyō*,' set out for Taiwan with thirteen vessels.[49] He was equipped with a *shuinjō* issued for 'Takasagun.'[50] Richard Wickham – an English resident of Hirado whose

[44] For research reports, see www.jacar.archives.go.jp/aj/meta/MetSearch.cgi (accessed March 2, 2021).

[45] Boxer, *Christian Century*, 50–5; Jurgis Elisonas, 'Christianity and the Daimyo,' in *The Cambridge History of Japan. Early Modern Japan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 4: 301–72; Brett L. Walker, 'Foreign Affairs and Frontiers in Early Modern Japan: A Historiographical Essay,' in Jeffrey E. Hanes and Hidetoshi Yamaji, eds., *Image and Identity: Rethinking Cultural History* (Kobe: Kobe University Press, 2005).

[46] Iwao, 'Taiwan nihon machi,' 17.

[47] Tremml-Werner, *Spain, China, and Japan*, 207.

[48] Murakami, *Ikoku ōfuku*, 309. The license was issued for 滝佐右衛門 and 太田治右衛門.

[49] Murakami, *Hirado*, 67.

[50] Iwao, 'Taiwan nihon machi,' 18.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

letters and records served Murakami and others as a valuable source for studying economic developments of Tokugawa foreign trade – interpreted Japanese intervention in Taiwan as part of Tokugawa foreign relations and even claimed that Tōan had actually received orders to conquer Taiwan the previous year.[51] However, the relatively large number of vessels is the only indicator for Wickham's claim. In any case, several ships ran into trouble on the way to Taiwan and only Tōan's small vessel reached its destination. Once ashore, the crew of Tōan's ship ran immediately into new troubles. According to Chinese and Spanish accounts, the surviving Japanese were soon forced to flee after fierce attacks by Indigenous people.[52]

Richard Cocks (1566–1624), who was, like Wickham, an eloquent Japan-based English merchant who gathered information for English readers, associated Japanese engagement in Taiwan with the arrival of a Ming Chinese envoy in Nagasaki, one year after Murayama Tōan's failed Taiwan expedition. Cocks, who included many episodes of commercial competition between Japanese, Dutch, and Chinese merchants in Taiwan in his diary, even emphasized the island's potential as a stage for commercial exchange without state interference.[53] His views influenced Murakami, who engaged closely with Cocks's diary when editing it in 1899.[54] Murakami framed the history of seventeenth-century Taiwan as one determined by Dutch–Japanese rivalry over trade in Chinese products in Taiwan.[55] The idea of Taiwan as stage for competition and rivalry between Dutch and Japanese merchants stood at the beginning of the Taiwan-centric narrative of trade rivalries by external forces that would also include the Zheng trading empire. It began with Japanese exports of deerskin from Taiwan at the end of the sixteenth century.

[51] Naojiro Murakami and Kengo Murakawa, *Letters Written by the English Residents in Japan, 1611–1623, with Other Documents on the English Trading Settlement in Japan in the Seventeenth Century* (Tokyo: Sankōsha, 1900), 180; 220; 230.

[52] Iwao refers to the work of the Spanish chronicler Diego Aduarte. Diego Aduarte, *Historia de la Provincia del Santo Rosario de Filipinas, Iapón y China, de la Orden de Predicadores*, Libro Segundo (Madrid: Gascon, 1693), capítulo XXIX, 557, and the Chinese naval chronicle by Zhang Xie, first published in 1618. Zhang Xie 張燮, 東西洋考 *Dongxi yang kao* (Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 1981).

[53] See Murakami and Murakawa, *Letters* (1900), 180; 220; 230.

[54] Murakami's successor at TIU, Iwao Seiichi, claimed that Murayama Tōan's expedition was perceived as a Japanese expansionist intervention by the Ming court. Iwao Seiichi 岩生成一, '長崎代官村山等安の臺灣遠征と遣明使' Nagasaki daikan Murayama Tōan no Taiwan ensei to kenminshi (Murayama Tōan's invasion of Taiwan and the Ming delegation), *Taihoku teikoku daigaku shigakuka kenkyū nenpō* (Taipei, 1934), 285–359.

[55] Murakami, *Bōeki shijō no Hirado* (1917); Chen Di's account is summarized in Andrade, *How Taiwan*, 20–6; 29. Andrade remarked that a "combination of ambition and military might, made the Japanese an important threat to Dutch control, especially given that aboriginal groups were eager to find allies."

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It has been said that this trade was originally in the hands of Fujianese (Minnan and Hakka) traders who bought from the Aborigines and sold to the Japanese.[56] Such narratives have since overwritten trajectories of the historical development of the island and hampered narrations from the Indigenous vantage point, ultimately cementing a wrongful perception of Taiwan as a place that became globally integrated only through foreign agency and outside intervention by male individuals.[57]

The case of Hamada Yahyōe (浜田弥兵衛), a Japanese merchant and ship captain who visited Taiwan several times, illustrates the larger point I want to make about the entangled historiography of empire. Although his life is relatively well documented, he has not made it to the forefront of popular accounts of a Japanese southward expansion. Hamada Yahyōe piloted a *shuinsen* (licensed trading vessel) owned by Suetsugu Heizō to Taiwan in 1626. As the Dutch were just asserting sovereignty over the island and striving to control all transactions, the terms of trade had changed. Anchoring in the Bay of Taoyouan, near present-day Tainan City, Hamada was forced to unload the newly purchased cargo after refusing to pay customs for the Chinese commodities. His request to sail directly to Fujian to trade with the Chinese was denied, and he had to leave the island with an empty hold. Unwilling to accept his loss, he returned a few months later with his brothers. The Japanese men forced their way into Fort Zeelandia, where the Dutch governor Pieter Nuyts (r. 1627–9) resided. The angry mob took him hostage and tortured him for several days.[58] Upon his return to Japan, Hamada was punished by the Tokugawa authorities for abusing his position as an official *shuinjō* merchant and jailed in Ōmura together with his crew.[59] Yet the story did not end there. Hamada's image as a traitor and troublemaker was refuted three hundred centuries later – not by historians but by the emperor. The Taishō Tennō (1912–26) personally worked toward positively transforming the collective memory of Hamada by deploying previous

[56] Xing Hang and Adam Clulow, 'Restraining Violence on the Seas: The Tokugawa, the Zheng Maritime Network, and the Dutch East India Company,' in Peter Wilson, Marie Houllemare, and Erica Charters, eds., *A Global History of Early Modern Violence* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), 142–60.

[57] For Southeast Asia similar points have been picked up by historians promoting the study of the region from its own vantage point. Victor Lieberman, *Strange Parallels. Southeast Asia in a Global Context, c.800–1830*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Oliver W. Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967); Leonard Y. Andaya, *Leaves of the Same Tree. Trade and Ethnicity in the Straits of Melaka* (Honolulu: Hawai'i University Press, 2008).

[58] Oka Mihoko, 商人と宣教師: 南蛮貿易の世界 *Shōnin to senkyōshi: Nanban bōeki no sekai* (Merchants and missionaries. The world of namban trade) (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 2010).

[59] The details of this story can be gleaned from Adam Clulow, *Company*, 229–46.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

historical investigations and the preparation of records and sources as empirical backing.[60] The Japanese colonial regime eventually erected a monument for Hamada in Tainan in 1941.[61]

Another central figure in Taiwan–Japanese foreign relations is Toyotomi Hideyoshi. In 1593, he sent an envoy with a *kokusho* (state letter) to 'Takayama' – an act that could be molded into different narratives, for instance, as part of Hideyoshi's macro-regional strategy of challenging Ming supremacy alongside his attempted conquest of Chosŏn Korea (also known as the Imjin War, 1592–8).[62] In addition to the timing of the Taiwan episode, the epistemological impact of the term *kokusho* shaped its legacy as official foreign relations. As it showed parallels with Hideyoshi's diplomatic advances toward Luzon (1592–3), it fit neatly with the overall pattern of early modern foreign relations based on envoys and letters. However, while Hideyoshi's *kokusho* initiative resulted in a lively diplomatic communication between the Spaniards in Manila and Japanese officials, it did not trigger any reciprocal reaction in Taiwan. This was due to the island's political organization. The Japanese envoy Harada Kiemon returned without having found an

[60] Yamamoto Renichi, 南方発展史・日本人南方発展史 *Nanpō hattenshi. Nihonjin nanpō hattenshi* (The history of southern development. The history of Japanese development of the south sea) (Taipei: Library of Taihoku University Lectures, 1944), 66. See also Yano Tōru 矢野暢, '大正期「南進論」の特質' Taishōki 'nanshinron' no tokushitsu (The characteristics of 'the Southern Expansion Doctrine' of the Taishō period), *Tōnan ajia kenkyū* 16, no. 1 (1978): 5–31. Hamada's public celebration as an important actor in the Japanese southern expansion began with his posthumous ennoblement as *jugoi* (従五位) in 1915 and the construction of a memorial in Tainan in the historical area of Fort Zeelandia.

[61] https://school.nmth.gov.tw/search/detail/R-03-000436-569860 (accessed September 7, 2024).

[62] Shimizu, 'Toyotomi ki,' 99. Shimizu compares the formalities and external features of three state letters sent to Goa, the Philippines, and Takasago by Toyotomi Hideyoshi, pointing out that all three diplomatic episodes were without precedent in Japanese history. Shimizu, 'Toyotomi ki,' 102. Recent scholarship has stressed Hideyoshi's pursuit of personal gain rather than a strategic plan of foreign expansion. Nam-Lin Hur, 'Japan's Invasions of Korea in 1592–98 and the Hideyoshi Regime,' in Gary P. Leupp and De-min Tao, eds., *The Tokugawa World* (London: Routledge, 2021), 23–45. For the global dimensions and long-term effects of the war, see Rebekah Clements, 'Alternate Attendance Parades in the Japanese Domain of Satsuma, Seventeenth to Eighteenth Centuries: Pottery, Power and Foreign Spectacle,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 32 (2022): 135–58; Baihui Duan and Rebekah Clements, 'Fighting for Forests: Protection and Exploitation of Kŏje Island Timber during the East Asian War of 1592–1598,' *Environmental History* 27, no. 3 (2022): 415–40. Lisa Yoshikawa hinted at the notion of the Korea invasion as emblematic moment in the construction of a national history in imperial Japan. Yoshikawa, *Making History Matter*, 227. Japanese historiography treats the war as two separate events, the *bunroku no yaku* of 1592 and the *keichō no yaku* of 1598. For a recent historical study with a refreshing perspective on the event, see J. Marshall Craig, *China, Korea & Japan at War, 1592–1598: Eyewitness Accounts* (London: Routledge, 2020).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

adequate central authority among the Indigenous population of Taiwan that could receive the *kokusho*. As the mission was subsequently deemed unsuccessful, the Japanese *kokusho* was stored and eventually buried in oblivion.

In 1882 (Meiji 15) a heavily damaged identical copy was discovered in the holdings of Marquis Maeda. The Maeda, a *daimyō* family from Owari on the Tōkaido (present-day Nagoya), had one daughter adopted by Hideyoshi, which may explain the location of the letter.[63] Incidentally, Murakami decided to add the letters to the foreign relations canon. He included it in the *Ikoku ōfuku* compilation with appropriate framing, emphasizing its diplomatic implications. Labeling the transcription of the letter as "Hideyoshi demands tribute from Taiwan in year 2 of Bunroku," Murakami combined past and present terms and concepts of foreign relations.[64] The Sinitic phrase for tribute-bearing (入貢, *nyūkō*) is absent in the original letter, but has become a standard term used by Japanese scholars to describe Hideyoshi's intentions.[65] Murakami's editorial work thus combined old and new ideas of foreign relations practices.

Examining the Chinese-style *kokusho* of 1593 reveals that Hideyoshi was indeed very explicit in his demands from the people of Takayama. It also shows that the author of the letter, a Buddhist monk known as Saishō, wildly exaggerated the power of the Japanese warlord Hideyoshi. The overt threats to conquer Takayama, Chosŏn, and Dai Min were unparalleled in Sinosphere diplomatic correspondence. Hideyoshi claimed that 10,000 warriors would be available after the successful conquest of Chosŏn and urged his imagined counterpart in Takayama to "send tribute and participate in communication." He, moreover, made clear that his envoy Harada had received an order to communicate to the authorities that if no ships came from Takayama, Hideyoshi would set out to retaliate.[66] That Saishō applied a hybrid vocabulary of foreign relations, including elements of classical Confucian foreign interaction and neologisms necessary to accommodate Hideyoshi's expansive plans in East Asia, got lost in translation before the message reached its potential addressees.[67]

[63] The offspring of the Maeda clan became directly involved with the Imperial University when in the 1880s Maeda received property in Meguro in exchange for his estate in Komaba where the Komaba Tōdai Agricultural Studies campus was built in Meiji 17 (1884).

[64] Murakami, *Ikoku ōfuku*, 68–9, includes a transcription of the letter to Takayama (文禄二豊臣秀吉の台湾に入貢を促したる書).

[65] Shimizu, 'Toyotomi ki,' 82.

[66] Shimizu, 'Toyotomi ki,' 100–1.

[67] Hideyoshi's own foreign worldview was modeled on Chinese geopolitical concepts such as the 'Four Seas' (四海, *shikai*), 'Our Empire' (本朝, *honchō*), and 'king' (国王, *kokuō*). See Murakami, *Ikoku ōfuku*, 68–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Japanese historians are inconclusive when it comes to Hideyoshi's engagement with Taiwan, which gives room to speculations about whether the letter was a forgery. While Iwao Seiichi put forward the thesis that the letter was never sent,[68] Shimizu Yūko has argued that the letter returned to Japan after the envoy could not determine to whom to deliver it. Shimizu links the episode to a larger history of Hideyoshi's efforts of sending state letters similar in tone and content to *nanban* ('Southern barbarian') rulers, including the viceroy of India, the governor general of the Philippines, and Takayama-koku without truly understanding the nature of their positions. In the cases of Taiwan and the Philippines, tributary demands were followed by threats of conquest. Shimizu's diligent research also revealed that while the letter addressed to Takayama-koku is dated Bunroku 2 month 11 day 5, a *kokusho* was drafted three days earlier for Little Ryūkyū (i.e., Luzon).[69] While the letter addressed to the rulers in Luzon made a serious impression on the Spaniards in Manila, who immediately started building stronger fortifications to fend off a potential Japanese attack from Taiwan, the letter to Takayama did not have its intended impact on Taiwan.[70] While fear lingered among the Spaniards in the Philippines far into the seventeenth century, neither Chinese settlers nor Indigenous people on Taiwan were bothered by Japanese assaults. In the early twentieth century the rediscovered letter would provide just enough circumstantial evidence to speculate about Japan's territorial interest in Southeast Asia, speculation that would bolster a narrative of Japanese early modern protoimperial spirit.

Before Southern Seas History: Writing about Taiwanese and Formosan (Colonial) Pasts

Leaving behind the question of narratives, the chapter now moves on to evaluate Murakami's scholarship against the background of the emerging historiography of Taiwan. Prior to his move to Taipei in 1929, he had published but one short research note (*Taiwan sinkansha monjo*, on the historical sources of the Siraya people) with Taiwan in the title.[71] However, he had long been engaging with those who had taken on the task of writing Japan into the history of Taiwan. One of them was James

[68] Iwao Seiichi, '文禄二年 (1593) 呂宋長官あて豊臣秀吉の書簡について' Bunroku ninen (1593) Ruson chōkan ate Toyotomi Hideyoshi no shokan ni tsuite (About the state letter sent by Toyotomi Hideyoshi to the governor of Luzon in 1593), 古文書研究 *Komonjo kenkyū* 25 (1986): 4–7.

[69] The letter to Luzon is kept in the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana in Venice. Cf. Shimizu, 'Toyotomi ki,' 84; 99.

[70] AGI Filipinas 35, n. 18 (04/07/1598). See also AGI Filipinas 18R, R.7, n. 65 (19/06/1597).

[71] Murakami, 'Taiwan shinkōsha monjo,' *Shigakku zasshi* 8, no. 7 (July 1897).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wheeler Davidson, a former war correspondent and US consular agent who published the magnum opus *The Island of Formosa, Past and Present* in 1903.[72] Davidson's work was the first historical monograph to tell the story of the island. It was the result of the diplomat's eight years of thorough research on Taiwanese history. In 1895, he debuted as a historian of Taiwan with an article programmatically entitled 'Koxinga, the First King of Formosa.'[73] His monograph of 1903 placed Taiwan in a larger historical context of foreign relations and reached many readers in the United States. Davidson organized the monograph chronologically, with the second half dealing with developments during the Japanese occupation. The book follows the island's integration into macro processes and maritime expansion from the sixteenth century onwards, with chapter headings such as 'Formosa's First Known Visitors' betraying Davidson's belief that change came only with foreigners. In the preface he called Riess's essay on Formosa "perhaps the most scholarly essay yet published on the history of the island."[74] When Murakami visited Taiwan as a postgraduate between 1896 and 1898, he became acquainted with Davidson as the only other person on the island committed to researching the history of Zheng Chenggong.

While Davidson and Riess were among the first to write about Taiwan in the style that was considered bona-fide academic history at the time, the assumption that no one else had engaged with the island's past betrays the arrogant ignorance that guided hegemonic knowledge creation in the late nineteenth century. In 1828, the Japanese Mito clan (a branch of the Tokugawa family – well known for its commitment to recording historical developments –that authored the *Dai nihon shi*, literally History of Great Japan, modeled after Chinese dynastic histories) encouraged Kawaguchi Chōju to publish the three-volume *Taiwan Teishi kiji* (Chronicle of the Zheng family of Taiwan).[75] It began with a description of the island before recounting an audience of Zheng Zhilong, the father of Zheng Chenggong, with Tokugawa Ieyasu in Sunpu in 1612

[72] James Wheeler Davidson, *The Island of Formosa, Past and Present. History, People, Resources, and Commercial Prospects. Tea, Camphor, Sugar, Gold, Coal, Sulphur, Economical Plants, and Other Productions* (London: Macmillan, 1903).

[73] James Wheeler Davidson, 'A Review of the History of Formosa, and a Sketch of the Life of Koxinga, the First King of Formosa,' *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 24 (1895): 112–36.

[74] Davidson, *Island of Formosa*, ii. Davidson, moreover, referred to Riess as "learned authority" (p. 3) when he introduced the misconception about the arrival of people known as Lonkius (Loochoo), who came to Taiwan from the northern part of Ryūkyū prior to immigration of the Malay people.

[75] Kawaguchi Chōju 川口長孺, 臺灣鄭氏紀事 *Taiwan teishi kiji* (Chronicle of the Zheng family of Taiwan) (1828).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Keicho 17 and Wanli 40 in Japanese and Ming Chinese periodization, respectively). While Kawaguchi did not mention any Chinese sources, he presented coherent accounts about Zheng's rule over Taiwan. Murakami closely studied the volume prior to his trip. Murakami's explicit focus on Zheng Chenggong's links to Japan was guided by his early interest in tracing Japanese agency in the China Seas, as he regarded Chenggong as a Japanese maritime hero.[76] Born to a Japanese mother on the Japanese island of Hirado, Zheng Chenggong's Japanese ancestry remains an important feature in historical memory into the twenty-first century.

When Murakami received his research assignment, Chenggong was already a popular historical figure in Japan. On his way to Taiwan in 1896, Murakami stopped in Kyushu to search domains such as Kumamoto, Hirado, Nagasaki, and Ōmura with historical ties to maritime China and *ikoku* ('foreign country') *Takasago*.[77] Chenggong's dramatic biography and ancestral connections with Hirado had enjoyed popular attention in Japan since the mid-Tokugawa period, when his reputation was built through, among other things, the puppet play (*Kokusen 'ya kassen*, The battles of Koxinga) by Chikamatsu Monzaemon (1653–1724).[78] David Mervart has traced how a Chinese source, the Zheng Chenggong zhuan (鄭成功傳, The tale of Zheng Chenggong), reached Nagasaki on a Dutch commercial ship via Batavia (present-day Jakarta) in the middle of the eighteenth century and thereafter became a common reference.[79] As Masuda Wataru aptly phrased it, Chenggong's "unyielding spirit of resistance" was what made him a popular literary subject during the Tokugawa period and a popular historical subject in the Meiji period.[80] Zheng Chenggong controlled what happened in the South China Sea trade beginning in the 1650s. As a military commander, Chenggong assembled and controlled thousands of ships. As a statesman, he proved himself skillful in diplomatic

[76] For more details on the involvement of Chenggong's father Zhilong in Japan, see www.matsura.or.jp/en/history/zheng-chenggong/ (accessed December 1, 2019). The Matsura Historical Museum, or *Matsuura shiryō hakubutsukan* (literally Matsura Museum of historical source material), refers to Zheng Chenggong as 'Asian Hero born in Hirado.'

[77] See Yeh, 'Murakami,' 5, for details on the trip via Kyushu. Murakami left for Taiwan on October 4, stayed for half a year until March 31, 1897, and returned to Japan via Shanghai. His assignment is also recorded in JACAR, Meiji 29 (1896-9-26), 台湾史編纂事務嘱託員村上真次郎ヲ史料蒐集ノ為清国厦門等ヘ差遣ノ件.

[78] Masuda Wataru, 'Zheng Chenggong and Guoxingye (Kokusen'ya, Koxinga),' in Wataru, *Japan and China: Mutual Representations in the Modern Era*, trans. Joshua Fogel (Richmond: Curzon, 2000), 184–95.

[79] David Mervart, 'Reading European Universal Histories in Japan, 1790s–1840s,' *Historical Journal* 64, no. 1 (2021): 43–69.

[80] Masuda, 'Zheng Chenggong,' 203.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

negotiations with the Manchu (the rulers of the Qing Dynasty), the Spanish, the Dutch, and Tokugawa rulers. Both his leadership qualities and advanced maritime strategies turned him into a perfect subject to emphasize Japan's early modern maritime engagement. To the advocates of strengthening Meiji Japan's Asian orientation, Chenggong was clearly an agent of multiethnic maritime networks (i.e., *wakō*) who connected the worlds of East and Southeast Asia.[81] This portrayal reflects the broader shift in the study of the past from a literary interpretation of texts to historical research based on scientific methods, as discussed in Chapter 4.[82]

The first modern Japanese intellectual to write about Taiwanese history was Takekoshi Yosaburō.[83] Takekoshi was a member of the Japanese Diet with an educational agenda that he expressed with a "slightly patronizing tone."[84] What is more, Takekoshi was famous for his ardent support of Meiji Japanese expansionism in the southern seas and proud of Japan's civilizational mission.[85] The first thing that stands out about his 1907 monograph, *Japanese Rule in Formosa*, is the fact that it was published in English by a British publisher. The book describes a Japanese colonial success story that plays on the narrative of the rise and fall of empires and the stereotypes that accompanied it. Takekoshi boldly claimed that while Spain decadently exploited the resources of its colonies, England and Japan poured money into them for further development.[86] In addition to writing a gushing account of the first ten years of Japanese rule in Taiwan, he provided an extensive chapter ('Formosa in the Past') on the island's history since the Sui period. The chapter has been dubbed 'Formosa under the Pirates.' The text is a mishmash of source-based accounts,[87] blunt inaccuracies,[88] examples of his inability

[81] Torsten Weber, *Embracing 'Asia' in China and Japan. Asianism Discourse and the Contest for Hegemony, 1912–1933* (New York: Palgrave, 2018), 65.

[82] Brownlee, *Japanese Historians*, examines this shift and provides ample examples demonstrating how Japanese historians of Murakami's generation believed that their methods were objective.

[83] Takekoshi Yosaburō, *Japanese Rule in Formosa*, trans. George Braithwaite (London: Longmans, Green, 1907). For the Japanese original, see 臺灣統治志 *Taiwan tōchi shi* (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1905).

[84] John Hennessey, 'Rule by Association: Japan in the Global Trans-Imperial Culture, 1868–1912' (PhD dissertation, Linnaeus University, 2018), 198.

[85] Peattie, *Japanese Colonial Empire*, 83.

[86] Takekoshi, *Japanese Rule*, 8.

[87] E.g., in Sui Chinese records the island is called Loochoo. See Takekoshi, *Japanese Rule*, 45. This record has more recently been used by the PRC to substantiate its claim over Taiwan as part of 'China.'

[88] E.g., referring to Admiral Zheng He as emperor who visited Taiwan. See Takekoshi, *Japanese Rule*, 48.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to historicize concepts,[89] wild speculations,[90] and fake facts.[91] In short, he acted contrary to the spirit of his promise to "limit [himself] to the account of the island's past as it is found in the historical sources."[92]

In 1920, Tainan-born Han Chinese author Lian Heng (連橫, 1878–1936) made an important contribution to written Taiwanese history in Chinese. He published *Taiwan tong shi* 臺灣通史 (General history of Taiwan) in three volumes under a Japanese pseudonym; the publication immediately turned into a reference in Chinese.[93] Motivated by the Japanese occupation, Lian had begun a thorough ten-year-long research project in 1908. His aim was to record 1,300 years of the history of the island from the mainland Chinese Sui Dynasty to the short-lived Republic of Taiwan of 1895. The outcome was a biographical historiography in the style of the great Sima Qian's (145–90 BCE) *Shiji* (史記). Each volume dealt with a different topic, ranging from economy, industry, and agriculture to language, religion, and education. The section on *gaikō* prominently featured Zheng Chenggong, with many examples of his diplomatic achievements and reference to his advance toward Luzon in 1662. It was followed by a section on relations with the English under Qing rule and interactions with American ships and the French military.[94] Beginning with the island's populations' encounter with the outside world and its integration into the Sinosphere, the book focused on connections with Ming China, Japan, and the Nanyang (the Chinese reading for *nan'yō*). In so doing, Lian's work included notorious actors such as Suetsugu Heizō and Hamada Yahyōe. Lian's overt agenda was to write the island into the history of Greater China, which he achieved by focusing entirely on outside agency, albeit paying scant attention to the short-lived Dutch and Spanish occupations.[95] In this latter regard, *Taiwan tong shi* differed from Japanese and English publications.

A comparison of Takekoshi and Murakami's writings shows there was even great variety among Japanese writings. While the former aimed at

[89] This is obvious when Takekoshi speaks of 'politicians of Hideyoshi's Cabinet.' See Takekoshi, *Japanese Rule*, 53

[90] For instance, when claiming that Japanese pirates made Taiwan their base as soon as they began pillaging Fujian in the fourteenth century. See Takekoshi, *Japanese Rule*, 51.

[91] For instance, that Murayama Tōan was executed upon return from Formosa in 1615. See Takekoshi, *Japanese Rule*, 53.

[92] Takekoshi, *Japanese Rule*, 44.

[93] Lian Heng 連雅堂, 臺灣通史 *Taiwan tong shi* (General history of Taiwan) (Taipei: Taiwan tongshisha, 1920).

[94] Lian, *Taiwan tong shi*, vol. 14.

[95] The first attempt to write a history from a Taiwanese viewpoint is Su Bing 史明, 台湾人四百年史 *Taiwanjin yonhyaku nen shi* (400 years history of the Taiwanese people) (Tokyo: Otowa shobō, 1962). First published in Japanese.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

moving the masses, the latter valued diligence. When it came to active Japanese participation in commercial developments in the southern seas, Takekoshi's narrative centered on those he called 'pirates.' Unsurprisingly, he chose to prioritize prose over source-based accuracy, for instance, when arguing that "pirates were really the pioneers of foreign trade. Their ships visited Borneo, Malacca, Annan, Siam, Tonkin, Saigon, Cambodia, and the Philippines, venturing at times even as far as Mexico, and carrying the treasures of the southern and eastern oceans backwards and forwards."[96] This stark exaggeration was from the prelude to the piece he is most remembered for – the *Wakō ki* (Records of the Wakō) released in 1939. This work, in which he transformed the 'pirates' (*bahan* or *kaizoku* in the Japanese original) into private maritime merchants who began to settle in *nan'yō* ports (in the Philippines, Java, Siam, and Cambodia) as early modernizers, was his response to imperial economic historiographies of the time. Using European pasts as a mirror, he concluded that while the Normans raided the British Isles with the goal of claiming territory, the *wakō* from Kyushu and Shikoku attacked Chinese and Korean coasts in search of material riches.[97] A diligent, thirty-page-long chronological list of Ming Chinese references to *wakō* raids contrasts starkly with scarce copyright references and the complete absence of any references to Japanese scholarship.[98] This absence deserves special mention as it coincided with increased Japanese-language output on the subject of *wakō* in the 1930s by people trained and mentored by Murakami at Taihoku Imperial University, as I will discuss below.

While different in style and genre, Murakami's and Takekoshi's publications had several characteristics in common. Both implied that the island's Indigenous population was unfit for – and therefore unable to conduct – communications with foreign countries. Methodologically both disintegrated and largely silenced Indigenous pasts in a way that rendered the island's history into a history of foreign visitors rather than of the native population.[99] This tendency was ultimately reflected in

[96] Takekoshi, *Japanese Rule*, 44. See also Paul Barclay, 'An Historian among the Anthropologists: The Inō Kanori Revival and the Legacy of Japanese Colonial Ethnography in Taiwan,' *Japanese Studies* 21, no. 2 (2001): 117–36 (here: 119, fn. 4).

[97] Takekoshi Yosaburō 竹越與三郎, 倭寇記 *Wakō ki* (Wakō records) (Tokyo: Hakuyōsha, 1939), 72.

[98] Takekoshi, *Wakō ki*, 77–108. His account of the Japanese colony in Manila, as he calls it, is based on the English translation of Antonio Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (1609) and M. Paske-Smith, 'The Japanese Trade and Residence in the Philippines. Before and during the Spanish Occupation,' *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* (1914): 686–710.

[99] Akira Iriye once called it "an indigenous tradition of expansionism in Japan." See Akira Iriye, *Pacific Enstrangement: Japanese and American Expansion, 1897–1911* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Taiwan's ambivalent position within *nan'yō shi* in which the island plays but a marginal role.[100]

Today both the National University of Taiwan and the Institute of Taiwan History at Academia Sinica (中央研究院, Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan) claim to have inherited both material and ideas from Murakami's Taiwan-related scholarship.[101] The Taiwan history source compilation is certainly Murakami's most enduring (albeit least glamourous) contribution to Taiwanese history. Between 1929 to 1933, Murakami headed the commission for the compilation of historical sources for the Government General and was responsible for the documents produced during Dutch and Spanish rule. He successfully ended the source compilation with translations of Taiwan-related contents from the VOC's daily records from Batavia,[102] Dutch commander Cornelis Reijersen's journal (1622–3),[103] and several historical sources about Taiwan under Dutch and Spanish rule entitled *Collection of Sources in Taiwan History*.[104] His translation of the *Zeelandia dagregisters* first appeared in 1937. The 1970 Chinese translation of Murakami's compilation of the Batavia records remained the sole published reference in Taiwan for the study of seventeenth-century Taiwanese history until the end of the twentieth century.[105]

Translating and Defining 'South' and 'Sea' in *Nan'yō* History

In his inaugural lecture as first *nan'yō shi* professor at Taihoku Imperial University in 1929, Murakami offered a definition of what constituted the *nan'yō* as a historical space and historical period. Focusing on the China Seas as a space for Japanese expansion, he tied past Japanese

[100] For an overview of general education policies in the colony, see Takeshi Komagome and J. A. Mangan, 'Japanese Colonial Education in Taiwan 1895–1922: Precepts and Practices of Control,' *History of Education* 26, no. 3 (1997): 307–22.

[101] Chinese translation. For Murakami's pioneering research in Taiwanese history, see Yeh, 'Murakami,' 2–3.

[102] バタビヤ城日誌. [103] 司令官コルネリス・ライエルセンの日記.

[104] 臺灣史料雜纂. The three remaining copies are held by the National Taiwan Library, National Taiwan University, and Kyoto University. Digitized versions can be accessed via the Taiwan Library E-Resources Database within 日治時期圖書影像系統 and 日治時期期刊影像系統 based on 'Dagregister gehouden in 't kasteel Batavia' and from Groenveldt's 'De Nederlanders in China' (1898).

[105] This changed only after 1996, when a Chinese translation of *De dagregisters van het kasteel Zeelandia* became available. I am grateful to Hung-yi Chien for pointing this out to me. See also www.th.gov.tw/new_site/10webeng/treasured.php (accessed November 15, 2021).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

overseas commercial activities to the age of European exploration. This comparison worked first and foremost on a terminological level. Instead of Chinese equivalents such as the Sinophone *nanhai* (*nankai* in Japanese),[106] a term that literally meant 'southern sea' used for the waters south of China and surrounding present-day Indonesia and the Philippines since the time of the Sui Dynasty, he spoke of the 'southern seas' (*nan'yō*).[107] This was by no means a slip of the tongue but rather a bold hegemonic claim. He categorically avoided referencing Chinese geography or the seafaring experience of Japan's Western neighbor. Instead, he elaborated on how Spanish navigator Vasco Nuñez de Balboa (1475–1519) called the ocean beyond the Isthmus of Panama Southern Sea (*mar del sur*). This was, he went on, before Ferdinand Magellan coined the term Pacific Ocean.[108] Murakami called Balboa's discovery of the Pacific the "beginning of European early modern era (欧州近世紀の初め, ōshū kinseiki no hajime)," which he implicitly deemed momentous for Japan's own southward expansion.[109] The inaugural lecture at TIU was published in instalments in the *Taiwan nichi nichi shinpō*, the main Japanese newspaper in the colony, with the headline 'Japanese Expansion before the Tokugawa Closed Country.'[110]

While *nan'yō* was not a neologism, Murakami's definition of the term emphasized significant semantic shifts in the early twentieth century. The strategy of eschewing categorizations originating from a Sinitic cultural geography, driven by the aforementioned European bias, had a clear geopolitical dimension that empowered Japanese colonialists to extend their claims from the South China Sea to the Pacific. The notion of the Japanese *nan'yō* as inseparably linked to Balboa's southern sea (i.e., the Pacific, *Dai nan'yō*, which became widely used to denote the Pacific around the Marianas and the Carolinas [modern-day Micronesia] in

[106] We should note that *nankai* as a term and concept was widely used by Japanese *nan'yō shi* scholars affiliated with TIU. Fujita Toyohachi 藤田豊八, 東西交涉史の研究 南海篇 *Tōzai kōshō shi no kenkyū* (Research on the history of east–west negotiations) (Tokyo: Oka Shoin, 1932).

[107] The term has been used by Ming historical memorialists, for instance, in the Ming Shi Lu. See https://epress.nus.edu.sg/msl/ (accessed September 12, 2021).

[108] See Rainer F. Buschmann, Edward R. Slack, and James B. Tueller, *Navigating the Spanish Lake. The Pacific in the Iberian World, 1521–1898* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014), 3–14.

[109] Taiwan nichi nichi shinpō, 19-26/06/1929, '寛永鎖国前における日本人の南洋発展' Kan'ei sakoku ni okeru nihonjin no nan'yō hatten. Kan'ei is a Japanese-era name for the period from 1624 and 1644. 'Sakoku,' literally 'closed country,' describes Japanese seclusion policies after 1639. However, the term 'sakoku' was not used prior to 1715. Kan'ei refers to the period when the Tokugawa regime prohibited foreign travel, which later became somewhat misleadingly known as *sakoku* 'closed country' policies.

[110] See previous footnote.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Japanese scholarship and political correspondence), in combination with the language of 'pioneering,' followed Murakami since he himself first crossed the Pacific to participate in the Panama Pacific conference in 1915. In San Francisco, Murakami was welcomed by scholars such as Herbert E. Bolton who, at the forefront of oceanic history research, set out to historicize the Pacific Ocean.[111] In front of an international audience, Murakami lectured about Japanese active participation in the Pacific's global integration.

Murakami opened his talk with a remark that it was "only ten years since the steamers of the Tōyō Kisen Kwaisha began to run between the ports of Japan and Mexico but attempts to open the same route were made more than three hundred years ago by one of the greatest statesmen of Japan."[112] Here, he referred to Tokugawa Ieyasu's aspiration to collaborate with Spanish overseas agents in transpacific trade in the early years of the seventeenth century. Murakami's outspoken admiration for Ieyasu's global aspiration has been overlooked by both critics and supporters. The format and timing of the congress may explain Murakami's boastful approach. He adopted the jargon of the organizers who, in the opening address to the congress, labeled the only two participating countries outside the Americas, Spain and Japan, as "old" and "new" powers "interested in the things of the Pacific Ocean."[113] The fledgling US–Japanese rivalry over dominion of the Pacific echoed in Murakami's public lectures.[114] Murakami's application of analogies from European maritime exploration and conquest and his framing of the *nan'yō* must be read against the background of contemporary geopolitical interests of the Japanese Empire and the extension of the *nanshin* doctrine from the South China Sea all over the Pacific.

The Pacific Ocean is rich in typology and toponyms; Mar del Sur/South Sea is just one category of many.[115] David Armitage and Alison Bashford discuss how historians far into the twentieth century struggled to understand the chronologies of the people inhabiting the Pacific

[111] Henry Morse Stephens and Herbert E. Bolton, 'The Pacific Ocean in History: Papers and Addresses Presented at the Panama-Pacific Historical Congress Held at San Francisco, Berkeley and Palo Alto, California,' July 19–23, 1915. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/p/philamer/afj6028.0001.001/124?page=root;rgn=full+text;size=100;view=image (accessed June 12, 2020).

[112] Murakami, 'Japan's Early Attempts,' 467.

[113] Stephens and Bolton, 'The Pacific Ocean in History,' 113.

[114] Tomoko Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific. The United States, Japan and the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1919–1945* (London: Routledge, 2003).

[115] Not to be confused with the Southern Ocean that emerged as a geographical entity in the postwar era and became hesitantly applied to the sea surrounding the Antarctica in the 1970s.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ocean and to do equal justice to oral hunter-gatherer cultures, agricultural communities, and industrialized societies.[116] Murakami, however, never had this struggle. Neither the Indigenous population of Taiwan nor oceanic history mattered much to his perception and contextualization of *nan'yōshi*. Conceptually speaking, he limited the discipline's regional framework to what we today refer to as maritime Southeast Asia, the region from Melaka to Manila, Batavia, and Singapore. The area had historically been influenced by foreign groups, all above – the *nan'yō kakyō* (南洋華僑).[117] *Nan'yō kakyō* (*nanhai huaqiao* in Chinese) captures the important role of Southeast Asian ports and seascapes in the large-scale diaspora from mainland China since the Ming period.[118] The term itself originated in the late nineteenth century. Ironically, the Taipei-based *nan'yōshi* of the 1930s paid little to no attention to the role of overseas/Nanyang Chinese in the *nan'yō*.[119] Their absence is part of the constructed, multilayered historiography characterized by silences, exaggerations, and purposeful ambivalences.

Another absence concerns Taiwan itself. When laying the ground for the *nan'yōshi* program, the island's past was of no concern to Murakami. It was only toward the end of his term in Taipei that Murakami more explicitly began to focus on Taiwan in teaching the general *nan'yō* history course. In the 1930s he would also include Taiwan in his publications on early modern expansion. Relying largely on Dutch sources, he began to stage the island as the historical space for European–Japanese–Chinese

[116] David Armitage and Alison Bashford, 'Pacific Ocean,' in Armitage and Bashford, eds., *Pacific Histories. Ocean, Land, People* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 6–8. They criticize historians for privileging written language as a requisite for 'civilization' and for perpetuating the persistent idea that oral-based societies and hunter-gathering economies were unchanging, thereby suggesting that such societies either possessed a lesser history or no history at all.

[117] In the twentieth century, Sinophones (including Japanese speakers) used this composite label to refer to ethnic Chinese residents in Southeast Asia. A brief JACAR search has shown that Japanese records of the Foreign Ministry and the Taiwan Government General frequently used the term at the beginning of the twentieth century. For historical studies on overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia, see Gungwu Wang, *A Short History of Nanyang Chinese* (Singapore: Eastern University Press, 1959); Victor Purcell, *The Chinese in Southeast Asia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965); Chang Pin-Tsun, 'The First Chinese Diaspora in Southeast Asia in the Fifteenth Century,' in Felipe Fernandez Armesto, ed., *The Global Opportunity* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995), 105–20.

[118] Shiba Yoshinobu 斯波義信, 華僑 *Kakyō* (Overseas Chinese) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shinsho, 1995).

[119] The Nanyang Chinese are often associated with the Chinese community of Singapore; however, the heterogeneous Chinese diaspora, which included both Han Chinese and Hakka, was dispersed all over maritime Southeast Asia. During the nineteenth century, Nanyang Chinese emigrated in unprecedently high numbers.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

collaborations. A coedited volume entitled *Taiwan bunka shisetsu* (Cultural history of Taiwan) aimed to narrate the history of Taiwan from the perspective of Japanese national history (*kokushi*) starting with Hirado as Zheng Chenggong's birthplace.[120] Murakami's contribution included three chapters, one on Fort Zeelandia, one on the Dutch efforts to educate the local ('barbarian') population, and one on the Sinkan manuscripts.[121] What is more, the compilation shares many linguistic and narrative parallels with a popular history book on Japanese people's advance into the southern seas (*Nanpō hattenshi*) published in the early 1940s by Taipei-based high school teacher Yamamoto Ren'ichi.[122] Such simplified publications demonstrate that the boundaries between the study of southern seas history and Japanese history had long been blurring. This was true in terms of themes and space, but even more so when it came to the inseparability of educational propaganda and scientific research. In the early 1940s, Murakami even contributed an article on the Japanese migration to Southeast Asia to an edited volume that can best be described as a 'colonial manual.'[123] Using seventeenth-century source material, he advocated the thesis that a strong Japanese presence in Asia was based on collaboration and confrontation. Such implicit claims about Japan's position in the region, above all in relation to China, always had geopolitical implications in prewar Asia.

Research in global intellectual history has stressed the importance of China as a reference point for both intellectuals in Meiji Japan and scholars working on the interwar period with both groups stressing imperial China's 'decadence' in a narrative of decline.[124] Murakami, who lived through both periods, was not part of either of these trends.

[120] Taiwan bunka sanbyakunen kinenkai 台湾文化三百年記念会, ed., 台湾文化史説 *Taiwan bunka shisetsu* (A cultural history of Taiwan) (Taipei, 1930).

[121] *Taiwan bunka shisetsu*, 23–161.

[122] Yamamoto, *Nanpō hattenshi*, 23–31. The specific chapters cover Hideyoshi's advance toward Takayama and Luzon (ch. 3), Japanese interest in the *nan'yō* in the Edo period (ch. 4), maritime trade operated by red seal ships (ch. 5), Japantowns in the *nan'yō* (ch. 6, 47–51), Hamada Yahyōe and Yamada Nagamasa (ch. 7, 51–4), Zheng Chenggong and Japan (ch. 8), from *sakoku* to *kaikoku* (From the 'closure of Japan' toward its opening) (ch. 9), the southward expansion (ch. 10), the solution of the 'Ryūkyū problem' (ch. 11), and the advance of national strength and southward development during the Meiji period (ch. 12). The last six chapters deal with more contemporary economic developments under Japanese rule and include a list of Japanese protagonists in the region.

[123] Murakami contributed a chapter on Japanese migration in Southeast Asia to a volume entitled *Tainan'yō* published by the Tainan'yō dantai in 1942.

[124] Yoshikawa, *Making History Matter*; David L. Howell, *Geographies of Identity in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005). Douglas Howland, *Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

By the time he designed the *nan'yō* program, he was occupied with the idea of foregrounding Japanese agency in the *nan'yō*. Wielding his authority as the first person ever to hold a chair in southern seas history, Murakami stressed Tokugawa Japan's collaboration with the Europeans (*nambanjin*). Public outreach activities and student supervision in the early 1930s allowed him to flesh out the expansion narrative he presented in his inaugural lecture. To prove his findings about the importance of Japanese towns, he relied on quantifiable data such as the exact numbers of Japanese passengers disembarking in Batavia, another important node in the network of overseas Japanese merchants. Statements such as that an "expansion into Siam" (*Shamuru hatten*) had been cut short show how his language became gradually more explicit and even propagandistic.[125] In a 1937 newsletter of the Bunmei kyōkai (a learned society with the befitting English title 'Association of Civilization'), he bluntly summarized the achievements of Tokugawa Japanese actors in Southeast Asia on the same level as European seafarers, describing them as "our contribution to the development of the Southern Seas."[126] A carefully prepared narrative placed Japanese actors into the center of early modern Southeast Asia and simultaneously synchronized the Japanese past with the European one.[127]

Nan'yōshi: Synchronizing Japanese and European Expansionism in the South China Sea

To further explain what I mean with synchronization through discourse and translation processes, it will be useful to explore the development of the *nan'yōshi* syllabus. After 1919, all imperial universities followed the example set by Tokyo Imperial University (Tōdai), where autonomous departments of Japanese history (*kokushi*), Western history (*seiyōshi*), and Eastern/Chinese history (*tōyōshi*) were established by 1904, while southern seas history (*nan'yōshi*) was considered a branch of the last.[128] Yet, when the Taihoku Imperial University was founded in 1928, *nan'yō shi* became a separate department. Thus, history students in Taipei could

[125] Taiwan nichi nichi shinpō, 19/06/1929, 'Kan'ei Sakoku'; at the end of section 3, one reads: 寛永十二年即ち千六百三十五年の末に日本船の海外渡航を全く禁じたので我が邏羅発展は絶望となった.

[126] Murakami, 'Waga nan'yō hatten no konjaku.'

[127] Stefan Tanaka explored other processes of synchronization in relation to the reckoning of new forms of time in Meiji Japan. Tanaka, *New Times*.

[128] For a discussion of the geographical bias, see Julia Thomas, 'Why Do Only Some Places Have History? Japan, the West, and the Geography of the Past,' *Journal of World History* 28, no. 2 (2016): 187–190. For a critical assessment of this division and its impact on research in Japan, see Haneda, *Atarashii sekaishi*, 23–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

choose courses from *kokushi*, *tōyōshi*, and *nan'yōshi*, as well as courses provided from a combined program in historiography (*shigaku shi*), *seiyōshi* (Western history), and geography.[129]

In political circles in the Japanese Empire, debates about north-, east-, and southward expansion had gathered steam in the 1920s.[130] Taiwan had officially been announced as the base for *nanshin*, that is to say Japan's infamous southern advancement policy.[131] Expansionist developments were hampered as the Taiwan Government General faced political tensions arising from assimilation policies (同化, *dōka*) in the name of the expansion of the homeland policy (内地延長主義, *naichi enchōshugi*) and from the Han Taiwanese elite's unfulfilled demands for self-representation.[132] In the 1930s, *nan'yō* maps featured Taiwan as the central point of the southern seas under Japanese influence.[133] These maps were used in international propaganda and became integral to popular history publications.[134] Taiwan was presented as the bridge

[129] Nagashima Hiroki, 永島広紀, '京城帝国大学法文学部の私学系講座とその歴史学研究: 台北帝大・満州・建国大学との比較的視点を踏まえた考察' Keijō teikoku daigaku hōbungakubu no shigakukei kōza to sono rekishigaku kenkyū. Taihoku teidai, manshū, kenkoku daigaku to no hikakuteki shiten wo fumaeta kōsatsu (Private lectures and historical research at Keijō Imperial University's Faculty of Law. Reflections and comparisons with Taihoku University and Kenkoku University), in Ōzawa Minoru and Satō Yūki, eds., 史学科の比較史: 歴史学の制度化と近代日本 *Shigakka no hikakushi. Rekishigaku no seidoka to kindai nihon* (A comparative history of historical science: The institutionalization of history in modern Japan) (Tokyo: Bensei shuppan, 2022), 207–308.

[130] Eiichiro Azuma, 'Remapping a Pre-World War Two Japanese Diaspora: Transpacific Migration as an Articulation of Japan's Colonial Expansionism,' in Donna Gabaccia and Dirk Hoerder, eds., *Connecting Seas and Connected Ocean Rims. Indian, Atlantic, and Pacific Oceans and China Seas Migrations from the 1830s to the 1930s* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 422.

[131] Ōe Shinobu 大江志乃夫, '東アジア新旧帝国の交代' Higashi ajia shinkyū teikoku no kōtai (The change of old and new empires in East Asia), in Ōe Shinobu, ed., 近代日本と植民地 *Kindai nihon to shokuminchi* (Modern Japan and its colonies) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1992), I: 3–31.

[132] Ching, *Becoming Japanese*, 51–9. On Japanese debates regarding assimilation as colonial policy, see Hennessey, 'Rule by Association,' 29–31. For a concise summary of critical voices of the Japanese colonial system, see Pierre-François Souyri, 'Criticising Colonialism in Pre-1945 Japan,' *Cipango-French Journal of Japanese Studies. English Selection*, no. 4 (2015): 189–236. Souyri identified teachers at Japanese imperial universities as particularly vocal anticolonialists.

[133] For a recent comprehensive discussion of critical cartography and maps and how imperial maps project the aims of their creators, see Tamara Bellone, Salvatore Engel-Di Mauro, Francesco Fiermonte, Emiliano Armano, and Linda Quiquivix, 'Mapping as Tacit Representations of the Colonial Gaze,' in Doug Specht, ed., *Mapping in Crisis: Participation, Datafication and Humanitarianism in the Age of Digital Mapping* (London: University of London Press, 2020), 17–38. See also the classic work from Denis Wood: *The Power of Maps* (London: Routledge, 1992), 17–38.

[134] Yamamoto, *Nanpō Hattenshi*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

between the Sinosphere and the southern seas. The decision to establish *nan'yōshi* as an autonomous university chair and to include it in the university's history curriculum within the fledgling academic environment of Taipei has to be seen in the context of such frictions.[135]

In a 1996 article in the National Taiwan University newsletter, the Taiwanese historian Chen Wei-zhi was the first to draw attention to the impact of TIU's history curriculum.[136] He elaborated on how each track of studies was based on a combination of an in-depth study of the home department's discipline with an introduction to the other historical subfields, as well as courses in anthropology and Western historical geography.[137] A student majoring in Japanese history (*kokushi gaku*; with positions held by Nakamura Kiyozō [中村喜代三] and Kyoto Imperial University graduate Kobata Atsushi [小葉田淳], who later became an internationally renowned economic historian), for instance, was required to take courses in Chinese history and several electives from the Faculty of Letters. Murakami taught a general introduction to historiography (史学概論, *shigaku gairon*) based on Ranke's objective history for five consecutive years.[138]

The compulsory classes in anthropology certainly added to the program's internationalization. Utsurikawa Nenozō (移川子之藏), who was trained at the Universities of Chicago and Harvard and traveled to Europe as a visiting scholar, became the first professor at TIU's Institute for Ethnology. This chair was the only one in anthropology/ethnology in the entire Japanese Empire and turned into an important institution for university-sponsored research into Taiwan's Native Formosans.[139] This distinctive shift in anthropological research recalls the overall change from informal imperialism during the Meiji period toward formal colonialism in the interwar period, when cultural

[135] Yano Tōru ('大正期「南進論」の特質') discusses the ideology of Meiji Japanese geographical and geopolitical discourse and the genealogy of foreign expansion. Nan'yō as frontier turned into an ideology of the Japanese Empire similar to Atlantic for Europe and Pacific for the United States. The southern seas are considered an alternative to the closing immigration channels into North America.

[136] Chen Wei-zhi 陳偉智, '文政學部—史學科簡介' Wenzheng xuebu – shixue ke jianjie (The Faculty of Humanities and the profile of historical studies), 台北帝國大學研究通訊創刊號 *Taiwan daxue yanjiu tongxun chuan kan hao* (1996): 72–95. See www.lib.ntu.edu.tw/doc/cg/resources/U_His/academia/no1-ch4.pdf (accessed June 15, 2020). Chen outlined the development of the history department including compulsory courses for history majors and relevant biographical aspects of faculty members and students.

[137] Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 80–3.

[138] Nagashima, 'Keijō,' 245.

[139] Kyung-soo Chun, 'A Trial of the History of Anthropology in Taiwan during the Japanese Occupation: Focusing on Inō Kanori, Utsurikawa Nenozo, and Kanaseki Takeo,' *South Pacific Studies* 36, no. 2 (2016): 79–101 (here: 80–5).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

distinctions were made more prominent.[140] In a manner reminiscent of Murakami and other historians, Utsurikawa went to the Netherlands to photograph a large number of Dutch colonial documents from Taiwan in 1937. His contribution to the study of Indigenous peoples – their language, culture, and customs, including publications on the genealogies of 'Formosan native tribes' – remains highly acclaimed and influential.[141] Yet, they are not without their limitations.

Like Taiwan-based anthropological research, the intellectual productions emerging from Murakami's *nan'yōshi* chair had major empirical and epistemological implications for the study of multilayered foreign relations. As an academic institution, the *nan'yōshi* program was the first of its kind in the world. It would take another thirty years and the shift to decolonization (supported by Indigenous perspectives) for the launch of the world's first department in Pacific history at the Australian National University.[142] Yet, Taipei's *nan'yōshi* program did not advocate a history studied from a regional or Indigenous vantage point. On the contrary, the faculty members in Taipei were committed to a European-oriented southern seas history as a subfield of Japanese history and, as such, to providing space and resources to southern sea history that showed broader Japanese maritime expansion. The program's orientation is thus part of the legacy of TIU's history curriculum, a legacy which continues to complicate historical thinking in and about Taiwan and Japan. Thanks to the program's unique character, all parties involved enjoyed significant freedom of scope until late 1945, when Taihoku Imperial University, alongside reforms of higher education, turned into National Taiwan University, and Japanese professors were gradually replaced by Chinese professors.[143]

At the time of its foundation in 1928, Taihoku Imperial University was divided into two faculties: the Faculty of Literature and Politics, and the Faculty of Science and Agriculture. History was one of the four disciplines taught alongside philosophy, literary studies, and political science at the Literature and Politics Faculty. When building up *nan'yōshi*, Murakami designed the compulsory lectures for the study of the southern seas and the Pacific in a way that allowed him to further his own studies and make immediate use of material he found during his overseas

[140] Kevin M. Doak, 'Building National Identity through Ethnicity: Ethnology in Wartime Japan and After,' *Journal of Japanese Studies* 27, no. 1 (2001): 1–39.
[141] The collection can be accessed online via the Taiwan Memory project. See https://tm.ncl.edu.tw (accessed March 31, 2020).
[142] Bashford, 'Pacific Ocean,' 74.
[143] Wu Wen-Hsing, Shun-Fen Chen, and Chen-Tsou Wu, 'The Development of Higher Education in Taiwan,' *Higher Education* 18, no 1 (1989): 123–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

research.[144] Furthermore, institutional funds enabled him to send young scholars – committed and equipped with what was considered command of the right foreign languages – abroad to collect source material and to expand the network of archives and scholars around the world. One of them was Iwao Seiichi (1900–1988), who was appointed assistant professor in 1929 and inherited Murakami's position in 1935. Despite providing lectures, regular reading groups, and research seminars, the history department in Taipei was not a place for mass education. It was a small-scale enterprise with only a total of sixty-two male students enrolled over its fifteen years of activity. They came from virtually all prefectures in Japan, including Okinawa.[145] In contrast, only two local Han Chinese students, Ke She-jie and Zhang Liang-biao, then known as 'islanders' (本島人, *hontōjin*), finished their history studies in Taipei.[146] While both teachers and graduate students contributed to historical knowledge and narratives of Southeast Asia, Iwao Seiichi, first as assistant professor and later as Murakami's successor, shaped the idea of the *nan'yō*, as we know it, as a mere crossroads for foreign intervention.[147] He was committed to promoting seventeenth-century Japanese claims over the island and far more outspoken than Murakami in favor of the imperial cause. His prewar publications on Japanese foreign relations helped shape the image of Japanese military presence and domination of Southeast Asian seascapes based on violence and superior military power.[148] In his study of 'Japan towns' in Asia, he underlined how the increase in Taiwan–Japan trade in the 1620s occurred in parallel with the construction by the Dutch of Fort Zeelandia in the Bay of Taoyouan near

[144] Yeh, 'Murakami,' 1–35. [145] See the list reproduced in Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 84–97.

[146] Historians in East Asia have compared the history education at the three imperial universities outside Japan, demonstrating that unlike students in Taipei, who did not learn anything about the Chinese, let alone the Indigenous past of the island, students in Seoul attended lectures with a particular focus on ancient Korean kingdoms. See Yeh Pi-Ling 葉碧苓, '臺北帝國大學與京城帝國大學史學科之比較 (1926–45)' Taibei diguo daxue yu jingcheng diguo daxue shixue ke de bijiao (Comparison of history courses offered at Taihoku Imperial University and Keijō Imperial University [1926–1945]), *Taiwan shi yanjiu* 16, no. 3 (2009): 87–132. In Korea, a third of the 121 graduates were Koreans. See also Nagashima, 'Keijō teikoku daigaku,' 207–308. For the experiences of Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Taiwanese students at the Japanese 'Nation-Building University' in Manchuria, which promised ethnic equality, see Yuka Hiruma Kishida, *Kenkoku University and the Experience of Pan-Asianism: Education in the Japanese Empire* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2021).

[147] Iwao, 'Nan'yō ni okeru nihon kankei shiryō chōsa hōkō,' 139–216. For a critique on simplifications and generalizations in writing regional history, see Jennifer L. Gaynor, 'Maritime Southeast Asia: Not Just a Crossroads,' *Maritime Asia* 19, no. 2 (2014): 14–19.

[148] Iwao Seiichi, 南洋日本町の盛衰 *Nan'yō nihonmachi no seisui* (The rise and fall of Japanese towns in Southeast Asia) (Taipei: Taihoku Teikoku Daigaku, 1937).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

present-day Tainan City, where Japanese traders also founded a settlement.[149]

For better contextualization, it is prudent to take Iwao's own intellectual journey into account. As a student at Tokyo University in the 1920s, he was encouraged by Kuroita Katsumi and Tsuji Zennosuke to study Japanese–Dutch relations. The two eminent professors were looking for evidence of early modern precedents to Japan's involvement in Southeast Asia.[150] In 1926, when Kuroita set out on his tour around the world in search of documents to uncover more about Japan's maritime past, he took Iwao along to help with languages. They started in the *nan'yō*, visiting Macau, Hoi An, Batavia, Bangkok, Khmer Angkor-wat, and finally Taipei, where Iwao was recruited by Kuroita's university friend of the 1890s, Murakami Naojirō.[151] Immediately after having been appointed assistant professor at *nan'yōshi* in 1929, Iwao followed Kuroita to Europe, where he would conduct archival research until 1932.[152] Embedded in a larger narrative of private maritime enterprises and mercantilist spirit as the driving forces in the establishment of trading outposts and colonies far away from Japan, Iwao collected evidence of Japanese settlements in Macau, Ayutthaya, and Hoi An (Faifo) in Annan.[153] The material he gathered was a welcome addition to the imperialists' story of expansionist considerations. Of particular importance was the 'Japanese bridge' (*Chua Cau*, Viet.) at Faifo, a monument built by the Japanese traders in the seventeenth century and maintained over the centuries.[154] This bridge illustrated the presence of Japanese capital and knowledge creation about Southeast Asia between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries. Clearly, knowledge creation of what mattered for *nan'yōshi* took place on uneven ground.[155]

The history students in Taipei were taught subjects closely linked to the faculty members' research agendas. Murakami's teaching assignments between 1929 and 1935 included an overview lecture on

[149] Iwao, 'Nagasaki daikan,' 285–359. [150] Yoshikawa, *Making History Matter*, 201.
[151] Yoshikawa, *Making History Matter*, 202–12. Tsuji, *Kaigai*, 598, quoted Kuroita Katsumi's report on the Japanese in Annan published in *Shigaku zasshi* 40.
[152] Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 81.
[153] This shows parallels to concurrent ideas promoted by Pacific scholars, for instance, elaborated in William Lytle Schurz, 'The Spanish Lake,' *Spanish American Historical Review* 5 (1922): 181–94.
[154] Tsuji, *Kaigai*, 590–8; see 591 for Kuroita's report on the construction of the Japanese bridge.
[155] Scholars in intellectual history recognize that knowledge creation takes place in a landscape of asymmetric power relations between genders, ethnic groups, and regions. See Donna Haraway, 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective,' *Feminist Studies* 14, no. 3 (1988): 575–99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Southeast Asian history (南洋史概説), a course in the Dutch language, a lecture on the historical relations between Japan and Southeast Asia (*nan'yō*), and a lecture course on the arrival of the Europeans in Southeast Asia (only taught in 1933). Until 1933, these courses, which focused almost exclusively on the early modern period, made up the entire syllabus of *nan'yōshi*. In 1935, Murakami's special lecture on *nan'yō* history focused on the history of Taiwan.[156] Murakami's lectures provided students with a solid training in the colonial history of Southeast Asia. Japan was presented as one of several historical powers in the region, which, thanks to its integration into the Sinosphere, had the best grip on the political and cultural context of Southeast Asia.[157] When Iwao started teaching after his research trip to Europe, the program's focus on the Japanese presence in the region increased even further. Under his tutelage, the *nihon machi* studies became a more elaborate and sophisticated form of narrating the *wakō* and other maritime adventures.[158]

The *nan'yō shi* program was in many ways a manifestation of the Eurocentric bias in Japan's imperial ideological orientation. This became apparent in the compulsory language training in Dutch and Spanish, which was after *komonjo gaku* the key pillar of the program. Dutch was promoted for several reasons, including the extent of the Dutch Empire and its colonial administration and the country's close foreign trade relations with Tokugawa Japan. Spanish was essential for studying colonial enterprises in the Philippines and even the short-lived colonial presence on Taiwan around present-day Tamsui (1626–42).[159] Ironically, neither historically important linguae francae such as Mandarin, Malay, or Arabic, nor popular languages spoken by significant numbers of people, such as Tagalog or Nanyang Chinese vernaculars (many Nanyang people settled in Taiwan and ports in Southeast Asia from the seventeenth century onward), appeared in the program. Nor was there any room for Indigenous languages either. Indeed, European languages mattered most to Murakami, who had little appreciation for

[156] For an overview of all courses in the program, see Nagashima, 'Keijō teikoku daigaku,' 305.

[157] Yeh, 'Murakami,' 12–13. Overall, the curriculum was integrated into universal history. In 1932, a course based on the *Compendio de la Historia Universal* was added to the Overview of Southern Seas History and a general introduction into Historical Studies, which had been taught since 1929.

[158] Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 91: In the department's reading group Murakami once presented a paper on the relics of the Dutch presence on the Penghu Islands, which were known as a notorious pirate hub in Ming times.

[159] The European bias of the program was further reinforced by course literature authored by Western scholars.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

anthropological approaches, as an anecdote of his student Nakamura Takashi (中村孝志, 1910–94) underlines. Accordingly, Murakami did not approve of his history students attending a debating club ('salon') launched by anthropologist Utsurikawa. Murakami argued that serious *nan'yō shi* students would have no spare time for such activities. To him they would be better off diligently spending that time on source and language studies.[160] It goes without saying that mastering two or more new foreign languages on a level to undertake independent source transcription and interpretation in only a year or two was a challenging task. This is why language tutoring regularly took place during lunchtime. Yet it is difficult not to wonder what the stimulating effects of interdisciplinary debates between students in anthropology and *nan'yōshi* could have meant for the historiography of Japan. Although Nakamura recalled the rigid environment where the word *minzoku* was taboo,[161] other examples hint at the comparatively liberal spirit of education and access to knowledge.[162]

In 1935, when Iwao succeeded Murakami as full professor, Yanai Kenji (箭内健司, 1910–2006) joined as assistant professor and received research funding to visit the archives in the Philippines. He became one of the translator-editors of Antonio de Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas* (Events in the Philippine Islands), first published in 1609.[163] The book's genealogy is indicative of the concurrent relationship between the history of knowledge and the geopolitics of imperial power. The genealogy can be briefly summarized like this: The book's author, Morga, a polarizing Spanish lawyer and colonial official, published the records he collected during his stay in the Philippines (1595–1603) after his return from Manila to Mexico. A first English translation was printed in London in 1868, and it was this translation that was famously annotated by Filipino intellectual and national hero Jose Rizal in 1890 during the latter's stay in Europe.[164] In the early 1900s, a team of American

[160] Nakamura, 'Taihoku teidai no koro,' 19.
[161] Nakamura, 'Taihoku teidai no koro,' 19.
[162] For instance, when Tōdai economist Yanaihara Tadao published his lecture series *Teikokushugika no Taiwan* in 1929, government authorities worried that the book might inspire the Taiwanese people under Japanese rule to claim more rights. Hence, the book was immediately banned across the Japanese Empire. At TIU, however, copies could be obtained. See Yanaihara Tadao 矢内原忠雄, 帝国主義下の台湾 *Teikoku shugi ka no Taiwan* (Tawain under imperialism) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1929).
[163] Antonio de Morga, フィリピン諸島誌 *Firipin shotō-shi* (*Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*), trans. Yanai Kenji 箭内健次 and Kanki Keizō 神吉敬三 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1966).
[164] Antonio de Morga, *Sucesos de Las Islas Filipinas* (Historical events of the Philippine Islands), vol. published in Mexico in 1609 recently brought to light and annotated by Jose Rizal (Manila: National Historical Institute, 2008).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholars (some of whom Murakami met in San Francisco in 1915) added parts of Morga's account to their source compilation on the Spanish Philippines.[165] Indeed, Morga's chronicle is full of references to Japanese residents in the Philippines and also describes the arrival of the envoys sent by Hideyoshi in the early 1590s. While Takekoshi used an English translation of Morga when writing the *Wakō ki*, demands for a Japanese edition were finally met by Yanai's 1966 Japanese translation, released in the year of Murakami's death and two decades after the dissolution of the *nan'yō shi* program.

Over the years, Murakami and his colleagues in Taipei shared material freshly located in the archives and collaborated in highlighting the historical Japanese presence in Asia to their Japanese students (*naichijin* 内地人). Several of these students would go on to write graduation theses on related topics.[166] Murakami's and Iwao's students helped with the exploration of the Japanese presence within Eurasian connections of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and with tracing the history of *nihon machi* (Japanese towns) and red seal ships (the *shuinsen* mentioned earlier). Research-led teaching was also an opportunity to introduce the records of these red seal shipping licenses as valuable historical records similar in status to European archival sources.[167] Graduate training had another important knock-on effect: When some of the graduates became high school teachers, they helped spread the narrative beyond academia.[168] After Murakami's departure from Taiwan in 1935, Kobata Atsushi, the professor of Japanese history, took charge of the continuous cross-disciplinary fertilization of historical studies at TIU. Focusing on Ashikaga and Tokugawa foreign relations from the perspective of trade, Kobata introduced the newly discovered *Ryukyuan Rekidai Hōan* (歴代宝案) to students and scholars. Kobata transcribed the *Rekidai* in 1935 in

[165] BR, vol. 15. [166] Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 88.

[167] Iwao, *Nan'yō nihonmachi*. For a survey of the impact of Iwao's scholarship on Taiwanese history, see Chou Wan-yao 周婉窈, '台北帝国大学と戦後台湾における学知・学縁の継承: 岩生成一を中心に' Taihoku teikoku daigaku to sengo Taiwan ni okeru gakuchi, gakuen no keishō: Iwao Seiichi wo chūshin ni (The legacy of knowledge and knowledge relations of the Imperial University of Taipei and postwar Taiwan: Focusing on Iwao Seiichi), in 姜尚中 Kan Sanjun, 青山 亨 Aoyama Tōru, 伊東 利勝 Itō Toshikats, 小松 久男 Komatsu Hisa, 重松 伸司 Shigematsu Shinji, 妹尾 達彦 Tatsuhiko Seo, 成田 龍一 Narita Ryūichi, 古井 龍介 Furui Ryōsuke, 三浦徹 Miura Ryū, 村田 雄二郎 Muria Yūjirō, and 李 成市 Yi Sŏng-si, eds., アジア人物史第11巻:世界戦争の惨禍を越えて *Ajia jinbutsushi dai 11 kan. Sekai sensō no sanka wo koete* (Great figures in the history of Asia 11: Overcoming the catastrophic world war) (Tokyo: Shūeisha, 2023), 183–25.

[168] Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 88: Gōbara, to give one example, graduated with a thesis on the Japanese in Luzon in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries before becoming a high school teacher in Taiwan.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Taipei, which then became classified as *gaikō monjo* of the Kingdom of Ryukyu, a compilation of diplomatic documents and records for ten foreign countries and ports frequented by Ryukyuan merchants between 1424 and 1867. Kobata's edition helped, among other things, to reconstruct Ryūkyū's medieval connections with Thailand and Malacca.[169] Kobata introduced further source-based empirical material to stress Japan's central role in *nan'yō* in a work called *Nihon to kingintō* (Japan and the gold and silver islands) – challenging accounts of an early modern European expansion in East Asia.[170] He first engaged with the historiographical narratives surrounding the mythical islands and their hypothetical location north of Japan at TIU's southern seas ethnology research seminar (南方土俗研究会, *Nanpō dozoku kenkyūkai*) in 1933.[171] Hence, the narrative of commercial expansion with Japan at the center potentially integrated the different research traditions of history and anthropology in Taipei.

Graduation theses and future occupations of Murakami's and Iwao's students provide further hints on the nature of the program and its impact. Examining the material left behind in the university archive, Chen Wei-zhi found that several students of the southern seas history program remained in the field of research, and others dedicated themselves to educational work in the colonies.[172] From Chen's survey I can extract certain thematic tendencies: Nine theses dealt with historical relations between European and Japanese in the *nan'yō*, but only three with the history of Taiwan, of which two focused on Zheng Chenggong's conquest of the island.[173] Shōnago Masayoshi (少名子正義, like Murakami a native of Ōita), who would later become the librarian of Tenri University in Nara, graduated with a thesis on the proselytizing efforts of the Philippine governor generals.[174] Zhang Liang-biao, one of the only two Taiwanese students in the program, graduated with a thesis on the relations between China and the *nan'yō* during the sixteenth and

[169] Kobata transcribed the rediscovered manuscript consisting of 245 scrolls while at Taihoku Imperial University in 1935. The microfilm of the transcription is kept at the National Taiwan University, while the original was destroyed in the Battle of Okinawa in 1945.

[170] Kobata Atsushi 小葉田淳, 日本と金銀島 *Nihon to kingintō* (Japan and the gold and silver isles) (Osaka: Sōgensha, 1943).

[171] Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 93.

[172] Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 84. Charles Boxer already collaborated with Tenrikyō scholars in the 1930s.

[173] Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 84–5.

[174] For the impact of southern seas history research on the history of Taiwan under Japanese rule, see Ou Su Ying's work on the role of higher education for empire in East Asia. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/198401766.pdf (accessed November 15, 2021).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seventeenth centuries.[175] Nakamura Takashi, who would later become a professor at Tenri Language College in Nara, developed a strong connection to Taiwan and contributed significantly to postwar Taiwanese history after his repatriation to Japan. In the 1970s he edited Murakami's three-volume translation of the *Diary of the Batavia Castle* posthumously.[176] Even if the narrative of an early modern Japanese presence in the *nan'yō* as a product of empirical imperialism was not the most evident or violent hegemonic intervention of Japanese imperialism, empirically it had a lasting impact on local and Indigenous stories.

Concluding Remarks

To end this chapter, I will briefly reflect on the legacies of the narrative elements of the *nan'yō* as a discursive space. While *wakō* as maritime adventurers had been prominent figureheads of southward expansion propaganda since the late Meiji period, *nan'yō no nihon machi* gradually replaced the trope of vicious sea-raiders with one of peaceful trading communities. The focus on Japanese towns and trading settlements in Southeast Asia gained momentum with the publication of Iwao Seiichi's 1937 book. The concept circulated already in a 1935 article exploring the Japanese presence in Macau and Batavia published in the *Rekishi kyōiku* (*History Education*) journal.[177] Today, given the vast historical evidence, no one would doubt the existence of *nihon machi* in Southeast Asian ports. Yet, the way this evidence was placed and exploited in the scholarship exaggerated their impact and created a story of Japanese exceptionalism. Japanese merchants and mercenaries in Manila, Ayutthaya, Batavia, or Phnom Penh were but one set of many actors involved in the cosmopolitan environments with their diverse local contexts. Murakami, Iwao, and others provided rich archival material with names and considerable biographical details of overseas Japanese settlements. However,

[175] Chen, 'Wen zheng,' 88. 張榘標 Zhang Liang-biao, '第十六七世紀に於ける南支と南洋との歴史的関係' Dai jūrokunana seiki ni okeru minami shina to nan'yō to no rekishiteki kankei (Historical relations between southern China and Southeast Asia during the sixteenth and seventeenth century).

[176] バタヴィア城日誌 *Batabiajō nikki* (Diary of Batavia Castle). With the exception of Reijersen's journal, Murakami's translations were reorganized by Nakamura Takashi and published by Heibonsha as *Batabiajō nisshi* in three volumes between 1970 and 1975, as part of a Tōyō bunko series. For Nakamura's engagement with Taiwanese history after his repatriation to Japan, see Nakamura Takashi, 荷蘭時代台灣史研究下卷 社會 文化 *Ho-lan shih tai T'ai-Wan shih yen chiu hsia chüan: she hui, wen hua* (Studies on Dutch Formosa, II: Society and culture) (Taipei: Tao-hsiang, 2002).

[177] Iwao Seiichi, '南洋の日本町' Nan'yō nihonmachi (Japantowns in nan'yō), *Rekishi kyōiku* 10, no. 2 (1935).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

they paid little attention to the fact that the *nihon machi* were a byproduct of the much larger network of *kakyō*/*huaqiao* – overseas Chinese settlements that emerged along profitable trading routes. Although burgeoning twenty-first-century research on overseas Chinese networks has revealed many new aspects of collaboration and conflict, there is a general lack of sources that would allow revealing the voices of the vast majority of lower-ranking Chinese merchants and Indigenous people of previous centuries. This is why the lives of *huaqiao*, Europeans, and Indigenous residents in early modern port cities can often only be approximated through consulting the material edited and provided by Murakami and his colleagues – the same material that overemphasizes the Japanese presence. That said, an increased awareness of the dynamic processes (including attempts to synchronize Japanese with European pasts) behind historical knowledge production is key in nuancing the existing narratives.

This chapter has, moreover, argued for approaching *nan'yō* as a discursive space. A publication by Murakami in the monthly periodical *Nan'yō*, the official journal of *Nan'yō kyōkai* published between 1937 and 1944, is telling for its colonial educational agenda, addressing first and foremost Japanese readers based in the metropole (*naichi*). In 1939, Murakami contributed an article on Japanese–Philippine relations in the time of interim Governor General Don Rodrigo de Vivero.[178] While Murakami's meticulously edited translation of Vivero's diary (*Relación del Japón*) of 1929 served as a basis for the article, ten years later Murakami chose a very different approach. Terminological slippages – namely Murakami's repeated use of national units such as Japanese–Philippine and Japanese–Mexican relations – suggest that he reinterpreted the historical references in the *Nan'yō* article in a way that would serve the propaganda requirements of the Pacific war and the empire's concurrent southward expansion.

In 1941, the Biographical Academic Association (*Denki gakkai*), in collaboration with the Rokkō Shobō, a publisher active in distributing books on the Japanese overseas empire, published a book entitled *Nanshin nihon no senkusha* (Pioneers of the southern expansion) based on the latest academic research.[179] In eleven chapters, it introduced what

[178] Murakami, 'Ruson taishu don Rodorigo to nippi, nichiboku kankei,' *Nan'yō* 25, no. 6 (1939).

[179] Mori Senzō 森銑三, ed., 南進日本の先驅者たち *Nanshin nihon no senkushatachi* (The pioneers of Japan's southern expansion) (Tokyo: Rokkō shobō, 1941). Mori Senzō, a native of Kariya/Aichi, also coordinated a book on the pioneers of the northern expansion in 1941. Mori Senzō, ed., 北進日本の先驅者たち *Hokushin nihon no senkushatachi* (The pioneers of Japan's northern expansion) (Tokyo: Rokkō shobō, 1941).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the editors considered to be the chief protagonists of the Japanese southward advance of previous centuries, including Itō Mancio, the leader of the Tenshō mission sent via Goa to Europe in the 1580s; Yamada Nagamasa; Hasekura Tsunenaga; and Suganuma Teifū (1865–1889), a Hirado-born intellectual and author of the *nanshinron* who died during a visit to Spanish-ruled Manila.[180] The final chapter was dedicated to the Japanese towns in the southern sea (*nan'yō no nihonmachi*), converting the many unnamed migrants from Japan into expansionists in their own rights. What is most interesting is that the book followed Murakami's lead in linking Japanese presence (even that of individual merchants and seafarers) in the *nan'yō* as closely as possible to official foreign relations. Yet, surprisingly, Murakami's scholarship is not given credit.[181] The only articulated references to Murakami are to a Dutch manuscript that mentions Yamada Nagamasa, and to his two monographs, *Bōekishijō no Hirado* and *Nichiran no 300nen*.[182] I will refrain from speculating about the reasons why Murakami did not receive the credit he was due, and instead remind readers that the written archive is only one of several sources of information. Murakami would also leave his mark on other forms of applied scholarly colonialism, a claim that I will expand upon in Chapter 6.

The narrative of foreign relations was implicitly shaped by the activities of Japanese scholarship in colonial Taiwan. Even if it only played a silent role, for furthering a global history of diplomacy, the inclusion of Indigenous communities remains an important task. Negotiations and power bargaining had not only determined the relations between the Indigenous communities on the island for centuries, but Indigenous diplomatic practices were also integrated into Japanese colonial politics at the beginning of the twentieth century.[183] It is important to understand that it is not the state and academic institutions alone that make history matter; the narratives, discourses, and memories of nonstate

[180] 菅沼貞風 also known as Suganuma Tadakaze was the author of a commercial history of Greater Japan. In 1942, Hanazono Kanesada authored a monograph that explored Suganuma's achievements as a pioneer of the southern expansion doctrine as part of a national broadcasting series. Hanazono Kanesada, *Nanshinron no senkusha Suganuma Teifū* (Suganuma Teifū, pioneer of the southward expansion) (Tokyo: Nihon hōsō shuppankai, 1942).

[181] Mori, *Nanshin nihon no senkusha*, 159–64: Frequent references include Tsuji's *Kaigai*, work by Kuroita Katsumi, *the Dai nihon (kursiv!) shiryō* 12/14 (edited by Murakami), the *Ikoku nikki* (used in its original manuscript form), and the *Tsukō ichiran.*

[182] Iwao Seiichi's book (南洋日本町の盛衰) is singled out as the most complete account on Japanese towns, while several other chapters, moreover, cite a book called *Nihonmachi no shinkenkyū* by Noel Perry.

[183] Barclay, *Outcasts*, 78–93.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press

actors are crucial, even if they are unacknowledged or downscaled. To underline this point, I will end this chapter with an example that highlights the dynamics behind memory, knowledge, and silences. In 1979, a group of Indigenous women from Taiwan traveled to Tokyo in 1979. The group met with Japanese government officials to negotiate the release of the souls of their family members who died in combat for the Japanese army and, like all war victims, were enshrined in Yasukuni Shrine. In renarrating the story of this Indigenous Taiwanese delegation, historian Leo Ching introduced an important episode that intersects cultural diplomacy and activism.[184] Those women came to Japan to represent the wishes of their husbands and fathers who supported the Japanese Imperial Army as Takasago Volunteers in the 1940s albeit being denied their rights as equal citizens. About four decades later, injustice based on ethnicity and national frameworks repeated itself when Japanese bureaucrats denied the request of the Indigenous Taiwanese delegation. While working on this book, I often reflected on the episode as a powerful illustration of the interplay of historical tropes and the lack of recognition of the spiritual and military dimensions of encounter narratives. Identifying themselves as Takasago people stressed the Taiwanese delegation's shared history with the Japanese Empire that dated back to the sixteenth century, when Takasago-koku became a synonym for armed Indigenous resistance against Japanese advances. The episode clearly demonstrates the need to nuance the narratives of global diplomacy and knowledge production by integrating plural temporalities, memory, gender, and agency.

[184] Leo T. S. Ching, *Becoming 'Japanese'. Colonial Taiwan and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009640817.006 Published online by Cambridge University Press