Keynote Speech 1

Bounding Early Modern Japan: Bakufu Maps, Hayashi Shihei, Kondō Jūzō, and Inō Tadataka

Ronald P. TOBY
(Professor Emeritus, EALC and History, The University of Illinois)

The early-modern Japanese regime—i.e., the Tokugawa bakufu and the political order under its authority—produced four distinct iterations of “maps of Japan” (*Nihon-zu*; *Nihon sōzu*) over the course of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, but each of these maps differed from the others in regard to the territory the bakufu viewed as comprising “Japan.” The first, compiled in the 1630s, mapped only the three large islands of Honshu, Shikoku and Kyushu, along with Iki and Tsushima, and a few offshore islands; the second, compiled in the 1660s, added Ezo (Hokkaido) and Chishima (“thousand islands,” i.e. Kuril) schematically; the third (1692) added the Ryukyus, but the fourth and final map excluded the Ryukyus as not part of Japan. At least until the late eighteenth century, in other words, the bakufu had not arrived at a definitive view as to what was included in the territory of “Japan,” or—conversely—what constituted the boundaries of “Japan.”

The bakufu’s maps of Japan were compiled on the basis of survey maps of Japan’s constituent provinces (*kuni*) produced on Edo’s orders, which included specifications as to scale, graphic conventions, representation of district (*gun*) and province etc.[1] The first national map compiled under Edo’s aegis included only Honshu, Shikoku, and Kyushu, as well as offshore islands like Sado, Iki and Tsushima; later iterations included a schematic indication of Ezo and the Chishima islands, and one iteration (the penultimate one) included the Ryukyu islands. As early as the 1640s, Edo ordered compilation of *kuniezu* for the Ryukyu archipelago, but did not include the archipelago in its national maps until the 1690s—and then excluded the Ryukyus from the subsequent national map of 1717.

The bakufu, as well as popular discourse, referred to Japan as comprising “sixty-six provinces” (*rokujū-rokkakoku*; *rokujū-rokushū*) or “sixty-six provinces plus two islands” (*rokujū-rokushū nitō*), the “two islands” referring to the islands of Iki and Tsushima, offshore north of Kyushu.[2] This discourse implicitly excluded from Japanese territory both the island of Ezo, to the north, and the Ryukyu archipelago to the southwest, which were popularly regarded as alien territory (*ikoku*; *iiki*). The four successive manuscript bakufu maps either excluded both Ezo and Ryukyu entirely; included only one, but not the other; or (once only) included both Ryukyu and Ezo in the official map of “Japan.” None of these four maps was ever officially made public; some scholars assert that commercial mapmakers may have had informal access to official bakufu map, but none has cited evidence to substantiate that claim.

Similarly, maps and gazetteers of “Japan” published commercially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as hand-painted maps produced on folding screens, shared no consistent vision of the outer boundaries of Japanese territory—and in any case the territory they mapped rarely coincided with the territory of “Japan” that was asserted in the official bakufu maps. Seventeenth-century printed Japan maps (with the possible exception of the “Map of Earthquakes in Great Japan” [*Dai Nihon jishin no zu*, 1624]) relegated both Ezo and Ryukyu to the margins—bleeding into the map from outside, but only showing a small part of each. Ontologically, commercially published maps accorded Ezo and Ryukyu treatment identical to that given to Korea (*Chōsen*) in the northwest, and to the mythic islands of “Rasetsu” to the south and “Gandō” to the north as what I term “boundary conditions,” that is, as lands not part of, yet near, the territory of “Japan.” Some of these maps distinguished between “Matsumae,” the castle town of the Matsumae daimyo responsible for trade and relations with the physically, culturally, and linguistically distinct indigenous population of Ezo (as well as the Kurils and

Sakhalin).

Gazetteers, likewise, largely confined their coverage to the "sixty-six provinces and two islands," and often explicitly excluded Ryukyu and Ezo from Japan by noting their distance from some port in "Japan." An early example is *Nihon bunkei-zu* (1666), a gazetteer of the sixty-six provinces and two islands, which makes no mention of Ryukyu or Ezo, noting only that Matsumae is a two-day voyage from Nobeji in northern Mutsu Province. In such a scheme, "Ryukyu" and "Ezo" were just as foreign as Korea or Cambodia. Similarly, in his *Hitome tamaboko* Ihara Saikaku only cursorily notes a few places beyond Mutsu Province—Ezo-ga-chishima, Rakkoshima, and Matsumae among them—and regards the Ryukyus as a foreign country (*karakuni*) five-hundred *ri* from Nagasaki.[3]

That is to say, the mutually inconsistent and sometimes contradictory representations of what comprised the territory of "Japan" in maps and gazetteers produced by both the Tokugawa authorities, as well as the makers of commercially published maps and gazetteers suggest that they were not concerned with delineating the boundaries of Japan vis-a-vis whatever constituted territory contiguous to Japan. To the extent that this "Japan," unlike China or Korea—or France or Spain—was entirely surrounded by water, of course, it may not be surprising that Japanese authorities and cartographers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries felt no need to delineate clear, explicit linear boundaries.

In the late eighteenth century, beginning in the 1770s, with increasing urgency in the 1780s and 1790s, however, and specifically with the encroachment of Russian forces (both commercial and military) in northern and eastern Ezo, the pretense of a borderless Japan rapidly became untenable. Interestingly, it was neither the bakufu itself, nor the daimyo of Matsumae, who first noted the urgency of establishing clear boundaries to Japanese territory in the northeast, but intellectuals outside official circles. Among these, the Sendai samurai Hayashi Shihei (1738–1793) stands out as the first to assert explicit and clearly marked Japanese boundaries in both the north and the south.

In his *Sangoku tsūran zusetsu* (*Illustrated Survey of the Three Countries*) Hayashi argued that, "statesmen who do not know geography are bound to fail in the face of crisis."[4] To inform their thinking he offers maps of the "three foreign countries whose territory abuts our country, and are thus countries which border ours."[5] Those "three countries" are Korea, the Ryukyus, and Ezo, all of which he regarded as ontologically equivalent foreign countries.

In this presentation I will examine how Hayashi delineated specific boundaries between Japanese and foreign territory in his *Sangoku tsūran zusetsu*, with particular attention to the northeastern periphery, and the ways his project of establishing clear boundaries was continued by others in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, especially Kondō Jūzō and Inō Tadataka.

Notes

[1] There is an extensive literature on *kuniezu*; see, especially: Kawamura Hirotada, "'Kuniezu' (Provincial Maps) Compiled by the Tokugawa Shogunate in Japan," in *Imago Mundi* 41 (1989): 70–75; Kawamura Hirotada, *Kuniezu* (Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1990); Sugimoto Fumiko, "Kuniezu," in *Iwanami kōza Nihon tsūshi* 12 (Iwanami Shoten, 1994): 303–325; Kuniezu Kenkyūkai, ed., *Kuniezu no sekai* (Kashiwa Shobō, 2005).

[2] *Heike monogatari* (thirteenth century), "*Nihon wa mukashi, sanjū-sankakoku ni te arikeru o, nakagoro rokujū-rokkakoku ni wakeraretannari*." In Tyler's rendition, "Japan, in times gone by, had just thirty-three provinces; but these were split more recently into sixty-six." *The Tale of the Heike*, translated by Royall Tyler (Viking, 2012): 104–105. *Nihon kokugo daijiten* lists this as the *locus classicus*.

[3] Ihara Saikaku, *Hitome tamaboko* (Osaka: Kariganeya Shōbei, 1689).

[4] “*Kokuji ni azukaru mono, chiri o shirazaru toki wa, chiran ni nozomite shitsu ari* 国事ニ与ル者地理ヲ不知トキハ治乱ニ臨テ失有 .” Hayashi Shihei, *Sangoku tsūran zusetsu* (1 vol. and 5 maps, Edo: Suharaya Ichibei, 1786); cf. Hayashi Shihei, *Shinpen Hayashi Shihei zenshū*, 5 vols. + suppl. vols., Yamagishi Tokuhei and Sano Masami, ed. (Daiichi Shobō, 1978–1980), vol. 2: 19.

[5] “*Sore, kono sangoku wa jō o honpō ni sesshite jitsu ni rinkyō no kuni nari* 夫此三国ハ壌ヲ本邦ニ接シテ実ニ隣境ノ国也 ”. *Ibid.*

Session 1

History that Lies within the Antique Maps

LIN Tieng Jen
(National Palace Museum, Taipei)

Antique maps are one of the most critical materials for researchers to study historical development, at the same time, they are one of the major resources for researchers to learn about how people in the historical period perceived the surrounding environment. However, in the early years, research on ancient maps was not prevalent. It was only used as annotations for historical papers instead of being seen as a key part of historical evidence, which was a shortcoming for the study of antique maps.

In recent years, cartography has begun to drift apart its attachment from the study of history and become an independent subject for academic research. With the help of scholars who dedicate themselves to cartographic studies, such trend may very well expand and prosper. When cartography gradually formed into its own branch of study, theories and methodology were also brought into life. Researchers got to enter the world of maps with a different perspective and combine the outcome with historical studies and therefore opening a new horizon to map reading. Such a development in cartography deepens and broadens the scope of map studies.

For a long time, maps have always played a supporting material role in the research fields of various disciplines; in other words, although the development of research on maps was early and functional, this study had not yet become an independent discipline. In the premodern era maps were considered no more than a reproduced picture which was distinct from text. This view limits our understanding of maps, because maps were confined to the historical data of the map, and its interpretation must be transformed into a narrative by the reader, and thus the map is positioned as an auxiliary tool in the historical material category. However, in recent years, the study of graphs has shown a booming trend, making cartography gradually become a professional discipline. The researchers interpret the illustrations from different aspects such as the style, beauty, genre, epochal meaning and historical data reflected in the map. From the information revealed on the surface to the hidden meaning behind it, they are gradually being deeply explored. Therefore, the map evolved from the original practical object to the later generation to understand the special carrier of the previous generation, and as a document interpretation; its importance has greatly increased.

For a long time, maps have always played a supporting material role in the research fields of various disciplines, in other words, although the development of research on maps was early and functional, this study had not yet become an independent discipline. In the premodern era maps were considered no more than a reproduced picture which was distinct from text. This view limits our understanding of maps, because maps were confined to the historical data category of the map, and their interpretation had to be transformed into a narrative by the reader. Thus, the map was positioned as an auxiliary tool among historical sources.