The Diverse Political Languages of Edo-Period Histories

Luke Roberts

The historian Watanabe Hiroshi (b. 1946) has advanced the argument that the commonly used terms *bakufu*, *tennō*, *chōtei*, and *han* have been employed by modern historians in ways that do not accurately reflect the Edo-period past. In the Tokugawa period, people used different terms—*kōgi* instead of *bakufu*, *tenshi* or *mikado* rather than *tennō*, and *ryō* or *ie* in place of *han*; the word *chōtei* was often applied to the Tokugawa court.[1] Watanabe notes that Mitogaku scholars encouraged the popularization of the terms *bakufu*, *chōtei* and *tennō*, and that these gradually became normal under the ideology of the Meiji Restoration. The Mitogaku terminology is tainted with the spirit of imperial nationalism, in Watanabe's opinion, and although it has powerfully influenced later historical writing, he questions whether we should continue to use it. He himself made a decision to rewrite most of the previously published chapters of his 1997 book, *Higashi Ajia no ōken to shisō*, changing the terminology to be (as he argues) more faithful to the Edo past. There is much truth to his stimulating argument, although it is not entirely without problems.[2]

This essay will analyze various political discourses that were employed during the era when heads of the Tokugawa clan were overlords. I examine a variety of histories, all written in Japan, dealing primarily with the Edo period. My particular interest here is to understand some of the diverse notions of political groupings and relations that were held by various authors, and to consider how historical narratives created in the Edo period relate to Mitogaku and modern narratives of early modern Japanese history. This essay thus will not only trace some of the terms in early modern historiography that were different from modern national forms of historical consciousness, but will also seek to locate historical terms and perspectives used in the Edo period that were later appropriated by modern nationalizing forms of historical writing.

Such a project is useful because there is a strong tendency in modern historical writing to depict the pre-modern past in Japan within a national framework of understanding. This is not merely a selection of terms, as Watanabe argues, but is also an issue of recognizing the unspoken frames of reference within which the terms take on meaning. The modern nationalizing of Edo-period history essentially involves a process of translating the past into terms and relationships easily understood within an assumed frame of reference that is "Japan." Much of this translation is done as a matter of course, and that this is done largely unconsciously is a symptom of the tremendous discursive power of nationalism. The potency of envisioning the past as national arises, of course, from the galvanic political force of modern nations; it reflects, more generally, the nationally politicized nature of history writing in the last century-and-a-half.[3] But what, we should be inquiring, were the narratives created in pre-modern times before the nation became highly politicized? What were the politics that shaped their narratives of history? The range of possibilities is great because of the compartmentalized or feudal nature of politics that was common on the islands at the time.

Many Edo-period philosophers understood their governmental system to be one involving a high degree of "*hōken*" or "enclosed political space" made by enfeoffment or delegation of authority.[4] This was a key notion in a debate over the virtues of bureaucratic vs. hereditarily disbursed realms of rule that originated in Chinese historiography. Because the notion includes what today might be called private ownership of public authority, the term *hōken* was later used to translate the Western notion of feudalism. This *hōken* style of compartmentalized political spaces was able to generate and protect political and historical narratives within these lesser polities that did not well agree with the visions of superior authorities. What from a Japanese national perspective appear to be contradictions in the various "story lines" of different authorities were acceptable as long as they were deployed in local spheres of competence, because they reflected the acceptable and actual nature of the political order. People enacted politics with a keen awareness of whether interaction was happening within a compartment of authority or across compartments of authority. The truth that functioned inside such a compartment, called *naijitsu* when in conscious reference to the difference with the outward face, was often dissimilar to the truth that functioned at the *omote* or ritual interface that governed interactions between such political compartments. Thus it is important to analyze not only key political terms and the way in which they were used, but also the unspoken frames of reference within which the terms took on meaning. Importantly, the frame was often not unitary "Japan." Rather it was multiple—including lesser political spaces such as daimyo households and realms. For example *kōgi* was used not only to name the Tokugawa government but also used in separate contexts to name various daimyo governments as well.[5] A samurai of the Yamauchi clan of Tosa domain frequently meant Yamauchi rule when he said *kōgi*, but if he were an official of his lord engaged in interactions in (or with) Edo, he would be constrained to apply the term *kōgi* only to Tokugawa overlord authority.[6] Indeed, because governments were often conceived as being embodied in their leaders, *kōgi* (sometimes *okōgisama*) at times refers to the ruling person himself in his capacity as authority. The only way to tell which is meant in the Edo context is by finding who was speaking to whom. Significant frames of reference usually become clear in terms of who was subservient to whom. The same kind of layering happened for many terms, such as *kokka*, *tono*, and *ōyake*, among others. For example, in the *Hagakure*, Yamamoto Tsunetomo (1659–1719), a samurai from Saga domain, uses *kokka* to mean the domain or the lord's family, *kokugaku* to mean study of the domain, *kokushu* to identify the lord of the domain, and *kokusei* to mean domain government, because it was addressed to fellow Saga samurai.[7]

The focus of this essay is on certain important aspects of Edo-period writing about the past, rather than on the rhetoric accompanying Edo-period political practice.[8] There was not a one-to-one parity between the rhetoric of actual political affairs and the discourses of historical writing that describe what happened, but the existence of layered spheres or compartments of political discourse did have a strong influence on writing about history. Thus it is important in analyzing Edo-period histories not merely to cast a critical eye on compositions produced with a view to presentation to the imperial house—often expressed in Mitogaku terms—and other works created for presentation to the Tokugawa, but also to look closely at compositions created for heads of *hōken* compartment authority. In my analysis here, I will make both supportive and critical reference to Watanabe's assertion of the central role played by the Mito school in creating the terms of relationship that have been

adopted by the vast majority of writers since the Meiji Restoration to describe the Edo-period polity. After introducing the terminology and political assumptions of Mito's *Dai Nihon shi*, I analyze similar issues in two histories commissioned by the ruling Tokugawa clan, *Honchō tsugan* and *Tokugawa jikki*. I will also compare those to two histories written by and for the daimyo polity of the Yamauchi clan of Tosa, "Gotōke nendai ryakki" and "Hanshi naihen." I conclude with a brief discussion of a Tosa history written for the early Meiji court, "Tosa hansei roku."

Politicizing the *Tennō* Suffix

One of Watanabe's main goals is to decenter the emperor in modern discourse on early modern history. To reflect what he regards as actual Edo-period consciousness, he assigns to the emperor a lower status relative to the Tokugawa than do most other histories written in the last two centuries. He chooses to call the emperor *tenshi* rather than *tennō* because, in fact, *tenshi* was the common Edo-period form of naming the emperor. Watanabe further notes that the granting of the posthumous title *tennō* to the heads of the imperial line had ended much earlier in Japanese history, and this practice was only revived at the death of the strong-willed emperor Kōkaku (1771–1840). He therefore chooses to affix the postposition *-in*, rather than *-tennō*, to the names of earlier Edo-period emperors. His usage accords with contemporary practice, and he attributes the origins of modern practice to the emperor-centered discourse of which Mito scholars were the foremost proponents.[9]

Watanabe bases some of his claims on the research of Fujita Satoru (b. 1946), who examined the circumstances of the posthumous naming of emperor Kōkaku.[10] At Kōkaku's death, the court made a special request to the Tokugawa for permission to give the deceased emperor an honorific posthumous name with the suffix *tennō*. The ostensible grounds for this appeal were that Kōkaku was particularly great. Clearly, however, the court's plea was a move to increase the authority of Kyoto vis-à-vis the Tokugawa, the last gambit from the grave of an emperor who had spent most of his reign trying to augment court power. It was Kōkaku who much earlier, in 1789, tried to get for his father, a prince who never actually reigned, the title of retired emperor (*daijō tennō*). This attempt was unsuccessful due to the resistance of the Tokugawa chief councilor Matsudaira Sadanobu (1758–1829). Ultimately this incident, known as the *songō jiken*, was a key factor in forcing Sadanobu's early retirement from office.[11] Although Kōkaku did not have the power to attain his objective in 1789, perhaps the difficulties caused by the incident led the Tokugawa government, which at any rate in 1840 was facing numerous other serious problems, to be more compliant on Kōkaku's death. Thus the Tokugawa granted the request for what they thought would be a single occasion revival of the *-tennō* suffix for Kōkaku. The incident was significant enough to be greeted with surprise by many people in Japan; a few went so far as to write graffiti making fun of the problems caused by this break with tradition.[12] For over half a millennium, the postfix *-in* had been attached to the names of deceased emperors, and this had been accepted as sufficient. Warriors commonly received the same suffix for their posthumous names, and many well-off commoners as well. That something changed with the honorific naming of Kōkaku after his demise was not lost on contemporaries.[13]

There are some differences in the claims concerning when and how the posthumous *tennō* title had lapsed, however, and a thorough investigation reveals some important issues

in Edo-period historiography and the nature of the "revival" itself. Watanabe states that the last emperor to receive the title *tennō* was Juntoku (1197–1242). Fujita states that the last emperor to have this title to his name was Murakami (926–67), and that the last to have been granted an honorific Sinitic posthumous name plus the title *tennō* was emperor Kōkō (830–887).[14] The 1840 naming of Kōkaku was certainly a politicized historical moment which gave ideological power to the use of the term *tennō* during what we know were years of decline for the Tokugawa. For us today, the question is this: was the meaning of the term at the time of its revival the same as it had been hundreds of years earlier, when it fell out of use? And how did historians in the pre-modern and Edo periods treat the issue of naming before Kōkaku?

The fact that two historians (Watanabe and Fujita) offer three different reigns as the significant moment of abandonment hints at the complexity of the issues involved. The supposed demise of the practice of according the title *tennō* turns out to be more about memories constructed in subsequent eras than about what we can know actually happened in the Heian and Kamakura past. The problem revolves around use of the word *tennō* itself as both a posthumous name suffix and a general term identifying the ruler. Also critical are usages of the posthumous names called *shigō* and *tsuigō*. *Shigō* are posthumous names that describe some aspect of the greatness of the emperor. They exist in both Japanese and Chinese for most emperors up to the early Heian period. Gradually, however, the Chinese names (called *kanfū shigō*) came to be regarded as standard. The court stopped creating new Japanese names, and in the eighth century replaced the Japanese names of early emperors with newly created Chinese ones.[15] *Tsuigō* are names based on place names important to that emperor, usually a grave site (such as emperor Murakami) or a retirement villa (such as emperor Suzaku, 923–952) or, occasionally, sadly enough, even a location of banishment. Convention in the Heian and Kamakura eras did not require *shigō* and *tsuigō* to be followed, respectively, by *-tennō* or *–in*. It is easy to find examples of people commonly fixing the honorific *-in* to *shigō* names of some emperors, and *-tennō* to *tsuigō* names of other emperors. It is even easy to find examples of the same emperor being named with both suffixes, such as Reizei-*in-tennō*. It is not clear that a postpositional honorific was always a formally declared element at the times Watanabe and Fujita have proposed as the moments when the established method of posthumous naming changed, and the use of one or the other—*-in* or *-tennō*—seems not to have been a highly politicized issue.[16] But it is clear that court people continued to call the reigning emperor *tennō* along with a number of other appellations such as *kōtei*, *mikado*, or *tenshi*. Vis-à-vis other terms, the choice of *tennō* either as an appellation for the person holding the position or as a suffix seems not to have been an important issue. In short the use of *tennō* was not so potent that its gradual decline in popular usage meant much until later eras, when its demise was used to energize the issue of "revival."

Both Watanabe and Fujita base their claims on popular print literature of the Edo period. Watanabe follows a household encyclopedia, the *Dai Nihon eitai setsuyō mujinzō*, in arguing that Juntoku was the last emperor called *tennō* until the time of Kōkaku.[17] Initially, I accepted Watanabe's claim and speculated that the subsequent demise of *shigō* might have been related to Juntoku's defeat in civil war and the subsequent ascendancy of warrior political power, but in investigations over several years I have found no evidence that Juntoku was given a *-tennō* suffix.[18] The two retired emperors Go-Toba (1180–1239) and Juntoku were banished to Oki and Sado islands respectively by the Kamakura government following their

defeat in the Jōkyū war of 1221, and Emperor Chūkyō (1218–1234) was forced to abdicate and not officially become a "retired emperor." Chūkyō, only four years old, had been in office for less than three months and had not yet carried out ritual ascendance (*sokuirei*) or the inaugural autumn festival (*daijōsai*), two events that confirmed the emperor's position. Although Chūkyō is a Sinitic posthumous name, this appellation was not granted until many centuries later. From the time he died in 1234 until 1871, when another boy-emperor conferred the honorific name, he was referred to variously as Hantei (half emperor), Go-haitei (the latter abolished emperor), or Kujōhaitei (the abolished emperor of the Kujō residence), in reference to his ambiguous status. When Go-Toba died in 1239, he was initially referred to as Oki-*hōō* or Oki-*in* in reference to his enforced place of retirement; later he was given the Sinitic posthumous name of Kentoku-*in*.[19] This *shigō* did not mean that the proper postposition was therefore -*tennō*. In his diary, Go-Toba's former servant Taira no Tsunetaka (1180–1255) refers to him as Kentoku-*in*.[20] Then in 1242 the emperor ordered that Kentoku-*in*'s name be changed to Go-Toba, alluding to his favorite retirement palace from the time before his banishment. This was an attempt to placate the former emperor's spirit (*onryō*), which was thought to be angry over his banishment, and in the following year Go-Toba was even posthumously absolved of his crimes.[21] It can be inferred from this attempt at spiritual pacification that the Sinitic posthumous name was not thought to be necessarily higher in honor or more agreeable than a *tsuigō* based on residence. Juntoku died in 1242, shortly after his father's name had been changed to Go-Toba, and initially he was called Sado-*in* in reference to the island of his banishment and final residence. It was not until seven years later that his posthumous name was changed to Juntoku-*in*.[22] Did this designation -*in* mean that the emperors were therefore not identified as *tennō*, as Watanabe asserts? Not so. In 1245 and 1246, the regent Konoe Kanetsune (1210–1259) referred in his diary to the then-current emperor, Go-Saga (1220–1272), as *tennō*.[23] The usage of *tennō* as an identifier of office was unrelated to posthumous suffixes.

In advancing an argument similar to Watanabe's about the disappearance of the *tennō* title, Fujita does not link it to *shigō*, but moves the time of change to the early Heian period. His understanding represents another view held in the Edo period, namely that the lapse in the title occurred subsequent to emperor Murakami, who was the last to receive the posthumous title. This view may have originated with Kitabatake Chikafusa (1293–1354), the author of the *Jinnō shōtōki*, completed in 1343. The medieval historian dealt with what he regarded as the shift to the -*in* suffix in the following way: lamenting that Reizei (950–1011, r. 967–969) had ordered that he not be called *tennō* after his death, Chikafusa called subsequent heads of that house by what he took to be their actual posthumous titles, which involved appending -*in* to a name denoting one of their places of residence, such as Reizei-*in* or Ichijō-*in*. Although Chikafusa says these sovereigns were given -*in* titles after death, he continues to refer to the office that they held as *tennō*. Calling the position *tennō* (along with *tenshi*, *mikado*, and a host of other names) was in accord with actual practice within the court, where certainly the position was often referred to as *kō* or *tei* as well as *tennō* and where retired emperors were regularly called *daijōtennō* or *jōkō* for short. Chikafusa writes of Reizei: "From the time of this *mikado*, use of the title *tennō* was discontinued. Bestowal of the honorific posthumous name (*shigō*) had already ceased at the time of Uda-*tennō*. Reizei's will said that the anniversary of his death should not be celebrated, and also that no mausoleum should

be built for him. He did this out of consideration for the people and to do things without luxury, and this was thoughtful, but to dispense with the honorific title makes it impossible for subjects and children to do their righteous duty. The imperial Sinitic posthumous names for sovereigns from the time of Jinmu-*tennō* on were picked in later ages. Beginning with Jitō and Genmei, *tennō* honorific titles were given to each sovereign after he retired or entered holy orders. Indeed, they should all be called *tennō*. The decision to abandon the *tennō* title was made by wise men of the middle age, but I absolutely cannot agree."[24]

For Kitabatake Chikafusa the issue of naming was politically consequential, as it framed the rituals of relations between ruler and ruled. He was seriously concerned—this was the time of the civil war between the Southern and Northern imperial courts—that lack of duty on the part of subjects was leading to disorder. Yet there are a number of problems with Chikafusa's argument as historical fact. One is that Reizei himself did have an imperial grave and seems to have left no wishes otherwise.[25] Three emperors who reigned after Reizei predeceased him, and Chikafusa himself identifies them with the *-in* suffix; En'yū (959–991, r. 969–984), Kazan (968–1008, r. 984–986) and Ichijō (980–1011, r. 986–1011).[26] To other earlier emperors Chikafusa affixes the postposition *tennō*, such as Yōzei (868–949) and Suzaku, who were also called *-in* by tenth-century high-ranking court people.[27] Also the order for no burial mound and no anniversaries of national mourning, if given by Reizei (and no evidence survives), would not have been new. More than a century earlier, emperor Junna (786–840) clearly did issue such an order. Junna also ordered that no imperial grave (*misasagi*) be created. Instead he had his body cremated and his ashes scattered on a mountaintop in Ōharano to the west of Kyoto. Finally, he ordered that there be no period of national mourning. All three of these wishes were respected. Emperor Saga (786–842), who died two years later, issued similar orders for the occasion of his own death.[28] Indeed, the brother emperors Heizei (774–824), Junna, and Saga did not have Sinitic posthumous appellations, but instead derived names from their places of retirement, albeit that there is no evidence that they were called *-in*. It seems possible that Chikafusa mistakenly attributed Junna's orders to Reizei. At any rate, beginning with the city's very first emperor, Kanmu (737–806), the only Heian emperors to get *shigō* were those who died in office and had no chance to retire, or those who died in banishment. It should be made clear, however, that these various changes in posthumous treatment do not seem to have been integrally related to the issue of the *-tennō* suffix and seem to have had no effect on later memory.

It is unclear if Fujita's last "*tennō*," emperor Murakami, ever officially had *-tennō* attached to his name. He died in 967 while in office, soon after falling ill and accepting Buddhist orders. The documents recording his death and burial in the *Dai Nihon shiryō* are histories from later times (many of them based on records that have since been lost) but they are unclear on the issue. He was buried in a location called Murakami and he ordered that the national anniversaries of mourning not be observed.[29] The impression that the documents give is that he was called *sentei* (the previous emperor) or, following a common early Heian practice of naming emperors by the first era name of their reign, Tenryaku no mikado (the emperor of the Tenryaku era). Two aristocratic diaries from not long after his death, the *Gonki* and the *Shōuki*, frequently call him Murakami, with no honorific affix at all, or Murakami-*sentei*. The only reference to him as Murakami-*tennō* in the *Gonki* comes from a much later entry, from the year 1004.[30] It may be that the lack of a postpositional *-in* made people feel uncom-

fortable, and they may have added *-tennō* on their own initiative (but without official sanction)—to fill the space, so to speak—but this is just speculation. At any rate there is no record concerning posthumous naming for Murakami. *Nihon kiryaku*, a history compiled (probably in the late Heian period) largely by selecting from diaries and other records and covering events from the "age of the gods" through the reign of Ichijō, calls Murakami variously *sentei*, *senkō*, and Daigyō kōtei, but almost never Murakami-*tennō*.[31] Despite this, *Nihon kiryaku* may have played a key role in influencing usage of *-tennō* in subsequent historical works. Its chapter titles are emperor's names. Murakami's chapter is titled Murakami-*tennō*, and all previous emperors are also referred to as *tennō*, while all subsequent emperors, beginning with Reizei, are treated in chapters titled with their names followed by *-in*. Yet the change seems casually done. *Nihon kiryaku* gives no explanation for why these chapter titles were given, and presents no evidence within the text to point to a sudden shift in postfix selection at the time. Reizei is diversely known within the text as *sentei*, *senkō*, and notably Reizei-*in-tennō*.[32] There were a number of emperors before Murakami who came to be known in the Heian period by *tsuigō*, with *-in* suffixes, but all of them had lived long enough to retire. It seems that Kanmu and Murakami did not have *-in* added to their names because they died while in office and did not have retirement villas, and not because of the granting of a *-tennō* suffix per se.

The second of the "discontinuation moments" put forward by Fujita and the earliest in terms of time period may be somewhat accurate. Fujita claims that Kōkō was the last of the emperors to have been granted both a Sinitic posthumous name and the designation *-tennō*, although the source for this claim is unclear. It may be a deduction based on the fact that Kōkō is the last of the Sinitic names to appear before Murakami, the emperor whom Fujita names as the last to be called *-tennō*, although the suffix is attached to a place name. The *Nihon kiryaku* does have an entry in the text saying that Kōkō was given the title Kōkō-*tennō* after his demise, so we can say that this is the last for which we have a record.[33] It should also be noted that no direct reference to the moments of posthumous naming of emperors exists for many or most of the emperors of the ninth and tenth centuries. If the evidence of this late Heian history is accurate, then Kōkō would indeed be the last, as Fujita argues. However, it should be noted that Kōkō and his predecessors were also often known by the locations of their graves, or by the first era name of their reign as well, and as we have noted above for Reizei, subsequent emperors were on some occasions called by their names with *-tennō* immediately following. Which is to say that the discontinuation that may have happened during this era seems not to have been at that time regarded as a significant event at all, but merely one of many events occurring among numerous naming options.

The key point that emerges from all of these details is that in the Heian and Kamakura periods, attaching the title *-tennō* to a name did not have the significance attributed to it by some people in the Muromachi and Edo periods. It may not be possible to accurately pinpoint a moment when the addition of *-tennō* was discontinued by any policy. It was certainly not a simple change that occurred at one of the junctures defined by Kitabatake Chikafusa or the Edo print sources cited by Watanabe and Fujita. It is also certain that these supposed junctures were not universally accepted as such in medieval or later historiography. Below I will discuss a number of Edo-period histories, but to give one medieval example, the *Gukanshō* (circa 1219), written in the early Kamakura era by the monk Jien (1155–1225), does not remark on such a change and continues calling all sovereigns *-tennō*, without *-in* ap-

pearing in their names at all: for example, Reizei-*tennō* and Ichijō-*tennō*.[34]

What does this mean for Watanabe's claim that "In a certain sense *tennō*'s did not exist in Japan from the beginning of the thirteenth century through the eighteenth century," or for Fujita's similar assertion that "The naming of Kōkaku with a Sinitic posthumous name plus the *tennō* suffix was in reality the first time in 955 years"? In the simplest sense the former is incorrect and the latter, while it may be narrowly accurate, ignores the variety of naming used in the Heian period (including occasional actual use, if not formal granting, of the title -*tennō* as an element attached to names of later emperors) and also the overall lack of contemporary documents that afford insight into posthumous naming practices. Assignation of names and honorific forms of reference in this period was diverse and complex, and the use of the suffix had no bearing on the notion of emperor as *tennō*. The word *tennō* gradually declines in usage, but it does not disappear. Yet, Watanabe's and Fujita's claims make us aware of a consciousness that became very important in the Edo period. The issue of the "discontinuance" of the title *tennō* is more accurately to be seen as arising from the rhetoric of Edo-period politics, as coming out of arguments about the position of the emperor. Following the Muromachi-era lead of Kitabatake Chikafusa, they made attachment of -*tennō* to names an issue symbolic of the proper hierarchy of loyalty in politics, which peaked in the linkage of late Edo era imperial loyalism and early Meiji era negation of the warrior *hōken* order. Watanabe sees the Mito school as playing a key role in developing the terminology of an emperor-centered view of Japan, which I shall explore next.

Mito's *Dai Nihon shi*

It is a curious thing that although *Dai Nihon shi* became influential from the early eighteenth century, it was not completed until long after the Edo period was over. Indeed the final published product represents two and a half centuries of writing and editing.[35] The project was begun in 1657 at the order of the lord of Mito domain, Tokugawa Mitsukuni (1628–1700), and achieved a complete draft status good enough to be presented to the Edo Tokugawa overlord in 1720. Although initially presented to the Tokugawa, *Dai Nihon shi* was written with all of the facts arranged around the imperial order, with an eye toward making the work formally presentable to the emperor, and a woodblock print edition was presented to the imperial court in 1851. From early on, it possessed the distinctive vision that it would impart to modern readers and writers.[36] But the history continued to go through revisions of interpretation and structure and consumed the energies of Mito historians until 1906. Portions of its eighteenth-century manuscript version nevertheless had significant influence on other historical writing in the Edo period. The *Dai Nihon shi sansō* (also known as *Dai Nihon shi ronsan*) was written by Asaka Tanpaku (1656–1737), one of the chief editor-compilers of the 1720 draft.[37] It was a commentary evaluating the actions of various people appearing in the main text of the history. Although removed from the official *Dai Nihon shi* by the Fujita Yūkoku (1773–1826) group in the early nineteenth century, *Dai Nihon shi sansō* circulated in manuscript from the eighteenth century and influenced such works as Rai San'yō's (1780–1832) tremendously popular *Nihon gaishi*, discussed elsewhere in this volume by Thomas Keirstead.[38]

The time period covered by *Dai Nihon shi* ranges from the historic origins of the dynasty through the end of the reign of Southern Court emperor Go-Kameyama (r. 1383–92), who

retired without heir in order to resolve the dynastic split that eighty years previously had created two competing imperial lines, the Northern Court and the Southern Court. The authors of *Dai Nihon shi* considered the Southern Court the more legitimate of the two lines, and the ending of this line's claims was significant enough to finish the history. The narrative thus does not continue on into the Edo period but rather ends with the demise of the Southern Court at the height of Ashikaga power. However, certain issues of political terminology and ideology have direct relevance to description of the Edo period. This is primarily in the way it deals with the relations between what we now commonly term the *shōgun* and the emperor, but also in the issue of how to name the emperors themselves.

As seen in *Dai Nihon shi sansō*, the Mito school called all of the heads of the imperial line *tennō*, such as Reizei-*tennō*.[39] Insofar as this ignores the commonly used *-in* suffix of many Heian, Kamakura, and Muromachi emperors, this can be seen as confirming Watanabe's assertion of its particular vision of an emperor-centered Japan. The general appellations used in *Dai Nihon shi sansō* for the Kyoto rulers include *-tei* (also read *mikado*) (pp. 98–99), *tenshi* (son of heaven, p. 173) and, in compound words, *ō* (king, pp. 173, 211). The Kyoto court is always the *chōtei*, never a reference to the court of the Minamoto or the Ashikaga, even though, as Watanabe points out, calling the Tokugawa court a *chōtei* did happen in Edo-period discourse at least occasionally. Likewise in *Dai Nihon shi sansō* the Minamoto and Ashikaga are referred to as *shōgun* and their government is occasionally referred to as *bakufu* (pp. 177, 178), *fu* (p. 185), or *gunsei* (military government p. 196). Lords are referred to as *shō* (general, pp. 186–213) or *kashin* (retainer). Thus, with the exception of *han*, the basic terms appear generally as they do in most post-Meiji Restoration work on Japanese history, even though some terms and titles were not used as such in politics during the times described. Even *han* appears briefly. In modern writing about history, *han* is only applied to Tokugawa-era domains; the term would not at any rate have been used in *Dai Nihon shi*, which ends its story in the fourteenth century. However, there is one location in a later version of *Dai Nihon shi* that does refer to the daimyo of the Edo period. It has a preface written by the Mito domain lord in 1810 wherein he refers to his position of daimyo as *hanpei*, a word that literally means "bulwarks" and is a classical allusion to the daimyo's role as protector of the Tokugawa overlord.[40] Such usage of the word *han* to mean the person of the daimyo had begun to appear sporadically in histories from the time of Ogyū Sorai (1666–1728) and Arai Hakuseki (1657–1725) in the early eighteenth century.[41] Allowing for a subsequent shift in the meaning of *han* from daimyo to domainal government or the domain itself, Watanabe is correct in pointing out that Mitogaku historiographic discourse is reflected in modern writing. As seen with the example of Jien's *Gukanshō*, and as we shall see *Honchō tsugan*, it might be wrong to overemphasize the singularity of *Dai Nihon shi* in using the *-tennō* suffix, but there were significant alternatives available for Edo-period historians.

Edo-Period Histories Presented to the Tokugawa Rulers

Two histories commissioned by the ruling Tokugawa house are the seventeenth-century *Honchō tsugan* and the nineteenth-century *Tokugawa jikki*. Written for the most part by scholars of the Hayashi school, these were official histories, designed for the edification of and use by the Tokugawa overlords. *Honchō tsugan* covers the history of Japan from the imperial origins up to 1611, and so allows easy comparison with *Dai Nihon shi*. Because it

continues into the early seventeenth century it also allows comparison with the *Tokugawa jikki*, which covers the history of the Tokugawa house from Ieyasu's origins to 1786, and exploration of the ways in which it described the Edo-period polity. That both were written for presentation to the warrior hegemon, and not the Kyoto court, affected their terminology in interesting ways, reflecting the feudal nature of politics. Although they record clearly that the Tokugawa recognized the sovereignty of the imperial court and were incorporated into its hierarchy, these histories nevertheless also portray the Tokugawa in ways that make them equal or in certain respects superior to that court, and also reveal sources of ruling authority separate from those derived by integration into imperial authority. These were elements that they could not present directly to the court in a public fashion. In this respect they clearly differ from *Dai Nihon shi*.

Completed in 1670 under the leadership of the clan that served as the chief scholars of the Tokugawa house, *Honchō tsugan* was the final product of a project begun by Hayashi Razan (1583–1657) in the 1640s, carried on by his son Gahō (1618–1680), and finished by his grandson Hōkō (1644–1732).[42] Gahō's workplace was designated the Kokushikan, reflecting the Hayashi family's ambitions for their project to produce an authoritative history of the country of Japan from the "first human" emperor Jinmu up through emperor Go-Yōzei (1571–1617), whose reign ended in 1611. The organization of the book into chapters named by each successive emperor reveals that the country the Hayashi had in mind centered on the imperial dynasty. A glance at the terminology regarding the emperor and his or her court in *Honchō tsugan* shows that the writers were in basic agreement with subsequent Mito-school work and modern histories. *Honchō tsugan* was presented to the Tokugawa and was not made public during the Edo period, yet copies of portions and redactions were available to the historians of Mito.

One important similarity with *Dai Nihon shi* is that *tennō*, not *-in*, is used for all emperors. As Watanabe points out, a substantial amount of writing in the Edo period refers to these sovereigns as *tenshi*, *tōgin*, *kinrisama*, and the like, yet on this vital point *Honchō tsugan* is like both the earlier work of Jien and the later usage of Mitogaku scholars. Similarly, the use of the term *chōtei* in *Honchō tsugan* consistently refers to the Kyoto court and not the Tokugawa court, despite the fact that, as Watanabe points out, quite a few scholars of the Edo period did refer to the Tokugawa court as the *chōtei*. What I wish to stress here, with reference to Watanabe's argument, is that the emperor-centered terminology functioning as a historiographic discourse is not necessarily just the product of Mitogaku scholarship. Rather it has much broader and older roots; Mitogaku scholarship nourished those roots and amplified and shaped the branches that grew out of them. Watanabe's decision to eschew the terms *tennō* and *chōtei* and utilize instead *tenshi* and *kinri* is certainly a legitimate choice, reflecting what was probably the most common usage in the Edo period, and it suggests to us a profitable new way of understanding. However, we should also realize that he is rejecting a deeply rooted strand of historiography on these points, a strand that was strong within Tokugawa circles and that Mito scholarship played a part in expanding.

Yet *Honchō tsugan* significantly differed from *Dai Nihon shi*. Many aspects of *Honchō tsugan* clearly did not please Mito scholars, who criticized it and its Hayashi school authors for forms of disrespect to the imperial clan. One area of difference concerned the relative status of the emperor and the Tokugawa ruler. Although *Dai Nihon shi* did not treat the Tokugawa

period itself, in the preface he wrote in 1810 for presentation to the imperial house, the ruler of Mito, Tokugawa Harutoshi (1773–1816), refers to the Tokugawa as the *daishōgun no ie*. Harutoshi did not leave any honorific open spaces before *daishōgun no ie*, but refered to the Tokugawa chiefs in a manner identical to the way that *Dai Nihon shi* treated the Minamoto and Ashikaga houses in the text. In this way the Tokugawa clan is not made holy within *Dai Nihon shi*, while the emperor clearly is.[43] *Honchō tsugan* had no open spaces before either emperors' names or the names of members of the previous military dynasties such as the Minamoto or the Ashikaga. However, a look at the sections of *Honchō tsugan* that deal with the period from Tokugawa Ieyasu's (1543–1616) birth on to 1611, clearly indicates greater reverence for the Tokugawa than for the imperial clan or other warrior clans. The sections dealing with the Tokugawa period appear in the *Honchō tsugan teiyō* portion of the work. The difference is most obvious in the use of honorific open spaces before the names of the first three Tokugawa rulers where they appear in the text, and the concomitant lack of such open spaces before imperial names.[44] Furthermore, Ieyasu is referred to as Jinkun (divine lord) or Daijinkun (great divine lord), deriving from his deification at Nikkō; this emphasizes his holy status within the historical narrative. A comparison of heirs to the Tokugawa and heirs to the imperial house also reveals the superior position of the Tokugawa. Imperial princes are referred to with their names and the suffix *shin'nō*, whereas the Tokugawa heirs are referred to only by their posthumous holy names—Hidetada (1579–1632) as Daitokukun, and Iemitsu (1604–1651) as Daiyū'inden. This is a sign of *Honchō tsugan teiyō*'s according higher respect or holiness to the Tokugawa. When we consider the meaning of this, it is important for us to remember that the intended audience of this history, the Tokugawa clan, held a tremendously powerful political space within the imperial order, to the point that the Tokugawa could largely control the imperial house as it wished. The Tokugawa political space was also a discursive space, and within it a different order could obtain to a large degree. In historical writing, a discourse emphasizing the holiness and centrality of the Tokugawa could exist alongside recognition of the formal superiority of the emperor overlord. This pattern had an exact parallel in the relationship between daimyo and the Tokugawa. However, it was fundamentally unacceptable to the emperor-centered Mito scholarship, which clearly subordinated the status of the warriors to that of the Kyoto aristocracy.

With regard to the Kamakura and Muromachi governments, the *Honchō tsugan* terminology for the military government and the position of its leader is quite similar to *Dai Nihon shi*.[45] Curiously this changes with regard to the Tokugawa era. For example, *Honchō tsugan* does not use the term *bakufu*, nor does it place particular emphasis on the term or rank of *shōgun*. In this sense it is distinct from Mitogaku writing and most writing about Japanese history since the nineteenth century, a trait that can be cited in support of Watanabe's claim that use of the term *bakufu* does not represent ruling Tokugawa preference.[46] However, *Honchō tsugan* does not employ the prevailing political terms of the day, *kubō* or *kōgi*, either. It is a mirror of Tokugawa-approved historiography, and not a mirror of contemporary practice. On the one hand, as we have seen, *Honchō tsugan* identifies the authority of the Tokugawa through a form of divine naming independent of Kyoto authority. Yet this aspect is not the whole story. On the other hand the *Honchō tsugan* narrative represents the military rulers as holding authority by virtue of their appointment to posts of minister of state by the emperor, and in this sense reveals a significant emperor-centered dimension. When Ieyasu is not called

"divine lord" he is referred to as *naifu* (also read *daifu*, for the time when he was *naidaijin*) or *ufu* (after his promotion to *udaijin*). It is worthy of note that the advancement of Ieyasu to *udaijin* in 1603 is an important event in the narrative, and the clause "to which was augmented appointment to *seii tai-shōgun*" is added on after the report of his promotion.[47] The importance of the various imperial court ranks reveal that, in the historical vision of *Honchō tsugan*, Tokugawa rule operates largely within the framework of imperial rule, but broadly and not with a particular emphasis on the post of *shōgun*. Perhaps because the military rank of *shōgun* was not particularly important as a marker of leadership (at least it was not *the* indispensable marker), *bakufu*, a notion of a type of appointed government specially associated with that rank, did not strike the Hayashi school authors of *Honchō tsugan* as an appropriate notion for Tokugawa rule. One senses in this subtle pattern of differentiation from the Minamoto and Ashikaga houses that usage of *bakufu* and *shōgun* might have been regarded as somehow diminishing, as missing the full dimensions of Tokugawa rule. Yet the treatment of the Minamoto and Ashikaga internalizes a historical discourse that predates but is essentially similar to that found in *Dai Nihon shi*. Does this call into question Watanabe's claim of the centrality of Mito scholarship in forming this vision? It is difficult to say. Watanabe's argument concerns the Tokugawa period, and the different treatment that *Honchō tsugan* accords to the Tokugawa period could be said to fit his argument.

The idea of military houses and rule was important in this history. Hayashi Gahō set down this moralizing generalization in the final lines of the section dealing with "imperial fortunes": "The imperial court depends upon the military houses and so is all the more revered. The military houses look up to the imperial house and they increasingly flourish."[48] So far as it goes, this view is consistent with the Mitogaku ideal, but the integration of the imperial order and the military order is subtler and more multifaceted than a simple court-*bakufu* dichotomy. What the imperial house contributes to warrior authority is integration into the imperial hierarchy by making high-ranking warriors into nominal aristocrats and ministers of imperial government.

Military government itself was built upon the authority of warriors themselves and had its own traditions of legitimation separate from imperial authority.[49] When *Honchō tsugan* does name the government of the military rulers subsequent to the collapse of the Ashikaga, it refers to it as a *kokka*, a word that could mean state or ruling household. One instance records Ieyasu's appointment to the council of five regents at Hideyoshi's (1536–98) deathbed to help with *gunkoku no sei* or the governance of the military country and dealing with *kokka daiji* or important matters of the government.[50] A later appearance of the term also confirms *Honchō tsugan*'s vision of the limited role of the post of *shōgun* in authorizing control of Tokugawa governance. Not long after retiring from the post of *shōgun* and having it given to his son Hidetada, *Honchō tsugan* confirms that Ieyasu did not see his giving up the title as retirement from governance, saying: "Although the Divine Lord surrendered the office of general over the military to Taitoku-*kō*, he continued to decide important matters of the *kokka* from Sunpu."[51] In this sense it seems that *Honchō tsugan* regarded the post of *shōgun* to be an important one of Tokugawa generalship, but the post was not presented as essential to the authority to rule the country. Here one can see, in accord with Watanabe's assertion, that Mitogaku usage of *bakufu* and *shōgun* do not reflect the Tokugawa image of itself as represented in this seventeenth-century history. The same point holds true, although not as

strongly, for the nineteenth-century *Tokugawa jikki* as well.

The *Ojikki*, now known as the *Tokugawa jikki* (which I will hereafter shorten to *Jikki*), was commissioned by the Tokugawa in the early nineteenth century (comp. 1809–1849) at the request of Hayashi Jussai (1768–1841). It is the most complete of the Tokugawa-sponsored histories and is a remarkable resource. It is different in character from *Honchō tsugan* in a number of important ways. The first thing to note is that the *Jikki* is a dynastic house history rather than a history of Japan at that time. A reading of the preface shows that the authors certainly saw the Tokugawa as a dynasty and a court (*chō*) worthy of treatment along the lines of Chinese imperial lineages, albeit their Tokugawa dynasty coexisted with a Japanese imperial dynasty (*kōchō*).[52] Reflecting this choice to center the household, the volumes of the *Jikki* are organized around Tokugawa reigns rather than imperial reigns. House history was perhaps the natural choice to reflect the mature political vision of the Tokugawa. Dynastic house histories were one of the most common forms of history writing amongst samurai because politics was largely organized metaphorically along the dimensions of a household. This means that in the politics of the day events of a family history, births, deaths, marriages, and the like took on a governmental or political aspect. For example, the death of the mother of Tokugawa Ietsugu (1709–1716) in 1752, occasioned a ten-day mourning period in which no music could be played, all daimyo in Edo had to report to their assigned rooms in the Tokugawa castle, and those not able to be present were required to send messengers.[53] Well recorded in the *Jikki* are the names of which parties contributed what presents, who sent messengers of congratulation or condolence, and similar details about such events; listings of participation by those with right of audience and similar minutiae can be tedious to modern readers whose notions of government are different, but they are a precious resource on the structure of subordination necessary to Tokugawa hegemony.

Names and terms that refer to the office of the Tokugawa hegemon are uncommon in the *Jikki*, but when they appear they suggest that in this framework of understanding the Kyoto emperor is clearly superior in rank and lord over the Tokugawa, but Tokugawa ruling authority does not wholly derive from his appointment as *shōgun*.[54] On occasions when the role of the Tokugawa hegemon is specified, it is primarily designated as "*kō*" (ruler). Receiving the rank of *shōgun* has more importance in *Jikki* than it did in *Honchō tsugan*. It is an event necessitating the beginning of a new chapter, and the history details the week of extensive rituals, but nevertheless it is not a decisive event in the acquisition of ruling authority. For example, Tokugawa Ienobu (1662–1712) ordered that he be referred to as *uesama* (ruler; this can also be read *kamisama*) from three days after the burial of Tsunayoshi (1646–1709), but well before his appointment to the rank of *shōgun*. This is based on his patrimonial authority as head of the Tokugawa clan. The head of the Kyoto court is referred to as *shujō* and *kintei* which clearly defines him as the ruler above the Tokugawa. Furthermore, the *kuge kanpaku*, or aristocratic regents, have *-kō* attached to their names when they appear, equivalent to the head of the Tokugawa himself.[55] In this way the titles indicate an acceptance of the Kyoto court's formal superiority and provide a framework of understanding that links all Japan at that time under Kyoto authority with the head of the Tokugawa above all princes and nobility except the *kuge kanpaku* with whom he is an equal and the Kyoto emperor with whom he is usually inferior. In this sense one may say that an imperial dynasty ruling Japan and to which the Tokugawa was subordinate is highly visible in the *Jikki*, and is at odds with Watanabe's

interpretation based more on actual practice in Tokugawa controlled discourse. One can say that the historiographic discourse of the *Jikki* reveals more subordination than the vocabulary actually used in the politics of the day, terms such as *kubō* to identify the Tokugawa ruler's position and *kōgi* to identify his government. Watanabe's choice appears thus not to be a rejection of the historiography of Mito in favor of that of the Tokugawa, but rather an argument for respecting the language actually used within the Tokugawa sphere of competence.

Despite the above evidence based on office and rank, the relative status of the emperor and the Tokugawa ruler as expressed by patterns of naming and verb usage seems to indicate equality rather than subordination. On the one hand, the fact that no family name is used when referring to the ruling Tokugawa puts them and the imperial clan on equal footing in this regard. The emperor is referred to by the posthumous title but with the suffix *-in*, which seems to be a step below or at least less grandiose than the Tokugawa's *inden*.[56] Yet the verbs that indicate social relationship are those used for an equal. A gift from the Tokugawa to the head of the Kyoto court is done with the verb *susumeru*, which implies polite equality on the part of the Tokugawa. Imperial princes are a step below the Tokugawa, referred to by name and honorific postfix *shin'nō*, which form is at a level comparable to the daughters of the Tokugawa who are referred to by name and *hime* or princess. With regard to the princes, the verbs used, such as *fusetamau* (when the Tokugawa give gifts to them) and *kenzu* (when they give to the Tokugawa), clearly indicate their relative status inferiority.[57] This kind of language is clearly not seen in *Dai Nihon shi* which is at pains to stress the superiority of the imperial house.

The forms of naming of characters in the history reveal messages about status and loyalty throughout the Tokugawa order. The ambiguities of the relationship with the emperor aside, customary naming in the *Jikki* seems to put the Tokugawa clan above all others and with an aura of holiness. The heads of the Tokugawa house and their wives and mothers are referred to without family name and with their posthumous names and *-inden*. Less frequently the head of the Tokugawa house will be referred to by his formal personal name followed by *kō* ("my lord"). However, the heads of the three Tokugawa collateral houses are distinguished from all other such retainers. Instead of family name they are denoted by their fief name (Owari, Mito and Kii) court rank (all *chūnagon*) and then the honorific *kyō*, indicating high advisory rank in the Kyoto court. In this way the narrative accepts and is integrated into the imperial order at the higher levels of the Tokugawa order. Daimyo and other retainers with right of audience are referred to by office in the Tokugawa government (if they have any), then family name, court rank, and formal personal name (*jitsumei*), which indicates a lower level of respect. There is no clear distinction between *hatamoto* and daimyo in this form of naming, but daimyo are commonly called *daimyō*, *ryōshu*, *jōshu*, *mangokuijō* ([holders of] more than 10,000 koku). Another dimension of the narrative of house organization in the *Jikki* is the Matsudaira family name applied to many daimyo. The Tokugawa employed a version of a common samurai practice of bestowing the clan name upon chief retainers, which the retainers then had to use in all formal dealings with the lord. The Tokugawa variant of this was that they bestowed the family name Matsudaira, by which they had been known until 1566, when Ieyasu created the Tokugawa name. Acceptance of the Matsudaira surname had the effect of suppressing independent daimyo clan identities in certain ritual interactions, and incorporating daimyo into the household while reminding them of their second-tier status. Many daimyo houses such

as the Ikeda, Shimazu, and Yamauchi used their original family names within their realms and households and their Matsudaira name in relations with the Tokugawa. They appear in the *Jikki*, however, only as Matsudaira. The lord's realm is called *shiryō* (personal income) and *shiryō* (personal territory), or *hō/fu* (fief) or *hōchi* (fiefland), which are ways of naming that deny the independently based authority of the lords over their realms. One might say that this is natural because they are all enfeoffed with these lands by the Tokugawa, which is quite true, but as we shall see, within their own discursive spaces lords had other sources of authority, and their realms themselves often had different appellations which reflect these separate discourses.[58] Just as the Tokugawa had their own historiographic space vis-à-vis the superior emperor, so also the daimyo had their space vis-à-vis the Tokugawa. In both cases these spaces were protected by real power and founts of authority separate from that gained by submission to the superior, and this was natural to the *hōken* order of things.

Edo-Period Histories Presented to a Domain Ruler

Much as histories written for the Tokugawa contain narratives that could not be formally presented to the emperor, histories written for a daimyo express distinctive political visions that could not without risk be shown formally to the Tokugawa. The historiographic discourses are recognizably separate from daily political discourse, but they still have much in common with the language used in domain politics and used in relations with the Tokugawa. Here I shall examine two official histories of the Yamauchi daimyo household which ruled the realm of Tosa, and briefly comment on a third history produced immediately after the abolition of the domain in 1871. The first of these histories was completed in the early nineteenth century, and the second was written just as the Tokugawa was collapsing and the new Meiji government was being created. These two alone reveal important shifts in terminology and political imagination as the old order disintegrated and a new order quickly replaced it. The third history written within a few years following 1871 reveals an essentially modern discourse of domainal history reflecting the end of a *hōken* or feudal domain perspective and the adoption of a unitary vision of an imperial Japan.

The "Gotōke nendai ryakki" (hereafter, "Nendai ryakki") was completed in 1812 by the domain scholar Miyaji Nakae (1767–1841). Copies were kept in the domain lord's house, the domain school, and in private hands; each holder continued making updates of the history as late as into the 1850s.[59] Like the *Jikki*, this history rather closely but not completely reflects actual terminological usage of the day. However the "Nendai ryakki" is distinctive because it incorporates political language used in a household protected by the feudal political order.

The "Nendai ryakki" treats the two external authorities, imperial and Tokugawa, with the terminology used at that time in the domain. The head of the Tokugawa house is generally called *kubō-sama*. This is different from usage in the *Jikki* noted above. The title *kubō* denotes his position of highest authority within the warrior order of things, rather than the direct affective relationship to the Tokugawa authority that the *Jikki* term *uesama* expresses. This is because domain loyalty goes to the Yamauchi lord and his family who mediate between the Tokugawa authority and domainal subjects. Usage of *kubō* does not place the Tokugawa within the imperial court hierarchy in the way that the *Jikki* frequently does with its terminology of court rank. That the primary title of Tokugawa authority is *kubō* and not

shōgun also reflects an important distance from Mito-style terminology.[60] Specific *kubō* are referred to by posthumous names followed by *-insama*, connoting a holiness arising from their overlordship. The "Nendai ryakki" does not use the term *bakufu* but calls the Edo government the *kōgi*; the Kyoto court is called *kinri*, and its palace *gosho*. Specific emperors are called by their posthumous names and *-insama*. Each of these reflect contemporary practice. With the exception of honorific naming practices, they are the terminology advocated by Watanabe—clearly different from usages in *Dai Nihon shi*.

Where the "Nendai ryakki" diverges from either an imperial or a Tokugawa vision is in the way that it centers and makes holy the daimyo clan itself. The Yamauchi lords and their wives and mothers are called by their posthumous names with *-insama* in a way identical to the naming of the imperial clan and the Tokugawa. Likewise Yamauchi daughters are called by their personal name with *-himesama*, which in the dimension of naming puts their ritual status on par with the Tokugawa daughters. Non-inheriting sons are identified by their childhood names and *-sama*. The "Nendai ryakki" uses no honorific open spaces at all for either lord, Tokugawa or emperor, and also uses no clan names for any of these. In these various ways, it effectively puts all on the same plane within its discourse, reflecting its character as a document for use within Tosa and the Yamauchi household.

The Yamauchi realm is treated differently as well, being called *oryōgoku* or *okuni* rather than *ryō* and the other common forms in the *Jikki*. The meaning within the Yamauchi discourse is that the realm is an entity of government rather than mere private property to be managed. The term for government in the text is *oseiji*, but *kōgi* is only used to mean the Tokugawa government. This is somewhat different from actual usage at the time, which often in internally directed discourse used *kōgi* to refer to domain governmental authority. The word *han* is not utilized at all, either to identify the domain lord, as seen in the preface of *Dai Nihon shi*, or the domain itself as has become common in modern historiography. Nor is it used to refer to other lords and domains. Other daimyo are noted as *daimyō* or with their family name, court rank (such as *Oki no kami*) and the honorific suffix *-sama*. This way of naming reveals respect but no relationship of fealty. *Hatamoto* are named in the same way but with the less honorific *-dono* suffix.

Naming of people within the realm reveals clear subordination to the Yamauchi house, and also with a graded hierarchy distinguishing status within the house. This is just as the *Jikki* deals with all non-imperial characters, but with the Yamauchi at the center of its own sphere. The ruling Yamauchi clan is not identified by family name, but rather by the absence of a family name. House elder status retainers (*karō*) are called by family name, "court title," and formal personal name, without any honorific suffix. "Court titles"—or imitation court titles—such as Wakasa and Mondo were not titles granted by either the imperial court or the Tokugawa court, and could not have been used publicly outside of the domain or in external historical discourses, but Yamauchi custom permitted the hereditary usage of such titles to certain senior clans in the realm as marks of status. Furthermore if the *karō* family had been granted use of the lord's family name, then "Yamauchi" was used in lieu of the original family name. For example the *karō* Inui Hikosaku (d. 1670) is called Yamauchi Hikosaku. This ritual incorporation into the ruling household parallels the use of the Matsudaira name in the *Jikki*, where, for example, the daimyo Yamauchi Toyoshige (1827–1872) is identified as Matsudaira Tosa no kami. Samurai retainers of lesser status than *karō* are called by their family name and

their *yobina* (common use name), marking a lower degree of respect than for the *karō* and in general terms are identified as *gokachū*/*shohōkōnin* or as *shoshi* (all samurai). Non-samurai are not mentioned by name at all. These patterns reflect the specific character of Yamauchi usage and in a general way are similar to all of the other histories discussed here in the intense status consciousness of the samurai world that is quite different from modern discourse.

The second Tosa history is what is today known as "Hanshi naihen." The Tokugawa authorities ordered the domain lord Yamauchi Yōdō (1827–1872) into enforced retirement in 1862, because of his role on the losing side of a Tokugawa inheritance dispute. From his retirement villa Yōdō ordered domain scholars to begin writing a new domain history. Actual work did not begin until 1866. Numerous volumes of the envisioned history were finished, mostly those pertaining to the seventeenth century, but all work on the project ceased in 1869 during the tumult of the Meiji Restoration and the history was never completed.[61] A key point in understanding the discourse of the history is that it was largely written after the collapse of Tokugawa authority but before the end of Yamauchi lordly authority and the end of the *hōken* order in 1871. Initially the work was entitled *Kokushi naihen* with reference to the domain as a "*koku*" (or "*kuni*") rather than as a "*han*," but the government reorganization of the Meiji Restoration in 1868 included changing the official term for domains to "*han*" in an attempt to promote unity under the emperor and to foster a Japan-as-country consciousness. This political change was reflected in the removal of "*koku*" and the insertion of "*han*" in the renaming of this history of the domain.[62] That this change occurred in mid-composition is seen for example in the near-final draft of the governmental history (*seitai enkaku*) volume devoted to the years 1700–1703. The outer cover and the inner cover have the title "Hanshi naihen" while the first page of the actual text begins with the title "*Okokushi naihen*."[63] In another rough draft volume the title on the first page has *Okokushi naihen* with a line neatly drawn through the *Okokushi* and to the right is inscribed in red "*Hanshi*."[64] The linguistically unsettled transitional period influenced a number of word choices in the "Hanshi naihen" that are not always internally consistent. Title change aside, within even the final version texts of the history the word "*han*" remains very rarely used and the Yamauchi realm remains predominantly a "*kuni*" (or "*koku*"). The common pronoun for the lord is *kō* and on occasion *kimi* (ruler) and government of the realm is called *okokusei*. The Yamauchi lords and immediate family are referred to without family name and with the posthumous *-in* names and the *-sama* suffix. Heads of branch houses are referred to by formal name or title with the *-sama* suffix and without family name. Beneath them are the chief retainers who are referred to by family name (for many of them the granted Yamauchi name), and hereditary title name or formal name. Regular retainers are referred to by family name and informal personal name. On the whole, descriptions of internal domainal realities are consistent with the "Nendai ryakki," incongruous with both Mito history and Tokugawa history, and reflect the *hōken* authority of the Yamauchi ruler.

Despite the similarities with the "Nendai ryakki" in terms of descriptions of internal realities, descriptions of the Tokugawa and imperial clan make it seem closer to the historical vision of Mito style of historiography as seen in the *Dai Nihon shi*. A "general guidelines" volume, probably written in 1866, describes the organization projected for the complete work that includes an external history (*gaihen*) component as well.[65] The *gaihen* section deals with important events in Japan that, although not directly connected with the domain, occurred

after 1600 when the Yamauchi clan entered into rule of Tosa. This organization situates the later event as the anchor of the political history of the whole project, and reflects the centrality of Yamauchi concerns to the history itself, but the terminology generally is congruent with the imperial vision and certainly reflects the ending of the Tokugawa order of things. The external history includes a projected section called the *Tenchō*, the imperial court, and reveals that the suffix for all emperors would be *-tennō*. Their history was to be treated simply, mainly with notice of succession, and there was also to be a record of appointments of officials to high ranks within the imperial court. This envisioned volume was never written, but the finished volumes of the *naihen* have occasional mention of the emperor and use the *-tennō* suffix even for seventeenth-century emperors who would in actuality have had *-in* attached to their names. The next section of the external history was called the *Bakufu*. Furthermore, in the surviving portions of the history itself, the Tokugawa government was called the *bakufu*. Frequently this government is written with the characters that would normally be read *hakufu* but in this case were probably intended to be read *bakufu* as well. There is no explanation of this word choice, which is not in the dictionaries and which I have not seen anywhere else. Perhaps the *haku* character was intended to connote the high rank of the Tokugawa within the imperial court. Thus, it may be subordinating the Tokugawa to imperial authority, but as a noble government rather than as a military government. At any rate, the use of both *bakufu* and *hakufu* in this work, and the fact that neither was used in the earlier "Nendai ryakki," suggests the relative novelty of this way of naming the Tokugawa—part of a newly accepted vision within the domain of political relations resulting from the Tokugawa collapse. Likewise, the Tokugawa overlord himself is frequently referred to as *shōgun* and as *shōgunke* rather than as the *kubō*, once again in line with Mito terminology. Thus it seems that this history written during and after the fall of the Tokugawa by a domain that played a key role in creating the new Meiji government was heavily influenced by Mitogaku.

For the first few years of its existence, the fledgling Meiji government chose not to do away with the *hōken* order and continued to have daimyo rule their realms. Attempts to decrease domainal independence by modifying this system failed and, fearing a resurgence of civil war, the new government in 1871 abolished domains and took away rule from the daimyo. At nearly the same time the imperial ministry ordered Tosa to write a history of the role the Yamauchi played in the Meiji Restoration from the arrival of Commodore Perry on. The product of this order was the "Tosa hansei roku," completed in the mid–1870s by a number of former Yamauchi retainers, some of whom had worked on the "Hanshi naihen."[66] "Tosa hansei roku" was completed within a few years of the abandonment of work on the "Hanshi naihen" project, yet regarding the Yamauchi clan, the domain, and the larger Tokugawa order, the discourses of the two works are worlds apart.

Only the emperor receives special respect. The lord of the domain as well as the Tokugawa are named by family name and formal name with no suffix. No open spaces appear before their names, and their actions are described with common verbs in plain form. It as if all of the magic or religious feeling that upheld the old order had dissolved. The new history had its own magic, one that suited Japan's imperial modernity: the Tokugawa government is called *bakufu*, the domain government is called *han*, and the imperial court is called *chōtei*—and only the last of these is preceded by an open space indicative of respect. The emperor is referred to by posthumous title plus *-tennō*, and also with an open space before each appear-

ance. The verbs for imperial actions are in plain form but the narrative uses polite vocabulary peculiar to the imperial station, such as *chokumei* for imperial order and *kuzusu* meaning to die, and these words are preceded by open spaces. The diction of history writing reflects that the new magic of an imperially ruled Japan exerted its power even in the lower spaces of rule such as Kōchi prefecture.

Conclusion

As evidenced in the changes that occurred over the period of composition of the three Tosa histories, Watanabe can be said to be correct in his assertion of the importance of an emperor-centered political vision in forming much of Meiji-era historiographical discourse. The vocabulary and rhetoric of imperial loyalism negated much of the ideology of the Tokugawa *hōken* order. However, we may suggest that, although Mito historical scholarship played an important role in this formulation, it did so because it resonated with and appropriated elements of other styles present in Japanese writing about history, before and during the Tokugawa era. These other elements defined a written cultural tradition that had ever greater influence thanks to the spread of print culture.[67]

Historiography in Japan and elsewhere has changed greatly since the late nineteenth century. It would be unacceptable, for example, in scholarly writing today to use open spaces before an emperor's name in order to express reverence. Yet in general prewar and postwar writing share a number of common elements that characterize them both as distinctly modern. As Watanabe points out, the basic terms that we use to describe government of the Edo period were in place by the start of Meiji, although they were not the terms actually used in day-to-day government; moreover these terms were not—for the most part—in the lexicon of historians whose work was sponsored by domain governments such as Tosa. Some might say that we have escaped the ideology of the Tokugawa period, which is certainly true, but one should not think that therefore modern historiography is objective and free of ideology. While markers of holiness have largely disappeared from modern scholarship, many writers continue to employ terms peculiar to the imperial station such as *chokumei* and *hōgyo* (the latter meaning "to die," used only of the emperor). The use of posthumous titles in modern Japanese historiography such as Meiji-*tennō* rather than Mutsuhito (1852–1912) is also a form of mystification, and this usage remains nearly ubiquitous. The emperor remains in some sense holy for his position and also for his role in symbolizing the nation state of Japan.

The *hōken* or compartmentalized nature of authority in the Edo period led to diverse historiographic discourses each representing different levels of politics, but today histories are generally deemed important to the degree that they contribute to the narrative of Japan, and the emperor-centered line of the Mito school in the Tokugawa period lends itself most easily to modern adoption. At the same time, few modern scholars would argue that the imperial government had much actual political authority, and that the vast areas of political behavior operated under discourses controlled by the samurai elite. It is worthy to question, such as Watanabe asserts, how using an imperial historiographic vocabulary to interpret Tokugawa politics may obscure issues better understood using the Tokugawa's own language. Likewise, it is worthy to question how the historiographic language of the Tokugawa might obscure elements useful in understanding the histories of lordly domains. Prewar and postwar historical scholarship have "Japan" as the main political entity and unspoken frame of reference within

which words take on their meaning. This is a point that Watanabe's essay does not address because his concerns were to replace an emperor-centric approach with a Tokugawa-centric one.

The *hōken* order of things and a widespread practice of formal rituals of subservience permitted a proliferation of historiographic discourses appropriate to different realms of political power, only a fraction of which have been explored here. There are a great variety of house histories, temple histories, and village histories for example, many of which were protected by delegated realms of authority, and we could learn much by seeing how they crafted meaningful visions of themselves. Furthermore, non-governmentally sponsored histories such as those written by individuals for printing by publishing houses, and with a view to selling to a broad readership, crafted yet other historical realms worthy of our understanding and analysis. The national narrative of modernity and the imperial narrative of Mito scholarship are not necessarily wrong, but over-reliance on them does limit our view, and there are so many other narratives to learn from and craft.

REFERENCES

Berry 1997

Mary Elizabeth Berry. "Was Early Modern Japan Culturally Integrated?" *Modern Asian Studies* 31:3 (1997), pp. 547–581.

Dai Nihon shiryō 1968-

Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo 東京大学史料編纂所, comp. *Dai Nihon shiryō* 大日本史料. Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1968-present.

Dai Nihon shi 1851

Minamoto Mitsukuni 源光圀 listed as author. *Dai Nihon shi* 大日本史. 243 vols. Publisher unknown, 1851. Woodblock printing, held in Osaka City University Library.

Dai Nihon shi sansō 1974

Dai Nihon shi sansō 大日本史賛藪. In Matsumoto Sannosuke 松本三之介 and Ogura Yoshihiko 小倉芳彦, eds. *Kinsei shi ronshū* 近世史論集, *Nihon shisōshi taikei* 日本思想史体系, vol. 48. Iwanami Shoten, 1974.

Fujii 1994

Fujii Jōji 藤井譲治. "Jūnana seiki no Nihon: Buke no kokka no keisei" 一七世紀の日本：武家の国家の形成. In Asao Naohiro 朝尾直弘 et. al., eds., *Iwanami kōza Nihon tsūshi* 岩波講座日本通史, vol. 12. Iwanami Shoten, 1994.

Fujita 1994

Fujita Satoru 藤田覚. *Bakumatsu no tennō* 幕末の天皇. Kōdansha, 1994.

"Gotōke nendai ryakki"

Miyaji Nakae 宮地仲枝. "Gotōke nendai ryakki" 御当家年代略記. Ms. in Princeton University Gest Library.

Hanami 1939
Hanami Sakumi 花見朔巳. "*Honchō tsugan* kō" 本朝通鑑考. In Shigakkai 史学会, ed., *Honpō shigaku shi ronsō* 本邦史学史論叢, pp. 793–834. Fuzanbō, 1939.

"Hanshi hensan toriatsukai hikae"
"Hanshi hensan toriatsukai hikae" 藩史編纂取扱控. Ms. in Miyaji Bunko 宮地文庫, Kōchi Prefectural Library, call no. K250/25/Miyaji.

"Hanshi naihen"
"Hanshi naihen" 藩史内篇. Ms. in Kōchi University Library, call no. 001.2/Han/2.

"Hanshi naihen"
"Hanshi naihen" 藩史内篇. Ms. in Miyaji Bunko, Kōchi Prefectural Library, call no K 250/25/1 Miyaji.

Honchō tsugan 1918
Hayashi Razan 林羅山. *Honchō tsugan* 本朝通鑑. Kokusho Kankōkai, 1918.

Ishio 1981
Ishio Yoshihisa 石尾芳久. "'Tosa hansei roku' no genpon ni tsuite" 土佐藩政録の原本について. *Kansai daigaku hōgaku ronshū* 関西大学法学論集 31:2–4 (1981), pp. 459–472.

Katsumata 1981
Katsumata Shizuo with Martin Collcutt. "The Development of Sengoku Law." In John W. Hall, Nagahara Keiji, and Kozo Yamamoto, eds., *Japan Before Tokugawa: Political Consolidation and Economic Growth, 1500–1650*, pp. 101–124. Princeton University Press, 1981.

Kōchi Ken Rekishi Jiten Hensan Iinkai 1980
Kōchi Ken Rekishi Jiten Hensan Iinkai 高知県歴史辞典編纂委員会, comp. *Kōchi ken rekishi jiten* 高知県歴史辞典. Kōchi:Kōchi Shimin Toshokan, 1980.

Kokushi daijiten 1979–1996
Kokushi Daijiten Hensan Iinkai 国史大辞典編纂委員会, comp. *Kokushi daijiten* 国史大辞典. 15 vols. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1979–1996.

"Kokushi gaihen hanrei"
"Kokushi gaihen hanrei" 国史外篇凡例. Ms. held in Kōchi City Library, Hirao Bunkō 平尾文庫 doc. no. 465.

Koschmann 1987
J. Victor Koschmann. *The Mito Ideology: Discourse, Reform, and Insurrection in Late Tokugawa Japan, 1790–1864*. University of California Press, 1987.

Mansai Jugō nikki 1958
Hanawa Koichi 塙己一, ed., *Mansai Jugō nikki* 満済准后日記, printed in *Zoku gunsho ruijū, hoi ichi*, 続群書類従、補遺一. Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1958.

Mizubayashi 1987
Mizubayashi Takeshi 水林彪. *Hōkensei no saihen to Nihonteki shakai no kakuritsu* 封建制の再編と日本的社会の確立. Yamakawa Shuppan, 1987.

Nagahara 1971
Nagahara Keiji 永原慶二, ed., *Jien, Kitabatake Chikafusa* 慈円北畠親房. In *Nihon no Meicho* 日本の名著 series, vol. 9. Chūō Kōron Sha, 1971.

Nakamura 1998
Nakamura Shunsaku 中村春作. "Shohyō: Watanabe Hiroshi cho, *Higashi Ajia no ōken to shisō*" 書評渡辺浩著『東アジアの王権と思想』. *Nihon shisō shigaku* 30 (September 1998), pp. 179–185.

Ng 2000
Wai-Ming Ng. "Political Terminology in the Legitimation of the Tokugawa System: A Study of *Bakufu* and *Shōgun*." *Journal of Asian History* 34:2 (2000), pp. 135–148.

Nihon kiryaku 1965
Kuroita Katsumi 黒板勝美, ed. *Nihon kiryaku* 日本紀略. *Shintei zōhō Kokushi taikei* 新訂増補国史大系, vols. 9–10. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965.

Nihon kōki 1989
Kuroita Katsumi 黒板勝美, ed. *Nihon kōki* 日本後紀. *Shintei zōhō Kokushi taikei* 新訂増補国史大系. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1989.

Ozawa 1972
Ozawa Eiichi 小沢栄一. "Bakuhanseika ni okeru hōken, gunken ron josetsu" 幕藩制下における封建・郡県論序説. *Tōkyō Gakugeidai kiyō*, 東京学芸大紀要, *3 bumon shakai kagaku* 3部門社会科学 24 (1972), pp. 111–128.

Ravina 1999
Mark Ravina. *Land and Lordship in Early Modern Japan*. Stanford University Press, 1999.

Rekidai shinki
Zōhō Shiryō Taisei Kankōkai 増補史料大成刊行会, comp., *Rekidai shinki* 歴代宸記. In *Zōho shiryō taisei* 増補史料大成, vol. 1. Rinsen Shoten, 1965.

Roberts 1997
Luke Roberts. "Tosa to ishin: 'kokka' no sōshitsu to 'chihō' no tanjō" 土佐と維新—「国家」の喪失と「地方」の誕生. *Nenpō kindai Nihon kenkyū* 年報近代日本研究 20 (1997), pp. 211–235.

Roberts 2004
———. "Cultivating Non-National Historical Understandings in Local History." In Joshua A. Fogel, ed., *The Teleology of the Modern Nation-State: Japan and China*, pp. 161–173. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Saikyūki 1914
Minamoto Takaakira 源高明. *Saikyūki* 西宮記. *Kaitei shiseki shūran* 改訂史籍集覧 series, gaihen 外篇. Kondō Shuppan, 1914.

Sekita 1981
Sekita Komakichi 関田駒吉. *Sekita Komakichi rekishi ronbunshū* 関田駒吉歴史論文集. 2 vols., Kōchi City Library, 1981.

Shiryō sōran 1965
Tōkyo Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo 東京大学史料編纂所, ed. *Shiryō sōran* 史料総覧. Tōkyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1965.

Sōbōkigen 1969
Nakai Chikuzan 中井竹山. *Sōbō kigen* 草茅危言. In Takimoto Seiichi 滝本誠一, ed., *Nihon keizai taiten* 日本経済大典, vol. 23. Meiji Bunken, 1969.

Tokugawa jikki 1964
Kuroita Katsumi 黒板勝美, ed. *Tokugawa jikki* 徳川実紀. In *Shintei zōhō Kokushi taikei* 新訂増補国史体系, vols. 38–47. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1964.

"Tosa hansei roku"
"Tosa hansei roku" 土佐藩政録. Ms. in Kōchi University Library, call no. 001.2/tos.

Tosa hansei roku 1969–1970
Kōchi Chihōshi Kenkyūkai 高知地方史研究会, ed. *Tosa hansei roku* 土佐藩政録, 2 vols. Kōchi Shimin Toshokan, 1969–1970.

Totman 1993
Conrad Totman. *Early Modern Japan*. University of California Press, 1993.

Tsukamoto 1998
Tsukamoto Manabu 塚本学. "Shohyō: Watanabe Hiroshi cho, *Higashi Ajia no ōken to shisō*" 書評:渡辺浩著 東アジアの王権と思想. *Rekishi hyōron* 歴史評論 581 (September 1998), pp. 57–61.

Varley 1980
H. Paul Varley. *A Chronicle of Gods and Sovereigns: Jinnō Shōtōki of Kitabatake Chikafusa*. Columbia University Press, 1980.

Wakabayashi 1991
Bob Wakabayashi. "In Name Only: Imperial Sovereignty in Early Modern Japan." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 17:1 (1991), pp. 25–57.

Watanabe 1985
Watabanabe Hiroshi 渡辺浩. *Kinsei Nihon shakai to Sōgaku* 近世日本社会と宋学. Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1985.

Watanabe 1997
———. *Higashi Ajia no ōken to shisō* 東アジアの王権と思想. Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1997.

Watanabe 1998
———. "About Some Japanese Historical Terms," trans. Luke Roberts. *Sino-Japanese Studies* 10:2 (1998), pp. 32–42.

Webb 1960
Herschel Webb. "What Is the *Dai Nihon Shi*?" *Journal of Asian Studies* 19:2 (1960), pp. 135–149.

Yamaguchi 1995
Yamaguchi Osamu 山口修. "'Tennō' shō no keifu" 「天皇」称の系譜. *Bukkyō Daigaku sōgō kenkyūjo kiyō* 仏教大学総合研究所紀要, no. 2 special issue (March 1995), pp. 96–118.

Yamamoto 1974
Yamamoto Tsunetomo 山本常朝. *Hagakure* 葉隠. In Saiki Kazuma 斎木一馬, Okayama Taiji 岡山泰四, and Sagara Tōru 相良亨, eds., *Mikawa monogatari, Hagakure* 三河物語・葉隠. Iwanami Shoten, 1974.

Yasukawa 1980
Yasukawa Minoru 安川実. *Honchō tsugan no kenkyū* 本朝通鑑の研究. Gensōsha, 1980.

NOTES

1 Watanabe 1997. The preface where he lays out his argument is translated into English in Watanabe 1998.

2 Watanabe's book garnered numerous reviews both praising and criticizing his argument. For example, Tsukamoto 1998 and Nakamura 1998.

3 I deal with this issue and its relationship to the writing of regional history in Roberts 2004.

4 Ozawa 1972.

5 A good summary of this understanding of the early modern order is laid out in Fujii 1994. Also see Mizubayashi 1987. Mizubayashi argues (pp. 165 and 177) that Edo was called *ōkōgi* and domainal governments *kōgi*. However, I have yet to find such a distinction in documents that I have read. This may be due to regional variations, but I suspect that the distinction between *ōkōgi* and *kōgi* was developed as a way to create a Japan framed discourse for the terms that were not usually needed under the *hōken* order.

6 Roberts 1997.

7 Yamamoto 1974, pp. 216–219. Such usage for a realm that was much smaller than the imperial province (likewise known as *kuni*) of Hizen in which it was situated makes it clear that these terms were domain based and not province based. However, Yamamoto uses *kōgi* consistently to mean the Tokugawa government rather than the government of the domain.

8 In addition to Watanabe's seminal piece there is also on this topic the essay by Wai-Ming Ng (Ng 2000).

9 Watanabe 1997, p. 7. There is an extensive English-language literature focusing on Mito historiography which is well known for its key role in an imperial centered vision of Japan, most importantly Koschmann 1987.

10 Fujita 1994. Also a good summary of posthumous titles and suffixes can be found in Yamaguchi 1995. The best discussion in English of the position of the emperor in the Edo period is Wakabayashi 1991.

11 For a nice discussion of the incident, see Totman 1993, pp. 473–76.

12 As noted in Fujita 1994, p. 129.

13 See for example Nakai Chikuzan's 1789 lament of this situation, and proposal to revive calling emperors by era names after the Chinese fashion and with *-tennō* suffixes. *Sōbō kigen* 1969, pp. 324–27.

14 Fujita 1994, pp. 125–35.

15 A late example of both the Japanese and Chinese posthumous names can be found in the chapter titles of the *Nihon kōki*, an imperially sponsored history completed in 840.

16 I base this claim on my reading of numerous relevant volumes of *Dai Nihon shiryō*, the details of which I will present below.
17 This interpretation seems to be based on the idea that Juntoku might be the last emperor until the time of Kōkaku who although he had retired was granted a *shigō*. This issue is in itself very complex. For example, emperor Shōkō (1401–28) had a new name especially created for himself and not based on residence. As was the case with Juntoku, this had the *-in* suffix. The monk Mansai (1378–1435) who was involved in, and records in his diary, the naming negotiations calls the name a *tsuigō*, because it had an *-in* suffix, but it is unclear if he was thinking of this in distinction to a *shigō* or it was just the word he happens to use. At any rate this calls into question whether the modern distinction between *shigō* and *tsuigō* is the same as it was in the pre-modern past. Unlike Juntoku, Shōkō died while in office and did not retire and receive a *daijōtennō* title and a difference may perhaps lie in this distinction. One interesting element of this naming process is the adamant refusal of the retired emperor Go-Komatsu (1377–1433), to allow Shōkō to be given a posthumous name deriving from that of earlier emperors in the form of adding a *go-* (latter) prefix to an earlier name. Shōkō was Ashikaga Yoshimitsu's (1358–1408) grandson and had been caught between the various power maneuverings of Yoshimitsu and Go-Komatsu. Furthermore Shōkō was an ineffectual youth and reputed to be insane. His title was no particular complement, but rather a form of separation. See *Mansai Jugō nikki* 1958, pp. 516–518. Empress Meishō (1623–97), who did retire early, was also given a name created for her rather than chosen from a residence, this name was also called a *tsuigō* rather than a *shigō* even though it was created by choosing two characters from the *shigō* of two ancient empresses, Genmei and Genshō. (*Kokushi daijiten* 1979–96, vol. 13, p. 747). One might say the *-in* suffix requires it being called a *tsuigō* rather than a *shigō* but, as we shall see, this was clearly not the case for Kentoku-*in* (later Go-Toba-*in*) or Juntoku-*in* in the twelfth century. It seems likely that by the Muromachi period and certainly by the Edo period the *-in* suffix was sufficient to determine that the name was not a *shigō* but rather a *tsuigō*, and then by projecting that logic back onto the past, allowed some to say that Juntoku had a *-tennō* suffix because it was a *shigō*, even though the oldest reference clearly calls him Juntoku-*in*.
18 See footnote 24 in Roberts 2004.
19 *Dai Nihon shiryō*, vol. 5:12, pp. 289, 434, 458. The source for the *-in* being part of the honorific title (*shigō*) is the *Hyakurenshō*, a mid-thirteenth-century chronicle based on earlier histories and diaries. No primary sources on this issue are presented. The use of the Sinitic *shigō* seems to have been an attempt to placate the banished emperor, based on the example of Emperor Sutoku (1119–64) who also died in banishment. Sutoku was originally called Sanuki-*in* in reference to his location of banishment, but his angry spirit was deemed responsible for a number of disasters in the capital and so his name was later changed to Sutoku-*in* in the hope of appeasing his spirit.
20 *Dai Nihon shiryō* 1968, vol. 5:14, p. 442, 446. He also clearly calls the name Kentoku-*in* a *shigō*.
21 *Dai Nihon shiryō* 1968, vol. 5:14, p. 444. *Kokushi daijiten* 1979–96, vol. 5, p. 924.
22 *Kokushi daijiten* 1979–96, vol. 7, pp. 423–24. The *Dai Nihon shiryō* volume for the period of Juntoku's renaming is not yet in print but the table of contents-like volume, *Shiryō sōran*, has an entry for that date that says Sado-*in* is given the *tsuigō* of Juntoku-*in*, vol. 4, p. 754.
23 *Dai Nihon shiryō* 1968, vol. 5:19, pp. 379, 418.
24 In Nagahara 1974, p. 412. I have adapted H. Paul Varley's translation of this passage, found in Varley 1980, p. 191.
25 *Dai Nihon shiryō* 1968, vol. 2:7, pp. 160–77, 221–33. Back at his retirement in 969, he did refuse the *daijōtennō* title which the subsequent emperor granted him (vol. 1:13, pp. 13–14), but this was almost customary by that time and numerous emperors did the same. The sons usually granted the title anyway despite the refusal.
26 They are clearly referred to posthumously with the *-in* title in contemporary diaries included in the *Dai Nihon shiryō* 1968; for Ichijō, see vol. 2:7, pp. 9–16.

27 See *Saikyūki* 1914, p. 640 , written by Emperor Uda's son Minamoto Takaakira.
28 A brief discussion of this can be found in *Kokushi daijiten* 1979–96, vol. 7, pp. 424–25, and vol. 6, p. 271.
29 *Dai Nihon shiryō* 1968, vol. 1:11, p. 966. The sections closely pertaining to his death and burial are vol. 1:11, pp. 914–96, and vol. 1:12, pp. 1–20. The one document that claims that he was granted the title Murakami-*tennō* is the early thirteenth-century *Man'yōshū nanji* (quoted in vol. 1:12, p. 12) and not necessarily reliable on the point.
30 *Dai Nihon shiryō* 1968, vol. 1:11, pp. 960, 964–66.
31 For a discussion of the character of the *Nihon kiryaku*, see *Kokushi daijiten* 1979–96, vol 11, pp. 133–34. The two relevant chapter titles are in *Nihon kiryaku* 1965, pp. 47 and 103.
32 *Dai Nihon shiryō* 1968, vol. 1:13, p. 6.
33 In *Dai Nihon shiryō* 1968, vol. 1:1, p. 208. The source for the *Nihon kiryaku*'s statement is unclear, and it is not impossible that the *-tennō* suffix is its own addition. The diary of the subsequent emperor Uda has no mention of the naming and does not use the name Kōkō. Uda's diary is to be found in *Rekidai shinki*. This diary is not complete so the evidence is not conclusive, but the only references to Kōkō in the diary call him *sentei*.
34 In Nagahara 1974.
35 Webb 1960, p. 135.
36 Although this needs more research, my studies have led me to conclude that, in the Edo period, documents and histories written for higher authorities could be formally presented to lesser ones, but not vice versa.
37 My references to Mitogaku usage here are based on readings of *Dai Nihon shi sansō* (circa 1720). I also was able to spend half a day with the 1851 woodblock print version of *Dai Nihon shi* held in Osaka City University Library thanks to Dani Botsman and Tsukada Takashi. I decided not to use the final 1906 version of the *Dai Nihon shi* in order to avoid questions of the meanings of Meiji-era editing.
38 On the *Dai Nihon shi sansō*, see the essay by modern historians Matsumoto Sannosuke and Ogura Yoshihiko, in *Dai Nihon shi sansō* 1974, p. 560. The reason for removal was that the Fujita group felt that historians should not presume to evaluate a dynasty which had not changed, and which therefore continued to hold heaven's mandate.
39 *Dai Nihon shi sansō* 1974, especially pp. 61 *passim*.
40 This is from the woodblock print 1851 version of the *Dai Nihon shi*, first volume *jōhyō* 上表 section, folio 2.
41 Watanabe 1985, pp. 34–40.
42 *Kokushi daijiten* 1979–96, vol. 12, pp. 841–842. See Yasukawa 1980 and also Hanami 1939. Yasukawa's work is especially interesting for its tracing of the many commonalities between *Honchō tsugan* and *Dai Nihon shi*.
43 This is from the woodblock print 1851 version of the *Dai Nihon shi*, first volume *jōhyō* 上表 section, folio 2.
44 See for example *Honchō tsugan* 1918, vol. 2, pp. 684–85 where Ieyasu and Hidetada both receive honorific open spaces while the emperor does not. This is consistent throughout in my survey of pp. 578–707.
45 Note for example *Honchō tsugan* 1918, vol. 1, pp. 290–91, and 438, and vol. 2, p. 504 where the term *shōgun* and *bakufu* are used and the shoguns are called by their formal personal names such as Sanetomo and Yoshimitsu.
46 As noted above, *Dai Nihon shi sansō* frequently uses the term *shōgun* to identify heads of the Kamakura and Muromachi military governments (pp. 172–213 *passim*) and frequently uses the term *bakufu* to denote those governments (pp. 176, 178, 190, 192), although it sometimes uses other terms such as *gunsei* and *fu* (p. 185), and once describes the ideal role of the *shōgun*'s government as being the

hanpei or bulwark of protection for the imperial house (p. 180), which is the word that was just coming into occasional pedantic use in the early eighteenth century to refer to the role of domain lords vis-à-vis the Tokugawa, and ultimately from which modern use of the term *han* derives.

47 *Honchō tsugan* 1918, vol. 2, p. 702.

48 Ibid., p. 751.

49 The important role of the Warring States era in this is discussed in Katsumata 1981.

50 *Honchō tsugan* 1918, vol. 2, p. 683.

51 Ibid., p. 706.

52 *Tokugawa jikki* 1964, vol. 1, pp. 1–5.

53 Ibid., vol. 9, pp. 574–75.

54 This multiplicity of ideological founts of authority for the Tokugawa is replicated in the rule of daimyo, as analyzed for daimyo so well by Mark Ravina in chapter 1 of Ravina 1999.

55 For example, *Tokugawa jikki* 1964, vol. 7, pp. 29–30. Also note a similar narrative for Tokugawa Ieharu (1737–86) in *Tokugawa jikki* 1964, vol. 10 pp. 1–16.

56 The *Tokugawa jikki* does not treat the pre-Tokugawa period extensively but in one location Montoku and Seiwa are given the *-tennō* suffix and Reizei and some subsequent emperors are given the *-in* suffix, vol. 1, p. 15.

57 For example, *Tokugawa jikki* 1964, vol. 7, pp. 38 and 67–68.

58 Ravina 1999.

59 "Gotōke nendai ryakki." Versions of this history exist in manuscript in many places, some of which are noted in the final notations of the second volume of the Gest Library manuscript. The Gest manuscript continues the history to 1846. Alternate names for this history include *Okuni nendai ryakki*, where *kuni* refers to Tosa domain.

60 Nevertheless, the moment of appointment to the rank of shogun is highlighted and is one of the few Tokugawa events not directly related to some domain action that appears in this history. This is different from *Honchō tsugan* and is similar to a trend seen in the *Tokugawa jikki* which was written in the same era as the "Nendai ryakki." Perhaps by the early nineteenth century an historiographic consensus was growing that was beginning to accord more value to the rank of shogun than had been the case in the seventeenth century.

61 Sekita 1981, vol. 2, pp. 293–98. *Kōchi Ken Rekishi Jiten Hensan Iinkai* 1980, pp. 626–27. This history has never been published, but near-final draft versions of many volumes are held in the Kōchi University Library, and many rough draft volumes and related correspondence and notes are held separately in the Miyaji collection in the Kōchi Prefecture Library and the Hirao collection of Kōchi City Library.

62 Roberts 1997.

63 "Hanshi naihen," *Seitai enkaku, Tenyōin-sama odai*, ms. held in Kōchi Daigaku Toshokan, call no. 001.2/Han/2.

64 "Hanshi naihen," *ichi*, ms. held in Kōchi Prefecture Library, call no. K 250/25/1 Miyaji.

65 *Kokushi gaihen hanrei*, ms. held in Kōchi City Library, Hirao bunko no. 465. The title is the library's title of convenience for this document, but the document includes the guidelines for the *naihen* volumes as well. This document has no date on it but a separate document of copies of various memoranda related to the writing of the history reveals an outline of a *hanrei* submitted to the retired lord Yamauchi Yōdo in the fourth month of 1866 that is the same in all essentials as the complete *hanrei* noted above. *Hanshi hensan toriatsukai hikae*, ms. held in Kōchi kenritsu toshokan, K250/25/Miyaji, folios 8–9.

66 I used the manuscript held in the Kōchi University Library, and this is in print as Kōchi Chihōshi Kenkyūkai 1969–70. Another slightly different manuscript is discussed in Ishio 1981.

67 This is a topic discussed in a broad way in Berry 1997.

GLOSSARY

Arai Hakuseki 新井白石
Asaka Tanpaku 安積澹泊
Ashikaga Yoshimitsu 足利義満
bakufu 幕府
chō 朝
chokumei 勅命
chōtei 朝廷
Chūkyō 仲恭
chūnagon 中納権
Daigyō kōtei 大行皇帝
Daijinkun 大神君
daijōsai 大嘗祭
daijō tennō 太上天皇
Dai Nihon eitai setsuyō mujinzō 大日本永代節用無尽蔵
Dai Nihon shi ronsan 大日本史論賛
Dai Nihon shi sansō 大日本史賛藪
daishōgun no ie 大将軍の家
Daitokukun 台徳君
Daiyū'inden 大猷院殿
En'yū 圓融
fu 府
Fujita Yūkoku 藤田幽谷
fusetamau 布施たまう
Gahō 鵞峯
gaihen 外編
Genmei 元明
Genshō 元正
Go-haitei 後廃帝
Gokachū 御家中
Go-Kameyama 後亀山
Go-Komatsu 後小松
Gonki 権記
Go-Saga 後嵯峨
gosho 御所
Go-Toba 後鳥羽
Gotōke nendai ryakki 御当家年代略記
Go-Yōzei 後陽成
Gukanshō 愚管抄
gunkoku no sei 軍国之政
gunsei 軍政
hakufu 伯府
han 藩
hanpei 藩屏
"Hanshi naihen" 藩史内編
Hantei 半帝
Hayashi Jussai 林述斎
Hayashi Razan 林羅山
Heizei 平城
Hidetada 秀忠
hime 姫
hō / *fu* 封
hōchi 封地
hōgyo 崩御
hōken 封建
Hōkō 鳳岡
Honchō tsugan 本朝通鑑
Honchō tsugan teiyō 本朝通鑑提要
Hyakurenshō 百練抄
Ichijō 一条
ie 家
-in 院
inden 院殿
Inui Hikosaku 乾彦作
Jien 慈円
Jinkun 神君
Jinnō shōtōki 神皇正統記
jitsumei 実名
jōkō 上皇
Junna 淳和
Juntoku 順徳
Kanmu 桓武
kanfū shigō 漢風諡号
karō 家老
kashin 家臣
Kazan 華山
Kentoku-*in* 顯徳院
kenzu 献ず
kimi 君
kinrisama 禁裏様
kintei 禁廷
Kitabatake Chikafusa 北畠親房
kō 公
kōchō 皇朝
kōgi 公儀
kōgi 公義

Kōkaku 光格
kokka 国家
kokka daiji 国家大事
Kōkō 光孝
kokugaku 国学
kokusei 国政
Kokushi naihen 国史内編
kokushu 国守
Kokushikan 国史館
Konoe Kanetsune 近衛兼経
kubō 公方
kuge kanpaku 公家関白
Kujōhaitei 九条廃帝
kuzusu 崩す
kyō 卿
Mansai 満済
Man'yōshū nanji 万葉集難事
Matsudaira Sadanobu 松平定信
Meishō 明正
mikado 御門
misasagi 陵
Miyaji Nakae 宮地中枝
Montoku 文徳
Murakami 村上
Mutsuhito 睦仁
naidaijin 内大臣
naifu 内府
naijitsu 内実
Nihon gaishi 日本外史
Nihonkiryaku 日本紀略
ō 王
Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠
Ojikki 御実記
Oki-*hōō* 隠岐法皇
Oki no kami 隠岐守
ōkōgi 大公儀
okōgisama 御公儀様
okokusei 御国政
Okokushi naihen 御国史内編
okuni 御国
omote 表
onryō 怨霊
oryōgoku 御領国
oseiji 御政事
ōyake 公
Rai San'yō 頼山陽
Reizei 令泉
ryō 領
Sado-*in* 佐渡院
Saga 嵯峨
Sanuki-*in* 讃岐院
seitai enkaku 政体沿革
Seiwa 清和
sentei 先帝
shigō 諡号
shin'nō 親王
shiryō 私料
shiryō 私領
shō 将
shōgunke 将軍家
shohōkōnin 諸奉公人
Shōkō 称光
shoshi 諸士
Shōuki 小右記
shujō 主上
sokuirei 即位礼
songō jiken 尊号事件
susumeru 進める
Sutoku 崇徳
Suzaku 朱雀
Taira no Tsunetaka 平経高
-tei/mikado 帝
tennō 天皇
Tenchō 天朝
Tenryaku no mikado 天暦の御門
tenshi 天子
tōgin 当今
Tokugawa Harutoshi 徳川治紀
Tokugawa Ieharu 徳川 家治
Tokugawa Ietsugu 徳川家継
Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康
Tokugawa jikki 徳川実記
Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀
Tokugawa Tsunayoshi 徳川綱吉
tono 殿
"Tosa hansei roku" 土佐藩政録
tsuigō 追号
Tsukada Takashi 塚田孝

udaijin 右大臣
uesama 上様
ufu 右府
Yamauchi Toyoshige 山内豊信
Yamauchi Yōdō 山内容堂
yobina 呼び名
Yōzei 陽成