

A Critique by Any Other Name: Imagawa Ryōshun’s *Nan Taiheiki*, an Introduction and Translation (Part 1)

Jeremy A. SATHER

This translation and analysis of Imagawa Ryōshun’s *Nan Taiheiki* examines the events that led him to write the work, namely his dismissal from the office of Kyūshū *tandai* and his subsequent participation in the Ōei Disturbance. After the rebellion ended in failure, he spent the rest of his life writing and critiquing literature. *Nan Taiheiki*, written around 1402, was a product of this period and of his rancor toward the Ashikaga chieftain Yoshimitsu. While the original *Nan Taiheiki* has no chapters or section headings, a close examination reveals three fundamental concerns. First, a focus on the Ashikaga’s status as a collateral family of the Minamoto, which gave them a near divine right to lordship. In order to protect his family from “becoming lowly people without name or rank,” Ryōshun asserts his family’s loyalty to the Ashikaga, in the process laying the groundwork for his criticism of Yoshimitsu later in the work. Second, a repudiation of *Taiheiki*, not for its overall storyline, but for its omission of the deeds of families that had participated in the Ashikaga’s rise to power, most notably his own. And last, a criticism of Yoshimitsu, whose maladministration led to Ryōshun’s dismissal from the office of *tandai*. Importantly, his criticism is of Yoshimitsu the individual, not of the Ashikaga family; a large part of *Nan Taiheiki* is meant to demonstrate Yoshimitsu’s unworthiness as a ruler and to cast Ryōshun’s participation in the Ōei Disturbance as the act of a loyal follower of the Ashikaga. Accordingly, I show that *Nan Taiheiki*, which Ryōshun did not even title, has been misinterpreted: its criticism of *Taiheiki* is but one of several aspects of the text, all of which are tied together by Ryōshun’s need to protect his family’s legacy and criticize Yoshimitsu, who he considered the architect of his downfall.

Keywords: Ashikaga Yoshimitsu, Ashikaga Mitsukane, Imagawa Ryōshun, Nanbokuchō, *Nan Taiheiki*, Ōei Disturbance, Ōuchi Yoshihiro, *Taiheiki*

Introduction

Few works appear less worth studying than Imagawa Ryōshun's 今川了俊 (1326–1420?) *Nan Taiheiki* 難太平記 (*Criticisms of Taiheiki*). Partly this is because *Taiheiki* 太平記 has been a work of little esteem among scholars and, aside from Helen McCullough's 1959 introduction and partial translation, mostly ignored.¹ Scholars usually rely on *Nan Taiheiki* for its historiographical value, especially regarding *Taiheiki*, or for its value as an historical reference work regarding warrior behavior and customs. Of late, however, *Taiheiki* research has seen a revival of sorts in Japan, particularly with regard to its many variants (*shobon kenkyū* 諸本研究), with a concomitant interest in *Nan Taiheiki*.² Furthermore, Ryōshun records a different perspective on many of the major events of the fourteenth century, making *Nan Taiheiki* a valuable if underutilized resource. Here I provide an introduction and analysis of *Nan Taiheiki*, as well as a translation. Understanding *Nan Taiheiki*, however, first requires a bit of background on both Ryōshun and the time in which he lived.

Ryōshun and the Fourteenth Century at a Glance

The fourteenth century was a violent epoch marked by conflict. First, Emperor Go-Daigo 後醍醐天皇 (1288–1339), of the Daikakuji imperial bloodline, destroyed the Kamakura shogunate in 1333. In the aftermath, the emperor's "Kenmu Imperium," to use Andrew Goble's term, was unable to cope with the subsequent unrest, particularly the protean nature of warrior desires.³ As a result, Go-Daigo's inefficient and autocratic government led one of his greatest generals, Ashikaga Takauji 足利尊氏 (1305–1358), to betray Go-Daigo in 1335 and establish a new shogunate with the backing of the rival Jimyōin imperial bloodline; this alliance would come to be called the Northern court for their position in Kyoto, north of Go-Daigo's encampment deep in the mountains of Yoshino to the south, to which he relocated after being forced to flee Kyoto in 1336. This conflict between Go-Daigo and the Ashikaga Jimyōin alliance is typically referred to as the Upheaval of the Northern and Southern courts (*Nanbokuchō no dōran* 南北朝の動乱). The conflict petered out during the latter half of the epoch as the Ashikaga shored up their control of the Japanese archipelago and came to an end in 1392, when the Southern court surrendered to the third shogun Ashikaga Yoshimitsu 足利義満 (1358–1408) and returned the imperial regalia, which Go-Daigo had taken with him when he fled Kyoto in 1335.

Despite the length of the conflict, the Ashikaga shogunate was in the ascendant by the 1350s, though it underwent a number of trials before it achieved some sense of stability. In the years following Go-Daigo's retreat and death in 1339, the Ashikaga worked assiduously to strengthen their authority, but the dual nature of their government—Takauji acting as the military leader and Tadayoshi 直義 (1306–1352) the civil leader—was untenable. By the

1 McCullough 1959. For examples of more recent scholars using *Taiheiki*, see Conlan 2011b, pp. 9–13; H. Paul Varley's students jokingly referred to *Taiheiki* as *Taihenki*, or *Chronicle of Great Horror*, though this is mostly in relation to the latter half of the text. See Varley 1994, p. 208.

2 Scholars such as Hasegawa Tadashi, Koakimoto Dan, Kitamura Masayuki, and Wada Takuma are spearheading this movement and have published a number of excellent works illuminating the process by which *Taiheiki* was created, copied, and disseminated. Wada Takumi has recently published a monograph on *Taiheiki* that looks at *Nan Taiheiki* in depth. Indeed, Wada puts it best: "When discussing *Taiheiki*'s author and creation, one can say that *Nan Taiheiki* is indispensable." Wada 2015, p. 52. For examples of works about *Taiheiki*, see Hasegawa 1994, Koakimoto 2005, Kitamura 2010, and Wada 2015.

3 Goble 1996.

end of the 1340s relations between Takauji and Tadayoshi had broken down, leading to the Kannō Disturbance (*Kannō no jōran* 観応の擾乱). The conflict concluded in 1352 with the defeat of Tadayoshi's faction; according to *Taiheiki*, Tadayoshi himself was poisoned by his brother Takauji.⁴

Three problems militated against Takauji's authority. First, Southern court resistance ebbed but did not die out—indeed, it would often take advantage of such divisions, as it had done during the Kannō Disturbance. Second, the Ashikaga had to deal with a number of internal problems, particularly recalcitrant followers such as Hosokawa Kiyouji 細川清氏 (?–1362) who saw opportunities for advancement following Takauji's death in 1359. Third, parts of the archipelago remained outside shogunal control. The north remained a frontier, while the southern island of Kyūshū was under the control of Go-Daigo's son Prince Kaneyoshi 懷良親王 (1329?–1383). The island remained a bastion of Southern court resistance well into the 1380s. It is over the matter of Kyūshū, in fact, that we get our first real glimpse of *Nan Taiheiki*'s author, Imagawa Ryōshun.

We know very little of Ryōshun's early life. Born in 1325 to Imagawa Norikuni 今川範国, young Ryōshun likely spent his early years accompanying his father on military campaigns and learning how to govern. These experiences would serve him well: during the 1360s he served as both chief of the bureau of samurai (*samurai dokoro tōnin* 侍所当人) and chief of the council of adjudicators (*hikitsuke tōnin* 引付当人).⁵ But it was in the realm of poetry and literature that he seems to have been most comfortable. During his youth he learned poetry from his father and grandmother and was taken as a pupil by both Nijō Yoshimoto 二条良基 (1320–1388) and Kyōgoku Tamemoto 京極為基 (dates unknown).⁶ Despite his youth, Ryōshun must have achieved a high level of distinction, for one of his poems was included in the imperial anthology *Fūga wakashū* 風雅和歌集 in 1345. He continued to publish poetry and literary criticism throughout his life.

Even without his later literary production, by the time he ventured to Kyūshū in 1370, Ryōshun's versatility in terms of military, administrative, and literary experience made him the epitome of the “civil and military arts” (*bunbu ryōdō* 文武兩道) ideal.⁷ This combination made Ryōshun the natural choice when his friend, the shogunal regent (*kanrei* 管領) Hosokawa Yoriyuki 細川頼之 (1329–1392), chose him to serve as Kyūshū *tandai* 九州探題 (shogunal deputy for Kyūshū). Prior to Ryōshun four individuals had been sent to subjugate the island. Each failed in the task; the last, Shibukawa Yoshiyuki 渋川義行, did not even make it to the island.⁸ Yoriyuki undoubtedly hoped Ryōshun's reputation and experience would allow him to succeed where the others had failed.

Ryōshun would spend the next twenty-five years of his life in Kyūshū paving the way for Ashikaga domination. However, what promised to be his greatest achievement concluded with humiliating disgrace. For after Yoriyuki died in 1392 the political climate changed and Ryōshun lost his allies. Moreover, Yoshimitsu was wary of powerful warlords,

4 Hasegawa 1998a, pp. 484–85.

5 Kawazoe 1964, pp. 61–70.

6 Kawazoe 1964, pp. 30–33.

7 For more on the notion of *bunbu ryōdō*, see chapter 10 by Hurst in Mass 1997; and for *bunbu ryōdō* specifically in the time of Ryōshun, see Conlan 2011a, pp. 109–11.

8 Kawazoe 1964, pp. 76–83; Harrington 1985, pp. 79–81.

and Ryōshun's success in and control over Kyūshū made him the most dangerous sort of ally. It is no surprise, then, that he was ordered to return to the capital.

This dismissal was a major turning point in his life, for in its aftermath Ryōshun experienced several political reversals that led him to join Ōuchi Yoshihiro 大内義弘 (1356–1399) in rebellion in 1399. Behind Ryōshun's dismissal were the increasing autocracy of Yoshimitsu and his mistrust of major warlords, especially those of collateral families such as the Imagawa who were in possession of *shugo* 守護 titles. Such men were in position to challenge Yoshimitsu's authority, and the would-be hegemon wasted little time in stamping out threats, real or perceived. Several famous warrior families met with disaster in the 1390s—the Toki and the Yamana come to mind—and by the late 1390s the writing was on the wall. But Yoshimitsu's despotism earned him plenty of enemies: *shugo daimyo* like Yoshihiro balked at rigid control, but even members of Yoshimitsu's own family, such as his cousin Ashikaga Ujimitsu 足利氏満 (1359–1398), the *Kantō kubō* 関東公方 (shogun in the east), and his first cousin once-removed Mitsukane 足利満兼 (1378–1409), were prone to resisting Yoshimitsu's high handedness. Given warrior distaste for despotism, it should come as little surprise that Yoshihiro and Mitsukane decided to revolt. What was surprising, however, was the alacrity with which their rebellion was snuffed out. The Ōei Disturbance lasted but two months, starting in October of 1399 and ending with the death of Yoshihiro two months later. Mitsukane surrendered soon after and formally apologized in 1401 for his role in the disturbance.

Though Ryōshun asserts his innocence in *Nan Taiheiki*, other evidence suggests that he did in fact participate, however insignificant his role, in the revolt.⁹ He was implicated and his life spared only through the intercession of a nephew and the second-in-command to the *Kantō kubō*, the *Kantō kanrei* 関東管領 (Kantō deputy) Uesugi Norisada 上杉憲定 (1375–1413), on the condition that Ryōshun retire from politics. Left with little else, Ryōshun returned to the pursuit that had sustained him throughout his life, producing a staggering number of works by the time of his death. As we shall see, the major reasons for his decision to write *Nan Taiheiki* were his dismissal from the post of Kyūshū *tandai* and his role in the Ōei Disturbance.

Taiheiki

Written in stages beginning sometime in the 1330s, *Taiheiki* records the events that led up to the war between the Northern and Southern courts and concludes with the succession of Ashikaga Takauji's grandson Yoshimitsu in 1367. It is an episodic text whose complexity and plurality of voice frustrate attempts to identify its authors, political leanings, or thematic purpose. Due to its length, scholars typically break *Taiheiki* into three parts: chapters 1–12 record the rise of Go-Daigo and the destruction of the Kamakura shogunate; chapters 12–20 the transformation of Go-Daigo from savior of the realm into despot, and the subsequent struggle between Ashikaga Takauji and another Minamoto descendant, Nitta Yoshisada 新田義貞 (1301–1338), over the position of shogun; and chapters 21–40 cover the Ashikaga's struggles to cement their authority and the events leading up to the succession

⁹ An entry in *Sondō shinnō kōjō* 尊道親王行状 for 1400.07.04 reads: “The foes in Tōtōmi, Kunainoshō nyūdō, and Hoshino were defeated, and Imagawa Iyo nyūdō [Ryōshun] surrendered.” Kawazoe 1964, pp. 228–29.

of Yoshimitsu to the office of shogun.¹⁰ Each section seems to have a different voice and purpose, though certain themes, such as Confucian morality and Buddhist karma, prevail throughout the narrative.

We know very little about the authors or the process by which *Taiheiki* was written. Indeed, we would know next to nothing if not for *Nan Taiheiki* and the diary of the courtier Tōin Kinsada 洞院公定 (1339–1399), *Tōin Kinsada nikki* 洞院公定日記, which provide clues to *Taiheiki*'s final completion date and authorship. Kinsada claims that a monk named Kojima passed away on 3.5.1374, and that he was the author of the *Taiheiki*.¹¹ This is significant because in *Nan Taiheiki* Ryōshun claims that Ashikaga Tadayoshi summoned two individuals to bring *Taiheiki* to him: The first is the Dharma Seal Gen'e 玄慧法印 (?–1350), a renowned Tendai monk and Confucian scholar who contributed to the Ashikaga's first legal document, the *Kenmu Formulary* (*Kenmu shikimoku* 建武式目); the other is Echin 恵鎮 (1281–1356), another Tendai monk known as a teacher to five emperors (one of whom was Go-Daigo himself), as a prolific leader of *kanjin* 勧進 campaigns, as a storytelling priest (*monogatari sō* 物語僧), and as leader to a group of scholar monks at Hosshōji temple. Interestingly, *kanjin* campaigns were typically lead by such storytelling priests, whose function was to read texts aloud to an audience, or an individual skilled in such matters.¹² Matsuo Kenji concludes that Echin's proximity to so many skilled writers at Hosshōji in concert with his facility for storytelling likely led him to being tasked with writing *Taiheiki*. If this were the case, Gen'e would have been a sort of editor-in-chief, while Echin would have overseen the monks at Hosshōji who would have taken care of the day-to-day business of writing *Taiheiki*.¹³ And while there is little information on Kojima or his life, Matsuo Kenji has concluded that he was likely a monk under Echin, and that his skill would have led him to become "author" of *Taiheiki* sometime after Echin's death in 1356. It would have been as a member of Echin's group that Kojima became known as the "author" of *Taiheiki*, and took over editorial responsibilities some time after Echin's death in 1356.¹⁴

Regarding *Taiheiki*'s narrative, the involvement of Tadayoshi leads one to believe that *Taiheiki* is a pro-Ashikaga text, but we should not leap to conclusions. First, it is important to remember that allegiances in the fourteenth century were easily transferable—today's ally could easily become tomorrow's enemy and vice versa. Indeed, the Northern and Southern courts held little appeal as abstract concepts; rather, warrior and courtier alike identified with one or the other based mostly on personal interest. And when their interests and those of the court they served were incompatible, few balked at switching sides. Echin himself

10 *Tenshōbon Taiheiki*, the most comprehensive version of the text in print, is four volumes in length, but part 3, books 21–40, is exceptionally long and thematically discordant, almost necessitating its division into two volumes. Hasegawa 1998a.

11 *Tōin Kinsada nikki*'s entry for 5.3.1374 reads: "This Kojima was the author of the *Taiheiki*, which has enjoyed popularity of late. Though he was of low standing, he was reputedly an exceptionally erudite scholar. [His passing] is most unfortunate."

12 "Long ago Echin of Hosshōji brought a thirty-chapter version of the work to Dōjiji, which was shown to Tadayoshi, who had Dharma Seal Gen'e read it aloud."

13 See part four in Matsuo 2001.

14 Matsuo 2001, pp. 118–24. It should be noted that this Kojima might have been Kojima Takanori, an individual who appears in *Taiheiki*. The theory rests on the argument that many characters who participated in the writing of *Taiheiki*—Gen'e and Echin included—appear in the text, making it plausible that Kojima, following his participation in the war, may have joined the priesthood and been a monk at Hosshōji. However tempting the theory, there is no evidence to suggest the two individuals are the same.

served five emperors, including Go-Daigo, and later the Ashikaga and the Northern court, while Ashikaga Tadayoshi defected to the Southern court at one time during the Kannō Disturbance. Indeed, Takauji himself even “surrendered” to the Southern court in what is known as the Shōhei Unification (*Shōhei ittō* 正平一統) in order to drive a wedge between Tadayoshi and the Southern court. *Taiheiki* reflects the conditional nature of allegiances during the fourteenth century and helps construct a view of the epoch as one of disorder. In terms of *Taiheiki*’s authorship, a number of individuals with shifting allegiances were likely involved with *Taiheiki*, making it difficult to pinpoint any one overarching voice echoing throughout the text’s narrative.¹⁵

In any event, by 1367 and the succession of Yoshimitsu, the Ashikaga’s place at the apex of society seemed incontrovertible, and so as an historical record *Taiheiki* must reflect the gradual victory of the Northern court, at least as it seemed at the time of its completion before the likely date of 1374.¹⁶ Indeed, the final line of the work suggests the finality of the conflict in favor of the Ashikaga and is a “felicitous phrase” (*shūgen* 祝言) meant to wrap up a text in a celebratory way.¹⁷ While *Taiheiki* is a work whose purpose was as protean as the allegiances it sought to record and must, as an historical record (*ki* 記), depict the events that led to the Ashikaga’s eventual victory, its narrative does not necessarily reflect a pro-Ashikaga bias throughout. Indeed, almost every main character—Ashikagas Takauji and Tadayoshi included—is criticized at some point in the narrative. In its plurality of voice and motive, then, we might say *Taiheiki* presents as objective a view of the fourteenth century as can be expected from a time when personal interest trumped all.

Nan Taiheiki

Ryōshun wrote *Nan Taiheiki* between 1400 and 1402. If we are to believe the title, the work is a criticism of *Taiheiki*. Indeed, the character *nan* 難 is typically read as “difficult,” but can also mean a “defect” or “criticism.” The character’s use here, I believe, is meant to encompass all three meanings—difficulty with the text due to its defects, which lead to a need for criticism. This would be all well and good, if not for the fact that there is no evidence to suggest Ryōshun actually supplied the title or that criticizing *Taiheiki* was his primary theme.¹⁸ In fact, his first mention of *Taiheiki* arrives about one third of the way through; the other two-thirds of *Nan Taiheiki* focus on the need for accurate history and Ryōshun’s criticisms of Yoshimitsu and attempts at absolving himself of responsibility for

15 *Taiheiki* might best be described as a proto-polyphonic text, to borrow Bakhtin’s notion. See Bakhtin 2009 and Bakhtin 1984.

16 Given that most extant versions of *Taiheiki* are roughly forty chapters and all end with the succession of Yoshimitsu, it is highly likely that it would have been completed by the time of the death of Kojima in 1374, though earlier versions (since it was written in stages), concluding around chapter 25, may have been completed by the onset of the Kannō Disturbance in 1350. There are many theories about the timing of the meeting between Tadayoshi and the two monks. For more, see: Koakimoto 2005, pp. 9–14.

17 “Both *tozama* and members of the Ashikaga held him [Hosokawa Yoriyuki] in high esteem, the latter cherishing him and the former submitting entirely to his orders. So the realm was at peace. How auspicious!” For more on *shūgen*, see Yamashita 1997, p. 131; Hyōdō 1989 pp. 18–22.

18 It seems that the title was only fixed in the sixteenth century when *Taiheiki* enjoyed considerable popularity. Associating the work that would come to be known as *Nan Taiheiki* to *Taiheiki* gave it a stable identity. Needless to say, the Imagawa would not want the title to intimate criticism of the Ashikaga, who remained in power, if only nominally, throughout much of the sixteenth century. Wada 2015, p. 53; Hasegawa 1998b, p. 80.

his role in the Ōei Rebellion. If we abandon expectations set forth by the title, we are left to wonder whether criticizing *Taiheiki* is Ryōshun's purpose. As we shall see, criticism of *Taiheiki* was but one aspect of a more complex series of motivations.

Nan Taiheiki does not have chapter or section titles, making it a difficult read and more akin to a work of the “following the brush” (*zuibitsu* 隨筆) genre, or even, perhaps, a house law (*kahō* 家法), given the didactic nature of Ryōshun's exhortations.¹⁹ Its lack of clarity does not preclude thematic cohesion, however. Three major themes stand out, allowing us to break *Nan Taiheiki* into three parts.²⁰ Part one is Ryōshun's delineation of Ashikaga and Imagawa family history. Part two is Ryōshun's critique of *Taiheiki*. And part three is a criticism of Ashikaga Yoshimitsu's despotism as well as a justification for Ryōshun's role in the Ōei Disturbance.²¹

The standard interpretation is that Ryōshun's primary goal in writing *Nan Taiheiki* was to demonstrate the Imagawa family's contribution to the Ashikaga by securing *Taiheiki*'s revision, or, barring that, at least ensuring that his descendants knew of those contributions. However, the title has led to an emphasis on Ryōshun's criticism of *Taiheiki* even though his need to censure Yoshimitsu's despotism and absolve himself of responsibility for his role in Ōuchi Yoshihiro's rebellion were equally pressing.²² In the following sections, I discuss each of his primary motivations in more detail.

Nan Taiheiki Part One

Ryōshun begins by explaining the importance of history, writing, “We barely know about the world of our fathers and even less about two or three generations prior. My descendants thus run the risk of becoming lowly people like those subjects without name or rank. For this reason, I will record the few things I know”; he also claims that he will record “only those things that can be verified or that I have personally seen.”²³ At the heart of his motivation to write *Nan Taiheiki*, then, was fear for his family's survival. In other words, we might say Ryōshun was trying to write an alternate history that prioritized his family. This required him to establish his credibility as an historian, for only by establishing this position could he attack *Taiheiki*'s deficiencies and criticize Yoshimitsu's despotism.²⁴

Warrior understanding of history was primarily based on the role individuals and families played in political and military events. Indeed, Ryōshun himself places more importance on *Taiheiki* as a repository of warrior deeds than on the main storyline.²⁵ The sheer number of *Taiheiki* variants both attests to the desire of warrior families to be included in the text, and also reflects the importance they placed on their participation in major

19 Matsuo 2001, pp. 104–105.

20 Hasegawa 2003, pp. 11–12, 86; Ichizawa 2002, p. 51. Wada parses the text more discretely, using the topic headings I have used but lettering them A-H. Nevertheless, he comes to the same conclusion: for Ryōshun the primary goals were establishing his credibility as an historian for his descendants, and, later, his criticism of Yoshimitsu. Wada 2015, pp. 86–88, 93.

21 Wada 2015, p. 90.

22 For lack of an accepted alternative, I will continue referring to *Nan Taiheiki* as such.

23 Hasegawa 2006, pp. 407–408.

24 Wada 2015, pp. 88, 93.

25 “The overall storyline is not wrong, but there are many falsehoods about the merit of various individuals.” Hasegawa 2006, p. 423.

events and the role that fame played in family survival.²⁶ Ryōshun's failure to have *Taiheiki* amended to reflect the role of his family was one factor motivating him to write *Nan Taiheiki*.

An individual wishing to ensure family survival had first to reaffirm the significance of their family to the Ashikaga, and in this way inextricably link the two in the minds of readers. It should come as no surprise, then, that the first section of *Nan Taiheiki* asserts the importance of the Minamoto bloodline and the divine signs that establish the Ashikaga's belonging to it.²⁷ Minamoto lineage was an almost necessary component of lordship in the minds of warriors.²⁸ Hence, it is nearly inevitable that Ryōshun would begin with Minamoto history and the Ashikaga's place therein.²⁹ As we shall see, this recognition is integral to understanding the last third of *Nan Taiheiki*, where Ryōshun attempts to explain his decision to rebel not in terms of rebellion against the Ashikaga clan but against its leader, Yoshimitsu.

We can summarize the first section of *Nan Taiheiki* as an attempt at three things: first, asserting the importance of accurate history; second, establishing Ryōshun's credibility as an historian; and third, affirming the link between the Minamoto, the Ashikaga, and the Imagawa lineages. These three aspects underpin both his subsequent criticisms of *Taiheiki* and of Yoshimitsu.

Nan Taiheiki Part Two

Ryōshun's criticism of *Taiheiki* is not about its overall storyline, but about "write-ins" (*kakiire* 書き入れ), which served mainly to glorify the deeds of warriors who participated in the events that comprised the main narrative. By the time Ryōshun wrote *Nan Taiheiki* the Ashikaga's victory vis-à-vis the Southern court was obvious, and so his acceptance of the narrative suggests it was a mostly accurate depiction of the Ashikaga's path to power. It was, instead, *kakiire* that were important for Ryōshun and his peers, since they proved an individual's or family's contribution to the Ashikaga's cause. Consider the following passage:

The deeds of countless have been subsequently added [to *Taiheiki*] because many desired to have their exploits written into the narrative. As a result both those of great valor and those whose names have simply been added as part of a group have been included; surely there are also some who have been omitted entirely.

We can surmise from this that not everybody who fought in the wars had their deeds recorded, and that the *kakiire* did not always meet the approval of those who requested

26 It comes as no surprise that *Taiheiki* has over 100 variants. Many powerful families, including but not limited to the Maeda 前田, Imagawa, Hosokawa 細川, Sasaki 佐々木, and the Hōjō 北条, possessed copies of the text, which either originally or subsequently prioritized their roles in the events.

27 For instance, Ryōshun begins his praise of the Ashikaga with the following: "When he was given his first bath, two doves appeared: one alighted on his left shoulder and the other on the handle of the ladle. Upon Tadayoshi's birth, two doves appeared, landing on the edge of the ladle and the mouth of the water basin. This was not revealed at the time out of respect for the previous regime. Many have spoken of this since the rule of the Ashikaga began."

28 Shidachi 2008, p. 67.

29 Wada 2008, p. 55.

them.³⁰ *Taiheiki* is replete with names but relatively few get anything more than a simple nod to their participation, as Ryōshun complains. This is the case with the Imagawa, who are mentioned only forty-four times throughout *Taiheiki*, and with relatively little detail, despite what Ryōshun considered his family's major contributions to the Ashikaga's efforts.³¹ Hence, *Nan Taiheiki* reminded readers of the Imagawa's pivotal role in the events of the fourteenth century, and, perhaps, lead to *Taiheiki*'s eventual revision.³²

For scholars of *Taiheiki*, part two has attracted most interest for a few reasons. First, Ryōshun accuses *Taiheiki*'s authors of being "Southern court partisans (*miyagata shinjū no mono* 官方深重の者)." What prompted this outburst is *Taiheiki*'s assertion that Ashikaga Takauji surrendered to Emperor Go-Daigo. This is likely why Ryōshun believed *Taiheiki* had a Southern court bias. Drawing attention to this was doubly beneficial for Ryōshun: it displayed his allegiance to the Ashikaga while establishing his own reliability as an historian by attacking *Taiheiki*. Furthermore, clarifying whether Takauji in fact surrendered was important, as Ryōshun argues that Takauji planned to turn against the Hōjō-led Kamakura shogunate from the beginning, and that his "surrender" to Go-Daigo was merely an expedient designed to avoid a hard fight before turning on the Hōjō. To Ryōshun, this did not qualify as actual surrender and therefore should not have been recorded as such.³³ Hence, by drawing attention to this shortcoming Ryōshun was here strengthening the Ashikaga's claim to authority and his allegiance to them, as well as displaying his attention to detail, which would serve him well in his attempts to have *Taiheiki* revised.³⁴

The second reason is the passage describing how Ashikaga Tadayoshi met with the monks Gen'e and Echin and commanded *Taiheiki* to be sealed away until such time as the narrative could be revised.³⁵ The extent of Tadayoshi's proposed changes is unknowable, but given his growing animosity toward his brother Takauji and the Kō family during the years leading up to the Kannō Disturbance, it is plausible that Ryōshun wanted *Taiheiki* to reflect his vision of the events. That *Taiheiki* portrays Tadayoshi's primary foes the Kō brothers Moronao and Moroyasu as villains suggests that at least this aspect of *Taiheiki* was written with Tadayoshi in mind. Accordingly, we can conclude that the Ashikaga, or at least Tadayoshi's faction, had some sort of proprietary control over *Taiheiki*, at least until 1350 when Tadayoshi was preoccupied with the war against the Kō in the Kannō Disturbance. Although one scholar has expressed reservations about concluding that the Ashikaga's control over *Taiheiki* was absolute, Tadayoshi's involvement in the text's production and Ryōshun's request to the shogunate to revise the text strongly suggest that the Ashikaga had

30 Wada 2008, p. 55.

31 See chapter 3 in Hasegawa 1998b, p. 116.

32 At least one of Ryōshun's descendants, Imagawa Ujichika 今川氏親 (1473–1526), continued to seek revisions of *Taiheiki*'s narrative during the sixteenth century. Kami 1985, pp. 144–46.

33 Ryōshun most likely used a different copy of *Taiheiki*, since no extant version claims Takauji "surrendered." Kitamura 2010, pp. 5–21.

34 Interestingly, no extant version of *Taiheiki* claims that Takauji surrendered to Go-Daigo. We can deduce that Ryōshun was working with an incomplete version of the text or an altogether different one. Hence we can conclude that no canonical version of *Taiheiki* existed at the time of *Nan Taiheiki*'s writing; it was still being amended up through its completion around 1402, not only in terms of written requests, but also in terms of actual content.

35 "Tadayoshi judged that it [*Taiheiki*] contained many falsities and said, 'even a small sampling of this work reveals that it is full of mistakes. Much must be amended or eliminated. It is not to be shown to anyone until such changes are made.' These amendments were later abandoned." Hasegawa 2006, p. 422.

the final say.³⁶ Indeed, logic dictates that it would have been a small matter for Yoshimitsu or another member of the Ashikaga to order its revision.

From part two we can conclude that Ryōshun considered *Taiheiki* in error only insofar as it did not accurately record the deeds of warrior houses, particularly his own. In other words, *Taiheiki* became a sort of textual battleground for recording clan history via write-ins, and that *Nan Taiheiki* was Ryōshun's attempt at influencing that conflict.

Nan Taiheiki Part Three

The last third of *Nan Taiheiki* is a criticism of Ashikaga Yoshimitsu and an explanation of Ryōshun's role in the Ōei Disturbance. Ryōshun's criticism of *Taiheiki* takes up a good portion of *Nan Taiheiki* but is generally measured in its tone; this last section, however, is filled with bitterness and resentment toward Yoshimitsu. The vituperations Ryōshun launches at the then-retired shogun are so scathing as to suggest this section of the text is more important than any other. It is the tone of Ryōshun's criticism of Yoshimitsu that leads one to believe the title *Nan Taiheiki* to be misleading.

Ryōshun castigates Yoshimitsu for his biased governance, which compelled loyal men like himself to contemplate rebellion.³⁷ In truth, Yoshimitsu had been weeding out *shugo daimyo* capable of challenging him. For instance, Yoshimitsu had Yamana Ujikiyo 山名氏清 (1344–1392) and his nephew Mitsuyuki 満幸 (?–1395) take out the Toki family in 1390; the Yamana were in turn vanquished in the Meitoku Rebellion of 1391, a rebellion that Yoshimitsu himself fomented through subterfuge.³⁸ Yoshimitsu was a master manipulator, pursuing policies that encouraged those he wished to see humbled to revolt, and then getting other warriors to do the dirty work.

Ōuchi Yoshihiro, one of the great lords of Kyūshū, also fell victim to Yoshimitsu's machinations. Yoshihiro followed Ryōshun during the latter's attempts to conquer Kyūshū and contributed heavily to Yoshimitsu's victories, in particular to the symbolic victory over the Southern court in 1392. It was none other than Yoshihiro who convinced the Southern court to relinquish the imperial regalia.³⁹ Under Yoshihiro the Ōuchi were rewarded handsomely for their service to the Ashikaga, eventually gaining *shugo* rights over six provinces. This alone was enough to put the Ōuchi in Yoshimitsu's sights, but they committed a more egregious error: they grew prosperous through trade with the Korean peninsula, which rankled Yoshimitsu, who sought official trade with China and Korea, and would continue to do so up till his death in 1408.⁴⁰

Yoshihiro, like many of his *shugo* peers, was dissatisfied with Yoshimitsu's autocratic tendencies and was well aware of Yoshimitsu's tendency to undermine and sabotage his followers. Indeed, it even led him to convince Ryōshun to join him in rebellion. In addition to three specific grievances recorded in *Ōeiki* 応永記, it seems Yoshihiro had designs on

36 Ichizawa 2002, p. 55.

37 "Lately everyone seems to speak of some grudge against Yoshimitsu, yet his destiny is strong and his authority is absolute. Accordingly, if his administration was even slightly correct, who indeed would join their hearts with Lord Mitsukane?" Hasegawa 2008, p. 36.

38 Yasui 1985, pp. 78–87.

39 This was dubbed the "Meitoku Peace Accord" (*Meitoku no wayaku* 明德の和約). Yasui 1985, pp. 78–87.

40 Yoshimitsu's designs regarding trade with the mainland are discussed in detail in von Verschuer 2007.

the position of Kyūshū viceroy.⁴¹ When Yoshimitsu purportedly commanded Yoshihiro to donate materials for the construction of his famed *Kitayama tei* 北山邸, Yoshihiro balked at being forced to provide service beyond the battlefield. While it is plausible that this event alone was responsible for Yoshihiro's decision to rebel, it is more likely that it was Yoshimitsu's consistent reinforcement of his authority, often at the expense of *shugo daimyō* like Yoshihiro, that was at the root of the latter's frustration. Indeed, the conversation between Ryōshun and Yoshimitsu recorded in *Nan Taiheiki* seems to bear this opinion out.⁴² In any event, Yoshihiro's dissatisfaction would lead him to rebel in 1399, when he allied himself with the shogunal deputy in the east (*Kantō kubō*) Ashikaga Mitsukane. But the rebellion barely got off the ground before Yoshihiro died in battle. Shortly after Mitsukane also accepted defeat, going so far as to submit an apology to Mishima Shrine in Izu province, signaling a premature end to one of the last real challenges to Yoshimitsu's authority.⁴³

Ryōshun himself experienced Yoshimitsu's tyranny firsthand. Despite Ryōshun's overall success and demonstrations of allegiance, Yoshimitsu grew suspicious of his intent. Some sign of this can be seen in a document sent to Ryōshun in 1394 that acknowledged his position as the Ashikaga's representative but seriously curtailed his authority.⁴⁴ He was subsequently dismissed from his position as Kyūshū viceroy (*Kyūshū tandai* 探題) and recalled to Kyoto, where Yoshimitsu requisitioned half of his lands. It is tempting to see Ryōshun as the hero in this situation, since he had by all accounts acquitted himself well and loyally during his twenty-five year tenure in Kyūshū. However, Yoshimitsu is not necessarily to be blamed for being suspicious. Ryōshun was a famous general, administrator, and literatus, but also of a collateral family of the Ashikaga, affording him the necessary birthright for lordship. Add to that his control over Kyūshū, and he was in an excellent position to threaten Yoshimitsu's authority. Given the tendency for warriors to turn on their lords, surely Yoshimitsu was wisely wary of families such as the Yamana, Toki, and Ōuchi, and most of all Ryōshun, who had accumulated authority over Kyūshū and its trade with Korea, and vast symbolic capital in the process. *Shugo daimyō* like Ryōshun and Yoshihiro, however, saw Yoshimitsu's disregard for their aspirations and service as a form of despotism that hearkened back to the days of Emperor Go-Daigo.

In any event, Ryōshun's role in the Ōei Disturbance appears to have been minor. He acted as a go-between for Yoshihiro and Mitsukane and may have mustered troops.⁴⁵ However, in *Nan Taiheiki* Ryōshun rejects outright the notion that he rebelled, placing the blame for any unrest squarely on Yoshimitsu's shoulders. In other words, Ryōshun did not see himself as a rebel, and placed all responsibility on Yoshimitsu's maladministration. Certainly Ryōshun's dismissal from the position of Kyūshū viceroy and his loss of the province of Suruga were enough to impel any warrior in a similar position to consider rebellion.⁴⁶ Consider the following passage:

41 *Ōeiki*, pp. 303–304; Kawazoe 1964, pp. 221–28.

42 Hasegawa 2008, pp. 15–16.

43 Kawazoe 1964, p. 228.

44 Kawazoe 1964, pp. 208–11.

45 Kawazoe 1964, pp. 228–29.

46 Kawazoe 1964, pp. 208–21 and pp. 223–24.

When I consider the circumstances, I exerted myself in vain because I foolishly thought of past connections and duty, and I lament having wasted the honor and wealth I accrued over long years. The truth about my time in Kyūshū is simply that I did not know my place. Though I was not necessarily as favored by or as close as others to Yoshimitsu, I put my own concerns aside entirely and, having been ordered above all to pacify the West, entrusted myself to that decision, all because I thought only to do my duty for the Ashikaga. Not in their wildest dreams did my followers think that I would lose hundreds of relatives and housemen, my honor, and now even my hereditary lands as a result. Men ought to perform loyal service according to their rank, for others will become resentful of those who perform service above their station.⁴⁷

Most striking are the last two sentences where Ryōshun reveals the extent of his losses, lamenting the resentment he caused among his peers for his achievements. In particular, his loss of honor and the forfeiture of his hereditary lands were the fault of Yoshimitsu. Accordingly, his goal in part three is to recount Yoshimitsu's misdeeds, to justify Yoshihiro's (and his own) decision to make a stand, and to warn his descendants about the perils of maladministration. Overall, however, part three reveals that Ryōshun did not consider himself a rebel; he believed himself loyal to the Ashikaga, though not to the despot Yoshimitsu.

There is much more to be said about the saga of the Ōei Rebellion, but this short introduction should suffice for understanding that Ryōshun's motivation for writing *Nan Taiheiki* was not simply due to his disapproval of *Taiheiki*, but also his desire to reveal Yoshimitsu's despotism and elucidate the circumstances behind his participation in the Ōei Rebellion.⁴⁸

Conclusion

There were then three factors that impelled Ryōshun to write *Nan Taiheiki*. The first was to outline the near divine right of the Minamoto and their branch line the Ashikaga, and thus the legitimacy of the Imagawa. The second was to reveal *Taiheiki*'s failure to record the role of the Imagawa, and specifically that of his father Norikuni and brother Noriuji, in the Ashikaga's march to power. The third was to criticize Ashikaga Yoshimitsu and explain why he, or anyone for that matter, would be justified by participating in Ōuchi Yoshihiro's rebellion. Underpinning all three factors is Ryōshun's fear for his family's survival, the key to which was accurate history, which required him to establish himself as an authoritative historian in his own right. Only thus could he level criticism at *Taiheiki* for its flaws, which he undoubtedly hoped would result in its revision. *Taiheiki*'s lack of Imagawa coverage was akin to effacing them from the historical record, and Yoshimitsu's decisions dishonored Ryōshun, weakening his authority vis-à-vis his peers. Hence, it was not simply a desire to criticize *Taiheiki* that prompted Ryōshun to pick up the brush, but a desire to preserve his family's social standing and ensure their survival.

To return to the problem of the work's title, *Nan Taiheiki* is a critique to be sure, but one that has been misunderstood. The title has led to an undue focus on *Taiheiki* when

⁴⁷ Hasegawa 2008, p. 40.

⁴⁸ Sather 2015.

in fact the criticism of Yoshimitsu's rule in the third section would appear to be the most significant aspect of the text, with parts one and two helping to construct the basis for Ryōshun's argument. Hence, if we must persist in calling the work by its current title, we should at least recognize that Ryōshun's criticism of *Taiheiki* is at best the axis around which two other major goals—restoration of family honor and, most importantly, criticism of Yoshimitsu—revolved.

A Note on the Introduction and Translation

I have relied primarily on the original *Nan Taiheiki* contained in the *Gunsho ruijū*, which contains no section titles or breaks of any kind, and Hasegawa Tadashi's reprint and translation of Arai Hakuseki's 新井白石 (1657–1725) *Jōkyō sannenban* version of *Nan Taiheiki*, which contains not only the section titles but also Arai's annotations. I have used the latter only where the original exhibits ambiguities.⁴⁹ However, an online facsimile of the *Gunsho ruijū Nan Taiheiki* is also available, providing a useful comparison where there are slight discrepancies between the two texts, usually regarding place names or other discrepancies.⁵⁰ I, like Hasegawa, find Hakuseki's version valuable because of his attempt to give some semblance of order to the work. My own broad divisions—parts one, two, and three—are based on an understanding of the text indebted to Hakuseki's and the interpretations of Hasegawa and Wada Takuma.⁵¹

Regarding names, it was common in medieval Japan to refer to individuals by their court titles or the location of their domiciles. This, however, can be confusing for the modern reader. Accordingly, when possible I refer to all individuals by their actual names as opposed to their titles, footnoting the latter.

Last, due to the length of *Nan Taiheiki*, I have chosen to divide this translation in two parts, the second of which will be published in next year's *Japan Review*. The next issue will contain part three of *Nan Taiheiki* with a short introduction.

49 Extant versions of *Nan Taiheiki* include the *Sonkeikaku bunkobon* 尊經閣文庫本, the *Tanimura bunkobon* 谷村文庫本, and the *Tawa bunkobon* 多和文庫本.

50 Hasegawa 2006; Hasegawa 2008; Hanafusa 2009. Alternatively, *Nan Taiheiki* is located in book 938 of *Gunsho ruijū*, in the “Battles” section (*kassenbu* 合戦部).

51 Wada 2015.

Nan Taiheiki or Criticisms of Taiheiki

Part One

Concerning One's Ancestors

The fool is one who does not know even his own heart. It is not that he does not understand, for example, regret, desire, hatred, or love and the like. No, what I mean is that he ought to wonder what sort of thing it is, the heart that has such feelings. Moreover, one should know what sort of people one's parents were and the life they lived in this world. I do not know about others, as for myself, I know nothing of events that occurred before my father's time; and remember little of the stories he would tell of the past. Considering this, my children and grandchildren will understand even less of their father than I do of mine.

There once was a man named Yamana Tokiuji 山名時氏. He was the father of Ujikiyo, who was slain in the battle of Uchino during the Meitoku years.⁵² He always used to say within earshot of the children:

My descendants will surely become enemies of the court. After the Kenmu years I became someone of note thanks to his lordship Takauji, but prior to the Genkō years (1331–1333) I was a mere commoner⁵³ in a place called Yamana, in Kōzuke province.⁵⁴ Thus did I experience how lamentable this world can be and come to know my place. I was also acquainted with the tribulations of war. I was grateful for the shogun's support. I have tried to be careful of my comportment. But nowadays even I have a tendency to be disrespectful of superiors and look down on others. When the children are grown they will know neither their lord's nor their parent's blessing. They will let their desires reign, and, putting themselves and their own glory first, will earn the shogun's mistrust.

As Tokiuji predicted, those children became traitors.⁵⁵ The people of the past understood quite well the way the world works, did they not? Tokiuji was astute, even though he was entirely unlettered.

As for myself, when I was young I did not think much of my father's stories, believing them to be annoying. But considering them now, not a single thing he said has proven false. After I have passed away my children will certainly come to realize this too, though I have grown old and senile and to them I must seem like a newborn babe. Thus I record here some of the things my father said. I abbreviate what I cannot remember entirely, recording only that which I remember exactly or that which is verifiable.

52 Ujikiyo was the fourth son of Tokiuji. Ryōshun uses Ujikiyo's title, the Governor of Mutsu (Mutsu no Kami 陸奥守), in reference to the Meitoku Rebellion of 1391. Ashikaga Yoshimitsu feared the Yamana, who were lords of one sixth of the total private manors throughout Japan, and set out to weaken them, a ploy that ended with a Yamana revolt. Ujikiyo was slain by Isshiki Akinori (1340?–1406) on 1391.02.30.

53 *Hyakushō* 百姓 means “the hundred surnames” or commoners, provincials who held an obligation to pay taxes, had a surname, and who had not attained the fifth court rank or above. For a definition of the term, see Conlan 2003, pp. 253–43.

54 The *Gunsho ruijū* version refers to this place as Yamana, while Arai's *Teikyō* version calls it Yamaishi.

55 Referring again to Ujikiyo.

Concerning the Two Children in the Age of the Gods

In the age of the kami it is said there were but two children. But they had many descendants, some of whom would become lords, some ministers, and others subjects and commoners. Those who were of low birth and without use to the state tilled the fields or served their betters, in this way becoming without name or rank. Even in the current age we know little about the world of our fathers and almost nothing about two or three generations back, and so my descendants run the risk of becoming mere subjects with neither name nor rank. Thus I will record the few things that I know.

Concerning the Descendants of Hachiman Tarō Minamoto Yoshiie, and Taking the Realm

Lord Hachiman refers to Lord Yoshiie, the governor of Mutsu and the shogun in the north. From his son Yoshikuni issued Yoshiyasu, Yoshikane, Yoshiuji, and Yasuuji.⁵⁶ Yoriuji, called Lord Jibu Daisuke, was his son, and Yoriuji's child was Ietoki, the governor of Iyo province. Ietoki's child was Sadauji, called the lay governor of Sanuki, whose children were Takauji and Tadayoshi. Although Yoriuji was the third son of Lord Hiraishi, he succeeded to the headship of the house. And though the folk of Owari (the Shiba) and the Shibukawa were his elder brothers, they became secondary sons (*shoshi* 庶子). As for the Hosokawa and Hatakeyama, it seems that they split off from Yoshikane.

Yoshikane was a large man and superior in strength.⁵⁷ He was the son of Tametomo, but Yoshiyasu raised Yoshikane from the time he was a child and kept him hidden from society, thus keeping his birthright secret.⁵⁸ Since he was closely related to Yoritomo,⁵⁹ Yoshikane maintained his privacy and feigned insanity. In this way he passed his life in safety. He claimed he would surely become a spirit for the sake of his descendants, or so it is said. [Minamoto no] Yoshiie also wrote in his will that he would be reborn as his seventh descendant to claim the realm. This corresponds to Ietoki's era. But Ietoki seems to have believed that the time had not yet come [for action], so he prayed to the Bodhisattva Hachiman to decrease his lifespan and instead claim the realm within three generations. So saying, he cut open his belly. I have seen the details of this document myself. In fact, their lordships Takauji and Tadayoshi have seen it, as has my father and others [of the Imagawa]. Both Takauji and Tadayoshi claimed that it was Ietoki's one wish that they should take the realm. Thus it was not simply their own wish that they become masters of the realm but the will of their ancestors. However, someone must have seen a genealogy and his lordship Yoshiakira that the ancestors of the Imagawa family were of the elder brother's line of the

56 Yoshiie was General for Pacification of the North (*Chinjuifu shōgun* 鎮守府將軍). For an excellent overview of this position and its importance to the Southern court, see chapter 3 in Mori 1988.

57 Ryōshun writes that “Yoshikane was roughly eight *shaku* tall and superior in strength” (*Somosomo Yoshikane wa take hasshaku amari nite, chikarabito ni suguretamaishi nari* 抑義兼は長八尺余にて、力人に勝給しなり). By *shaku* measurements (30.3 centimeters or 11.93 inches) this would equate to nearly eight feet tall! It is hard to credit this, but other sources seem to confirm his exceptional size. The *Imagawa-ki* lists Yoshikane as nine *shaku*, while the *Hōgen monogatari* lists Tametomo as around seven *shaku*. The latter seems plausible. In any event, I have chosen to ignore specifics here. Hasegawa 2006, p. 414.

58 Minamoto no Tametomo is the famous archer who appears in *Hōgen monogatari*.

59 Minamoto no Yoritomo's official title is given as *Udaishō* 右大將, or the Captain of the Right Guards. It is no surprise that Yoshikane would desire to remain out of sight, for Yoritomo went as far as to kill his brother Yoshitsune in order to secure his lordship. Tametomo was Yoritomo's uncle. The two fought together in the Hōgen Disturbance, but those times were long past—any issue of the Minamoto line could potentially threaten Yoritomo's rule, making Yoshikane's concealment a prudent decision.

Ashikaga.⁶⁰ He was infuriated, and later must have spoken of this to others.⁶¹ Someone must have told him of this later.

Who in all of Japan has not felt the benevolence of the Ashikaga after they became masters of the realm? This is especially true of our house; indeed, we are most grateful. Lord Tadayoshi always said: “Never think to establish yourself through your house. Become skilled in the literary arts and be of assistance to the shogun. One should establish oneself through virtuous conduct.”⁶² Lord Tadafuyu,⁶³ when he was still known as Kunai Daisuke, taught this to Hatakeyama Naomune 畑山直宗, Isshiki Naouji 一色直氏, and me.⁶⁴ Others undoubtedly heard this too.

Concerning the Lineage of the Imagawa Family

Our ancestors were known as the Kira from the time of Yoshiuji’s son Nagauji Kōzuke no Kami. His child was Mitsuiji, and after his younger brother Kuniuji we came to be called the Imagawa. Sadayoshi Kōzuke Nyūdō, whose Buddhist name was Shōkan, and my grandfather Motouji were cousins. Kira Mitsuyoshi Uhyōemon and my father were third cousins. As the Sekiguchi, Irino, and the Kida were the offspring of Kuniuji, they are the descendants of my grandfather’s younger brothers, in other words, the children of my father’s cousin.

Motouji alone inherited the name Imagawa. The Sekiguchi were of their mother’s line, the Ogasawara, and inherited the chieftainship from them. The Irino of Aki province were of the Miura and Ōtawa families, and came to be called the Irino after receiving a parcel of land [with that name] from their mother. Among the Imagawa they are called the Kawabata Imagawa. Motouji had many sisters, all of whom married members of the court; their children were called the Ishikawa Imagawa or the Nagoya. They became Motouji’s foster children and were the same as siblings to him. Thus during the Kenmu years he requested Takauji make them a family unto themselves. I have heard that there is a place in Ise called Soga, said to belong to Motouji’s sister’s husband, who is called Ishikawa Sanmi Kō. His father is the son of Hōshi no Miya. Though the father of Isshiki Shōsuke Tarō Nyūdō Tadauji was a mountain ascetic (*yamabushi* 山伏), he became the husband of Motouji’s sister. He was my father’s uncle, making his child, Isshiki Nyūdō, my father’s cousin.

Concerning the Donation of Imagawa Manor to Shōhōin

During the time of *Sama Nyūdō* Yoshiuji, Imagawa manor was given to Nagauji as a single-generation inheritance when he was a youth. But when the shogunate decreed that the chieftain of Kira manor would decide its fate, discord arose between Motouji and the Kira as a result. My father made an accord with Jōkan Kōzuke no kami Sadayoshi, sealing a

60 Ashikaga Yoshiakira (1330–1367), Takauji’s son.

61 Presumably because such information would give the Imagawa claim to lordship.

62 Tadayoshi’s official title here is *Nishiki kōji dono* 鋪小路殿, or Lord *Nishiki kōji*, the street where Tadayoshi’s mansion was located.

63 Tadafuyu was the estranged first son of Takauji. Later Tadafuyu allied with his uncle Tadayoshi and fought against Takauji in the Kannō Disturbance of 1350–1352. He was a powerful force in Kyūshū, using his lineage to raise troops and assist his uncle.

64 Each individual is provided a title: Hatakeyama Naomune is Hatakeyama *ōkura shōyū* Naomune 畠山大藏少輔直宗 and Isshiki Naouji is *Isshiki kunai shōyū* Naouji 一色宫内少輔直氏.

father-son pact and thereby preventing further conflict.⁶⁵ I inherited this land and became its lord.

The Zen monk Bukkai of Tōfukuji was my teacher. Consequently, I donated the land in perpetuity to the prelate of Shōhōin.⁶⁶ We were mostly on good terms, since he was the uncle of the man called Takagi Nyūdō, who was *mandokoro* 政所 from the time our ancestors first ruled over Imagawa manor.⁶⁷ I commended it for seven generations for the repose of my parents. If, however, one of my descendants holds a fondness for their name lands, they should direct a request to the shogun and exchange it for private lands that have or are certain to have a large income. If it is allowed, do as the prelate of Shōhōin wishes. Use this document as proof.

Concerning the Birth of Ashikaga Takauji and Tadayoshi

I left much out when I previously wrote of his lordship Takauji, so I shall continue now. When he was given his first bath, two doves appeared. One alighted on his left shoulder and the other on the handle of the ladle.⁶⁸ Upon Tadayoshi's birth, two doves appeared, landing on the edge of the ladle and the mouth of the water basin. This was not revealed at the time out of respect for the previous regime.⁶⁹ Many have spoken of this since the rule of the Ashikaga began.

Concerning Takauji's Entry into the Capital and the Miracle at Mikawa

A strange event occurred when Takauji was coming to the capital during the Genkō years. When we arrived at Hachibashi in Mikawa province on a night when there were none in attendance, a woman dressed in white robes came before Takauji and said, "If your descendants do no wrong, they shall be protected for seven generations. As proof, each time you set out for war there shall be rain and wind." So saying, she disappeared as if a dream. From then on Takauji secretly harbored thoughts of rebellion, and using Uesugi Hyōgō Nyūdō as messenger he sent word first to Kira Kōzuke Zenmon.⁷⁰ He replied, "I thought you would never make up your mind. This is most auspicious." Afterward Takauji conferred with many people.

It is likely that Uesugi Hyōgō Nyūdō had suggested this [to Takauji] in secret from the time they set out from Kantō. Uesugi exerted himself to the utmost and perished at the

65 Norikuni, Ryōshun's father, became the adopted son of Kira Sadayoshi 吉良貞義, the governor of Kazusa province and chief administrator of the Kira house. According to Hasegawa, Norikuni was referred to as Ashikaga Kazusa Tarō Nyūdō in 1332.11 in a document from the Shizuoka prefecture histories as a result of this pact. More importantly, as part of the agreement, Norikuni's sons Noriuji, Yasunori, and Norimasa alternated service as vice governor of Kazusa with the Kira family. Hasegawa 2006, p. 416, note 35.

66 Shōhōin was a sub temple of Tōfukuji.

67 During the Muromachi shogunate, the *mandokoro* was the office of finance and processing of fiefs. Beginning in 1379 members of the Ise clan held the position of chief of the *mandokoro*. This change occurred after Hosokawa Yoriyuki was forced to resign from the position of *kanrei* in what is called the *Kōryaku no seihen* 康暦の政変, or the Political Disturbance of the Kōryaku Era. The anti-Yoriyuki forces, led by the Shiba family, succeeded in forcing Yoshimitsu to remove Yoriyuki, who was replaced by Shiba Yoshimasa. An overview of this event can be found in Satō 1990, pp. 137–39.

68 Doves were considered the servants of Hachiman. To have them land on the two boys was to proclaim them as true descendants of the Minamoto, ready to fulfill the destiny set forth by Ietoki, who wanted to take the realm within three generations. See Hasegawa 2006, p. 420.

69 That is, the Hōjō and the Kamakura shogunate.

70 Uesugi Norifusa, his mother's uncle, and Kira Sadayoshi, assumed to be the same Sadayoshi from earlier.

Battle of Kawara, perhaps because Takauji had trusted him alone with the knowledge of Ietoki and Sadauji's plan.⁷¹ He was the grandfather of Uesugi Nakatsukasa Nyūdō.⁷²

Part Two

Concerning *Taiheiki's* Many Errors

Taiheiki records that Takauji surrendered to the previous emperor [Go-Daigo] after General Nagoe was slain at the Battle of Rokuhara.⁷³ What nonsense! The author of this work must have been a partisan of the Southern court to write such a baseless fabrication. It is the height of impudence and should be deleted.

This *Taiheiki* is full of errors and untruths, is it not? Many years ago Reverend Echin of Hosshōji first brought a thirty-scroll version of the work to Tōjiji, which was shown to Tadayoshi,⁷⁴ who had Dharma Seal Gen'e read it aloud [to him]. Tadayoshi judged that it contained many falsities and said, "There is an outrageous number of mistakes in even a small sampling of this work. There is much that should be amended or expunged. It is not to be shown to anyone until such changes are made." Later, his orders [to that effect] were suspended. But recently work has begun anew. So many desired to have their exploits included in the narrative that in the course of the revisions an enormous number of individuals have been included. As a result, [the work now includes] both those of great valor and those whose names have simply been included as part of a group; surely there are also some who have been omitted entirely.

The age of the shogun has continued and people selfishly report things without a shred of evidence about events even of the last thirty or forty years. I would like [*Taiheiki*] to be corrected before the elders who lived during that time pass away. *Heike monogatari* was written using real records such as *Gotokuki*, but even that work surely contains errors.⁷⁵ Without question eighty or ninety percent of *Taiheiki* is false. The overall storyline is not wrong, but there are many falsehoods about the merits of various individuals. Moreover, as is clear from Dharma Seal Gen'e's reading of the work before Tadayoshi, there are errors in the text even though the aforementioned Echin of Hosshōji witnessed most of the events of the time. My complaints are not groundless.

71 The Battle of Kawara is detailed in chapter 15 of *Taiheiki*. See vol. 2 of Hasegawa 1998a.

72 Yorimune was at the time of *Nan Taiheiki's* writing the deputy of the eastern shogun, or the *Kantō kanrei*.

73 Emperor Go-Daigo is often referred to as *sentei* 先帝, or former emperor, in this and other works, most notably *Taiheiki*. How authors refer to Go-Daigo is often an indicator of their political leaning. He succeeded the throne (*chōso* 重祚), though this was seen as illegitimate in the eyes of the Northern court partisans, who considered him to have been legitimate only during his time as emperor under the terms of the Bunpō Compromise of 1317. Ōmori Kitayoshi discusses the importance of the term *sentei*, particularly as it relates to the narrative of *Taiheiki*, in Ōmori 1988, pp. 72–105.

74 Here referred to as Nishikikōji dono 錦小路殿.

75 The work *Gotokuki* 後徳記 is not extant, but this may be a reference to Gotokudaiji Sanesada's 後徳大寺実定 (1139–1191) *Teikaishō* 庭槐抄, also known as *Sanesada kōki* 実定公記 or *Kairinki* 槐林記. See Hasegawa 2006, p. 425.

Concerning Takauji's Flight to Kyūshū and
Those Who Accompanied Him Being Omitted from *Taiheiki*

There were many who accompanied Takauji on the retreat [to Kyūshū] but whose names are undoubtedly not recorded in *Taiheiki*.⁷⁶ Is this not unfortunate for their descendants? Inaccuracies should be amended using the documents of various houses. All sections including famous deeds are open to criticism. People of Hosokawa Awa no Kami's generation said that mistakes were present in his *Musōki* 夢想記, even though he intended to avoid personal bias.⁷⁷ I am told there are those who gained fame in various battles on the way to Kyoto from Kyūshū, though they are not recorded in [*Taiheiki*].

Concerning the Muster at Shinomura Hachiman Shrine and the Presentation of Prayer

Taiheiki records that Hikuda Myōgen wrote out a prayer when banners were raised at Shinomura Hachiman Shrine. At the same time, the Ashikaga brothers dedicated an arrow to the shrine.⁷⁸ Two followers performed this task: the first was Isshiki Uma no Suke, and the second was Imagawa Nakatsukasa Daisuke. This is a matter of some detail, and those who were not directly transmitted this knowledge might be mistaken. Should such a fact not be included in *Taiheiki*? Nakatsukasa Daisuke was my elder brother Noriuji.

Concerning a Poem That Should be in *Taiheiki*

There is a satirical verse:

The Hosokawa flows with the Imagawa,
splitting the Horiguchi from the Nitta.⁷⁹

The following amusing verse was included in *Heike monogatari*:

Ah, the lay priest, wrapping his head
with a white cloth instead of red.⁸⁰

76 Ryōshun speaks of the Ashikaga's retreat to Kyūshū after Nitta Yoshisada and Kitabatake Akiie defeated Takauji's forces in Kyoto in January of 1336. For an account of this event see chapter 15 of *Taiheiki*, especially the episode *Shogun miyako ochiru koto ni tsuite Yakushimaru kikyō no koto* 將軍都落事付薬師丸帰京事.

77 This was supposedly Hosokawa Kazuui's work. It may even be that the Hosokawa allowed *Taiheiki*'s authors to use this work as a reference. Hasegawa 2006, p. 427.

78 Such arrows, called *uwaya* 上矢, were ceremonial and often included in one's quiver. They were typically *kaburaya* 鎗矢 or *karimata* 雁股 arrows, and used for dedications at temples and shrines. *Kaburaya*, or "turnip head arrow," were often shot at the beginning of battles to herald their onset, and whistled as they sailed over the battlefield. The tips of *karimata*, or "goose crotch," were pronged and often used to cut off the legs of birds and other small game.

79 *Imagawa ni/Hosokawa soite idenureba/Horiguchi kirete/Nitta nagaruru* 今川に細川そひて出ぬれば堀口きれて新田流るる. The meaning of the poem seems to be that the Imagawa and Hosokawa are allies and defeat the Horiguchi, allies of the Nitta, by cutting through them literally or metaphorically. Arai Hakuseki's footnote indicates that this individual is Horiguchi Sadamitsu (1297–1338), a follower of Nitta Yoshisada. Hasegawa 2006, p. 429.

80 The priest removed the red cloth from his head when the Heike were expelled from the capital, replacing it with the white of the Genji, smoothly changing his allegiance. This comes from chapter 33 of *Genpei seisuiiki* 源平盛衰記. Hasegawa 2006, p. 429.

Since the latter was included [in *Heike monogatari*], why not add the former [to *Taiheiki*] if it would do honor to the descendants of those folk? Hosokawa refers to none other than Hosokawa Jōzen.⁸¹

Concerning Norikuni's Blade *Happaō* and its Naming

The former emperor was on Mt. Hiei when Takauji was encamped at Tōji temple. Imperial forces blocked all four directions, making it difficult for our allies to stay provisioned: to the east lay Amida Peak; to the south, the Uji Road; to the west, Oi no Yama; and to the north, Nagasakaguchi. A general was dispatched to each, and our foes were thrown back. My father went to Amida Peak, fighting battles at Suō and Imahie. Though victorious, he was shot in the left shoulder. Two or three days later he also accompanied the forces sent to Shinomiya Kawara, removing his left shoulder plate on account of the wound. Initially Niki Yoshinaga 仁木義長 (?–1376), who is currently known as Ukyō Tayū, was at Sakaguchi.⁸² When my father went to Megurijizō by way of Miidera Road, Yoshinaga said to him: “Today we shall fight without retreating.” My father replied, “Naturally.”

In the two battles on the final day, a powerful mounted warrior named Aisō of Ise province came up from Aisakate by himself as Niki retreated.⁸³ My father did not see Aisō, for he was engaged in battle to the front. [Aisō] unhorsed Lord Aki Nyūdō, hacking through his face guard. Noruji was nearby, and Aisō slashed off his quiver of war arrows. At that moment my father swung his mount around and instinctively struck at Aisō, sundering his helmet. Aisō flattened himself against his horse's neck and parried [the next blow], whereupon my father slashed through Aisō's forearm guard before he disappeared into the forward ranks of foes. The battle then concluded.

Tonomura Heizō, a houseman of my father acquainted with Aisō, said that he later showed him the helmet and face guard, saying “What sort of blade was Lord Imagawa's that it could split my battle-tested helmet and face guard, cutting right into my helmet cloth and wounding me? I was dizzied and had to retreat!” From then on my father called that sword *Happaō*, which, he said, was because it combined the words for the top of the helmet (*hachi* 鉢) and helmet cloth (*hachimaki* 鉢巻).⁸⁴ Noriujū desired this sword and forearm guard and inherited them. The sword was forged by Kuniyoshi.⁸⁵

81 Since Hosokawa Jōzen was one of the famous warlords of the fourteenth century, appearing on several occasions throughout *Taiheiki*, it follows that including him in relation to Ryōshun and his father was a way of asserting the importance of their alliance with the Hosokawa for the eventual victory of the Ashikaga.

82 Niki Yoshinaga is typically counted among the ostentatious and profligate daimyo of the period, often referred to using the pejorative *basara* 婆娑羅 or ostentation. These daimyo tried to meld their warrior upbringing with court culture in ways that were seen as aberrant. For an excellent overview of *basara*, see Hyōdō 1991.

83 This is a humorous bit that gives a sense of Ryōshun's wit: he slips this line in almost as an afterthought, pointing out that Niki retreated after telling his father he would not.

84 The sword is stylized using the homonym “Eighty Eight King” (*Happaō* 八々王), though, as Ryōshun recounts, the origin of the name is in the fact that his father's sword was so sharp that it cut through both Aisō's helmet and helmet cloth.

85 Kuniyoshi was a famous swordsmith of the Higo Enju school during the fourteenth century. Sesko 2010, p. 78.

Hosokawa and Imagawa's Difference of Opinion

In Kenmu 4 (1337), Lord Hosokawa [Jōzen] suggested to Tadayoshi that they die in battle when our forces lost the Battle of Suruga at Tegoshigawara.⁸⁶ His longtime follower Fuchibe said, "I shall perish before my lord!" Thereupon he rode into the enemy forces and was slain. No one else was able to follow him. Imagawa Nagoya Saburō Nyūdō died during this battle.

My father said, "This is not the right time to die. Retreat and gather your forces, for we shall certainly win in the next battle." [Tadayoshi] and those following him wheeled their horses about and retreated, whipping their mounts. My father remained there alone but the enemy did not appear, and once night fell he followed Tadayoshi's tracks to Okitsu (Shimizu) Station.

During the retreat to Kyūshū everyone had come to the decision to commit seppuku at a place called Uonomidō in Hyōgō province. Lord Hosokawa strongly urged that they should board the ship [that awaited them]. My father countered that they should cut their bellies open right there. Later Tadayoshi frequently spoke of this, saying, "Both times I had decided that the end had come, but each time these two were of differing opinions. I believe that the hearts of pure warriors ought to match⁸⁷; it puzzles me even now that [their opinions] differed."⁸⁸ This is no secret, so I wanted to request that it be included in *Taiheiki*. I have written of this here on the assumption that the shogun has given an order to that effect.⁸⁹

Concerning Imagawa Yorikuni's Death in Battle and Motouji's Children

Yorimoto⁹⁰ was the grand general (*taishō* 大將)⁹¹ of the Seaboard Road during the Nakasendai Disturbance.⁹² When he departed Kyoto for the front, he slew a Hōjō general

86 Ryōshun's recollection here would seem to be faulty, as this battle took place in 1335, or Kenmu 2. This battle is recounted in detail in the chapter 14 episode of *Taiheiki*, "Yahagi Sagisaka Tegoshigawara no tatakai." Hasegawa 1998a.

87 Only Hakuseki's version has the word "good warrior" (*yoki musha* 好き武者). All other variants have "pure" (*kijyoki musha* きよき武者). I believe this latter meaning more accurately accords with Tadayoshi's sober and judgmental personality, as the word "pure" has a moral component that the less precise "good" does not. Hasegawa 2006, p. 436, note 90.

88 These disagreements between two of Tadayoshi's loyal followers must have posed particularly difficult questions for Takauji's staid and moral younger brother. Ryōshun does not elaborate as to who was correct, but we can safely assume, given the respect he paid to his father, that he felt Jōzen was not.

89 This statement is a mystery, and highlights the difficulty of identifying the authoring process of *Taiheiki*. Over one hundred variants exist, and none of them, to my knowledge, has anything resembling a quote by Tadayoshi regarding what it meant to be a warrior. Ryōshun's plea, if it was ever even heard, seemingly fell on deaf ears.

90 Yorimoto, also known as Motokuni, is referred to in the text by his title, *Shikibu Tayū Nyūdō*. He was Ryōshun's uncle, also referred to as Yorikuni in the *Sonpi bunmyaku*. Hasegawa 2006, p. 439, notes 92–93, p. 460, note 3.

91 *Taishō* were generals appointed from notable families, typically Ashikaga collaterals, nobles, or imperial princes. Conlan 2003, p. 264.

92 The Nakasendai Disturbance, which occurred in 1335.07, was a failed uprising against Go-Daigo's Kenmu Imperium and Ashikaga. Led by Hōjō Tokiyuki, the nephew of Hōjō Takatoki, who was the final Kamakura *shikken*, the revolt lasted less than a month. Briefly, Tokiyuki expelled Tadayoshi from Kamakura. Takauji then marched, without Emperor Go-Daigo's permission, to the defense of Kamakura and his brother, quelling the disturbance and rewarding his warriors without Go-Daigo's permission, in effect establishing himself as independent of imperial authority. This is seen as one of the initial, and pivotal, events that led to the creation of the Kamakura-*fu*, or Kamakura outpost, and the Muromachi shogunate itself. For more on the Nakasendai Disturbance, see Sakata 2012.

named Nagoe in the mountains at Saya in Tōtōmi province. Since the enemy had fortified themselves at Yumoto in Sagami province, Yorimoto's forces ascended the northern mountains and charged down into the middle of their foes, routing them.

Looking at it now, neither man nor beast would seem able to traverse this perilous location. It is a descent of about five hundred meters (*chō* 町) from the peak, steeper even than Ichinotani.⁹³ Yorimoto rode a famously rough horse named Matsukaze, given to him by Lord Nijō. It is said that its hindquarters, hooves, and shins were torn up [by the charge].

In any event, the foe was entrenched at Sagami river during the floods, but Sasaki Dōyo 佐々木道誉 (1306–1373) and his forces forded the river using the upper and lower crossings. Since the current was exceptionally strong toward the middle of the river, many men and horses were shot dead [as they crossed]. Two individuals, one named Imagawa Saburō and the other Kawabata, were slain at the same place.⁹⁴ Yorikuni [perished here] riddled with twenty-some arrows. My father was accompanying Takauji and so did not participate in this battle, but afterward he retrieved Yorikuni's body [from the bottom of the river]. That it took such a perilous location to make an end of Yorikuni is a testament to his fortitude.⁹⁵ His children, Suruga no kami Yorisada, Mikawa no kami Yorikane, Shichirō Mitsuyo, and Miyauchi Shōsuke all passed away after taking the tonsure.

Imagawa Norimitsu was slain around the same time at Kotesashibara in Musashi province.⁹⁶ Though seriously ill, it is said he had himself placed on his horse and had his legs fastened [to the saddle] with leather straps. His leg was hacked off, and some houseman named Sakada Uemon took his head. Having no offspring, Norimitsu had adopted Yorikane's younger brother Shichirō [Mitsuyo], but the latter died young and his house disappeared. Butsuman Zenshi was equivalent to the fourth child and was the previous master of Kenchōji and Engakuji.⁹⁷

Many followed Hōjō Takatoki in taking the tonsure. I believe my father was twenty-three when he did so. This is perplexing, since my grandfather Motouji told my father that he should inherit everything.⁹⁸ My grandmother, Lady Kōun-in, spoke of this.⁹⁹ My father's childhood name was Matsumaru, Gorō Norikuni. Tsunekuni and Toshiuji were both Motouji's younger brothers. Now they are the grandfathers of the Sekiguchi, Irino, and the Kida.

93 Ryōshun is comparing this charge to that of Minamoto Yoshitsune's famous rout of the Heike at the Battle of Ichinotani. Incidentally, one *chō* is roughly equivalent to a hundred meters, so here Ryōshun is describing a roughly 550-meter descent.

94 According to Kowada Tetsurō, this individual was Ryōshun's uncle Yorichika. On the other hand, *Sonpi bunmyaku* and *Shizuokaken shi* 静岡県史 (*Shizuoka Prefectural History*), suggest that he was either Ryōshun's uncle Toshiuji, or Imagawa Akiuji 今川顯氏, the son of a different uncle named Tsunekuni. All three men were referred to as Imagawa Saburō, making it difficult to distinguish which one Ryōshun is referring to. Hasegawa 2006, p. 440, note 96.

95 The implication is that the enemy only killed him since he was hampered at this difficult place.

96 Ryōshun's uncle was also known as Kunimitsu.

97 Butsuman Zenshi was the fourth son of Imagawa Motouji, Ryōshun's grandfather, brother to Ryōshun's father Norikuni. Hence, Butsuman Zenshi was Ryōshun's uncle.

98 That is, that he should be clan chieftain (*sōryō* 惣領).

99 Ryōshun's grandmother, who encouraged him to become skilled in poetry, was integral to his career as a poet. Kawazoe 1964, pp. 30–31.

Concerning the Battle of Aonohara

I believe it was around Kenmu 4 (1337) or Kōei 1 (1342), when Akiie, the son of Kitabatake Chikafusa, marched out of the north on the capital at the head of a force of thirty-five thousand mounted warriors.¹⁰⁰ Momonoi Naotsune, with the forces of Utsunomiya and Miura no Suke as allies, chased Akiie hoping to do battle [with him]. My father had been encamped at Mikurayama in Tōtōmi province when he rushed to join them, fighting all along the Seaboard road.¹⁰¹

Kira Mitsuyoshi, Kō Morokane, along with the Mikawa forces and their roughly two thousand mounted warriors, came from Mikawa province and arrived at Kurochi in Mino province. The *shugo* there, Toki Yoritō, said, “We should charge out from the mountain and do battle at Aonohara,” to which it was said, “Tomorrow’s battle is of the utmost importance.”¹⁰² Accordingly, the forces were split into three along the Seaboard road, when it was agreed that we should draw lots for the first, second, and third positions, exchanging places in battle accordingly. The Momonoi and Utsunomiya force drew the first lots; my father and Miura no Suke the second; and Mitsuyoshi, the Mikawa, and Morokane the third.

The Momonoi force all wore hawk bells. Thinking of a symbol, my father came up with “red bird.” Later that night they attached them to their horses.

Some youngsters—Inagaki Hachirō, Yonekura Hachirō Saemon, Kagazume Matasaburō, and Hiraga Gorō—said, “A few of us from this force should ride out in front of the first group regardless of the lots!” Eleven, including the aforementioned individuals, rode out from the Momonoi force up to Mt. Ameuji near Akasakaguchi. Our allies, thinking that the foe was coming, cut down the first youth who was mounted on a dapple; the rest were cut down one after another and their bodies went rolling back to the bottom of the mountain. At this point we recognized them as allies, and the first force began the fight. Momonoi and Utsunomiya were defeated and retreated to the south of Akasaka station toward Kuisegawa.

My father relieved them and defeated a foe named Yamanouchi and his followers, and to the west at Nawateguchi he shot down two mounted warriors wearing *boro* 母衣 capes.¹⁰³ The enemy managed to continue resisting, and so my father camped in the house of a non-person (*binin* 非人) above the banks of the Kuisegawa.¹⁰⁴ Night fell and it began to rain, whereupon some said that they ought to join the Kuroda forces before the enemy attacks again. But my father replied that they should wait until tomorrow for their allies, and Yonekura Hachirō Saemon, though wounded, replied: “We should burn such a stupid

100 Kōei 1, or 1342, would appear to be a mistake, since Akiie had died several years earlier in 1338.06.10 Ryōshun’s recollection of years past would seem to be imperfect here. The Battle of Aonohara took place between 1338.1.20 and 1338.01.29.

101 The *Kaidō* 海道, also known as the Tōkaidō, connected Kyoto and Kamakura, and was one of seven great highways connecting the various regions of Japan.

102 Implying that there should be more planning and direction instead of a simple surprise charge.

103 The billowing cape was thought to make the wearer more difficult to hit with arrows and to ensure the safe repose of their soul; it also served as a shroud in case its wearer was decapitated in battle. See Conlan 2003, pp. 179 and 253.

104 At the time, *binin*, or non-people, were social outcasts because they were involved in occupations thought to bring one in close contact with pollution, both physical and spiritual. Ikegami 1997, pp. 113–17.

general!” He set fire to the house [in which we were encamped], and the ensuing light [from the conflagration] gave him no choice but to join our allies at Kurochi.¹⁰⁵

Momonoï [Naotsune] said: “If neither friend nor foe retreats, there is no hope for victory. One should retreat a bit toward the water against an advancing foe, and then muster one’s forces and attack. In this way the foe will also retreat. Merit is nothing more than gaining victory through opportunity.” Afterward my father said, “Momonoï was the sort of man to fight a losing battle against a stronger enemy. Heavenly destiny (*tenmei* 天命) is not the sort of thing which one can avoid simply by following ancient practices. One must simply fight, and retreat when one’s power is exhausted.”

At any rate, once Toki had joined the fray the Kurochi forces fought a defensive battle, cut off by the foes coming from Kyoto. As our allies on the Seaboard road were engaged in battle, the Northern forces headed toward the Ise road after Aonohara and fought at Nara and Tennōji temples. The Kyoto forces advanced on Kumozu in Ise but suffered defeat.¹⁰⁶

I heard that Toki Yoritō himself acquired glory at the battle of Aonohara—apparently he suffered a wound.¹⁰⁷ While this is recorded in *Taiheiki*, it is unfortunate that my father’s deeds have gone unrecorded, even though he fought valiantly. Perhaps the author did not inquire about them, or maybe we did not provide records? It is unfortunate that in the future none shall know the names of those who achieved glory. Perhaps such information can be added [to *Taiheiki*] if I ask?

Concerning the Divine Oracle at Fuji Asama

Suruga province and ten or so other locations were our rewards in the aftermath [of Aonohara]. I was but a child when we first entered those lands, and, accompanying my father, we prayed at Fuji Asama no Miya. An oracle spoke a divination, saying “Tōtōmi province is close by, and my worshippers desire it; do you remember the prophecy I gave to you at Akasaka?” My father moved back from his seat and said, “What are you talking about? I know nothing of this.” She replied, “When you were thinking about a symbol, I put the idea of the red bird in your head, thereby bringing you victory and this province.” My father recalled that [incident] and said, “Allowing women to accompany an army is considered taboo. But how indeed did I arrive at that idea? Truly this is the work of the kami.” He believed her, and since then he said that he and his descendants would use the symbol of the red bird. This is why when I was in Kyūshū I saw dreams of many women on horseback each night when encamped before important battles; others witnessed the same dream. We were always victorious. Thus, [the red bird] became the most important treasure of our house.

105 This and the previous passage where warriors decided to rush out to fight regardless of strategic planning are excellent examples of the difficulty warlords had controlling their allies. In the fourteenth century, lords were trying to instill greater discipline in their followers, often by creating proscriptions against headhunting and other military activity likely to break order or get one killed. Naturally, since warriors wanted to show their bravery, they resisted such rules. For a discussion of this tendency, see Ikegami 1997, pp. 97–113; and Friday 2004, chapter 5.

106 The Kyoto forces were led by Kō no Moronao, who would play a prominent role as a villain in *Taiheiki*, and later, in the popular *bunraku* play, *Chūshingura*. See Keene 1971.

107 Indeed, *Taiheiki* records that Yoritō was “slashed from below his right eye down to his mouth, including even his nose.” Hasegawa 1998a, p. 518.

Concerning Ryōshun's Relinquishment of Suruga Province

My father intended to pass on the Province of Suruga to me, but my brother was desirous of it, and so I repeatedly insisted on giving it to him. After my brother passed away early, my father once again wanted to give it to me, but I asked for it to be given to the late Imagawa Ujiie 今川氏家.¹⁰⁸ He was shrewd indeed, for he was childless, and right before he died he bequeathed it to my son Sadatomi.¹⁰⁹

It saddens me to think that my brother watched these events from the grave.¹¹⁰ Imagawa Yasunori 今川泰範, who at the time was a monk at Kenchōji, covered his shorn pate when he was summoned to Kyoto.¹¹¹ When he asked to be given the province of Suruga and other lands, he even went so far as to say that Hosokawa Yoriyuki, then *kanrei*, was a model [for such an action]. Next, understanding nothing of obligation, Yasunori next had designs on Tōtōmi province and so told the shogun that I still had ambitions. Oh, if not for the matter of Suruga or had Yasunori not been summoned to Kyoto, [the Imagawa] would not have experienced such duplicity from within our own family. How true the saying, “One must accept the will of heaven.”¹¹² Yasunori received half of Suruga, saying it was my idea.¹¹³ His request was granted. However, still bearing a grudge over the matter, it seems he has also recently sought and acquired Tōtōmi province. I feel no shame at all for these events, for the particulars are well known. Moreover, Yoshimitsu is certainly aware of this even now and so it is not really worth bringing up.

I am sure Yoshimitsu has seen disloyal relatives such as [Yasunori]. My father left a document urging our house to follow the orders of the shogun. Still, it is no wonder that unprincipled and dishonorable (*fudō fugi* 不道不義) relatives are likely to prosper, since Yoshimitsu is lacking in the way. What a deplorable situation.

Long before any of this, Yoshimitsu indicated his wish that I cede Tōtōmi province to Nakaaki, which was difficult to understand.¹¹⁴ That I had officially to divest myself of Tōtōmi was likely because of this decision.¹¹⁵

Concerning Norikuni's Desire to Kill Kiyouji using Ryōshun

When Hosokawa Kiyouji fell under the shogun's suspicion, although my father exerted himself to the utmost and was unequalled in his loyalty, all that is recorded in *Taiheiki* is that the shogun entered Imagumano. The situation [with Kiyouji] was becoming a real issue, so

108 Imagawa Ujiie was the son of Ryōshun's elder brother Noriuji, and was *shugo* of Suruga from 1365–1366.

109 Ryōshun's son Sadatomi. Had Ujiie not given the land to Sadatomi, it would have passed to Imagawa Yasunori.

110 Literally, “watches from the shade of the leaves (*nao sōshū no kusa no kage ni mo mitamau koto kanashikute* なほ 総州の草の陰にも見給ふこと悲しくて).”

111 Noriuji's second child and Ryōshun's nephew. His head was concealed because he had returned to lay life to request the lands belonging to Ryōshun.

112 From *Histories* (*Shiki* 史記). The meaning is that if one neither accepts nor makes the best of what heaven doles out, then disaster is sure to follow.

113 Yasunori was eventually granted both Suruga and Tōtōmi after Ryōshun's fall from grace following the Ōei Disturbance in 1399.

114 This occurred in 1388, long before Ryōshun was dismissed from the office of *tandai* or the Ōei Disturbance. Nakaaki is Ryōshun's younger brother Nakaaki, who he would later adopt, and to whom the *Imagawa Letter* (*Imagawa-jō* 今川状) was addressed. For more on this text, see Steenstrup 1973.

115 That is, write a document of divestment called a *sariwatashi*, *sarisusumi*, *sakeatae*, or *nogareatae* that was written and handed over when one formally gave up one's rights or authority to land or other emoluments to another.

my father went to Yoshiakira, then shogun, and said: “Ryōshun is close to Kiyouji. If you send for Ryōshun and have him sacrifice himself, you can prevent the situation from getting any worse; nor shall many have to die [in the ensuing struggle].” Yoshiakira consented. I was in Tōtōmi at the time and sent my reply via messenger to the capital. I traveled as far as Yamanaka in Mikawa province when another messenger arrived saying that Kiyouji had fled to Wakasa province.

It was only when I arrived in Kyoto that my father explained the situation, leaving me speechless. My father requested this of Yoshiakira because Kiyouji, being innocent of the charge of ambition, wanted to speak to my brother Ujikane of his frustrations.¹¹⁶ But when Ujikane did not go out of respect for the shogun, my father heard that Kiyouji told Nobuaki of the Music Bureau that “Ryōshun would come if only he were in the city.” So my father came up with the idea and proposed it to the shogun. My father believed his action to be a great service, and even though it is no secret fact that he thought to put an end to a matter of great significance by sacrificing one of his children, it is not recorded in the *Taiheiki*. Perhaps it was not told to the author?

A satirical verse at the time said:

The Ebina, once kneeling before the Hosokawa,
leave the Imagawa and straighten up.¹¹⁷

This was written because Hosokawa Kiyouji hated Ebina Bitchū no Kami, who stopped coming to pay his respects to the shogun. Though but a triviality, I have recorded it here simply because it occurred at the time.

Kiyouji's Ambition and Innocence Thereof

It is doubtful that Hosokawa Kiyouji truly had any ambitions. Instead I think someone who had thoughts to rise above his station and go against the wishes of the shogun slandered Kiyouji.¹¹⁸ One reason is that Kiyouji sent his child to Hachiman shrine and capped him there, naming him Hachiman Hachirō.¹¹⁹ Another reason is that when Kiyouji offered a prayer request to the shrine, apparently it contained words to the effect that he [Kiyouji] ought to become master of the realm, leading the chief priest to report it to the shogun. My

116 Ryōshun's younger brother Ujikane is called Eshū Naoyo in the text.

117 *Hosokawa ni/kagamariorishi/Ebina koso/Imagawa idete/koshi wa noshitaru* 細川に屈り居りし海老名こそ今川出て腰は伸したる. This verse would seem to have little relation to the events Ryōshun describes, other than the fact that *Taiheiki* does not record it either. Neither Hasegawa nor Hanafusa attempts to interpret this verse, and Arai Hakuseki does not provide an annotation. The meaning, apparently, is that the Ebina, who had once paid homage to the Hosokawa, had struck out on their own and abandoned a friendship or alliance with the Imagawa when they decided to stop coming to attend on the shogun. Hasegawa 2008, p. 32.

118 Kiyouji and Sasaki Dōyo had been at odds over the office of *shitsuji* 執事, later *kanrei* 管領. This cryptic reference has been suggested to implicate Dōyo. The political struggles between Kiyouji and Dōyo are well documented in *Taiheiki*. Hasegawa 2003, pp. 89–94.

119 This was Kiyouji's son Akiuji, later to be governor of Awa province. Naming him Hachiman Hachirō, or the eighth son of Hachiman, put him in line with the descendants of the Genji—Hachiman Tarō, or Yoshiie—which would have been interpreted as an underhanded attempt by Kiyouji to give his family Minamoto lineage, thereby allowing him and his family legitimacy to rule should he successfully displace the Ashikaga.

father said that the seal looked suspicious, and so did not believe the document was written by Kiyouji.

At the battle of Tōji, Kiyouji was firm in his desire to share the road with my force—we fought together on two occasions. Once the battle was concluded I petitioned for Kasahara manor and Hamamatsu manor in Tōtōmi province because they were appropriated lands (*kessho* 闕所), but even though he agreed to request his rewards separately, Kiyouji said nothing [of our agreement] and was awarded them all. This was unfortunate, but, being in Tōtōmi, I was not in the capital during the incident [and so could not protest]. Since the shogun believed that I was in league with Kiyouji, my father came up with the aforementioned plan.¹²⁰ Consequently, I obeyed the shogun's wishes, my father resigned, and I was summoned to Kyoto to succeed him.

REFERENCES

Bakhtin 1984

Mikhail Bakhtin. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, trans. Caryl Emerson. University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Bakhtin 2009

Mikhail Bakhtin and Helene Iswolsky. *Rabelais and His World*. Indiana University Press, 2009.

Conlan 2003

Thomas Donald Conlan. *State of War: The Violent Order of Fourteenth-Century Japan*. University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies, 2003.

Conlan 2011a

Thomas Donald Conlan. "The Two Paths of Writing and Warring in Medieval Japan." *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies* 8:1 (June 2011), pp. 85–127.

Conlan 2011b

Thomas Donald Conlan. *From Sovereign to Symbol: An Age of Ritual Determinism in Fourteenth-Century Japan*. Oxford University Press, 2011.

Friday 2004

Karl Friday. *Samurai, Warfare and the State in Early Medieval Japan*. Routledge, 2004.

Goble 1996

Andrew Edmund Goble. *Kemmu: Go-Daigo's Revolution*. The Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1996.

Gunsho ruijū

Gunsho ruijū 群書類従. Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1965.

Hanafusa 2009

Hanafusa Tomokazu 花房友一. "Nan Taiheiki" 難太平記, by Imagawa Ryōshun 今川了俊. <http://homepage1.nifty.com/sira/nantaiheiki/index.html> (Accessed 18 January 2016).

120 Here the shogun is Yoshiakira, Takauji's son.

Harrington 1985

Loraine Harrington. "Regional Outposts of Muromachi Bakufu Rule." In *The Bakufu in Japanese History*, eds. Jeffrey P. Mass and William B. Hauser. Stanford University Press, 1985, pp. 66–98.

Hasegawa 1994

Hasegawa Tadashi 長谷川端. *Taiheiki to sono shūben* 太平記とその周辺. Shintensha, 1994.

Hasegawa 1998a

Tenshōbon Taiheiki 天正本太平記, ed. Hasegawa Tadashi. Shogakukan, 1998.

Hasegawa 1998b

Hasegawa Tadashi, ed. *Taiheiki no seiritsu* 太平記の成立. Kyūko Shoin, 1998.

Hasegawa 2003

Hasegawa Tadashi. *Taiheiki: Sōzō to seichō* 太平記: 創造と成長. Miyai Shoten, 2003.

Hasegawa 2006

Hasegawa Tadashi, trans. "Nan Taiheiki, jōkan" 難太平記, 上巻, by Imagawa Ryōshun 今川了俊." *Chūkyō daigaku bungakubu kiyō* 中京大学文学部紀要 41 (2006), pp. 401–59.

Hasegawa 2008

Hasegawa Tadashi, trans. "Nan Taiheiki, gekan" 難太平記, 下巻, by Imagawa Ryōshun 今川了俊." *Chūkyō daigaku bungakubu kiyō* 42 (2008), pp. 19–69.

Hyōdō 1989

Hyōdō Hiromi 兵藤裕己. *Ōken to monogatari* 王権と物語. Seikyūsha, 1989.

Hyōdō 1991

Hyōdō Hiromi. "Basara to akutō: Kojima hōshi o megutte" 婆娑羅と悪党: 小島法師をめぐって. *Kokubungaku* 国文学 36:2 (1991), pp. 51–57.

Hyōdō 2005

Hyōdō Hiromi. *Taiheiki 'yomi' no kanōsei* 太平記〈よみ〉の可能性. Kōdansha, 2005.

Ichizawa 2002

Ichizawa Satoshi 市沢哲. "Nan Taiheiki futatsu no rekishiteki shatei: Muromachi shoki no Heike monogatari o kangaeru tame ni" 難太平記二つの歴史的射程: 室町初期の平家物語を考えるために. *Bungaku* 文学 3:4 (2002), pp. 47–59.

Ikegami 1997

Eiko Ikegami. *The Taming of the Samurai: Honorific Individualism in the Making of Modern Japan*. Harvard University Press, 1997.

Kami 1985

Kami Hiroshi 加美宏. *Taiheiki kyōjushi ronkō* 太平記享受史論考. Ōfūsha, 1985.

Kawazoe 1964

Kawazoe Shōji 川添昭二. *Imagawa Ryōshun* 今川了俊. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1964.

Keene 1971

Donald Keene, trans. *Chushingura (The Treasury of Loyal Retainers): A Puppet Play*. Columbia University Press, 1971.

Kitamura 2010

Kitamura Masayuki 北村昌幸. *Taiheiki sekai no keishō* 太平記世界の形象. Hanawa Shobō, 2010.

Koakimoto 2005

Koakimoto Dan 小秋元段. *Taiheiki, Baishōron no kenkyū* 太平記・梅松論の研究. Kyūko Shoin, 2005.

Mass 1997

Jeffrey Mass, ed. *The Origin of Japan's Medieval World: Courtiers, Clerics, Warriors, and Peasants in the Fourteenth Century*. Stanford University Press, 2002.

Matsuo 2001

Matsuo Kenji 松尾剛次. *Taiheiki: Chinkon to kyūsai no shisho* 太平記: 鎮魂と救済の史書. Chūō Kōshinsha, 2001.

McCullough 1959

Helen Craig McCullough. *Taiheiki: A Chronicle of Medieval Japan*. Columbia University Press, 1959.

Mori 1988

Mori Shigeaki 森茂暁. *Ōjitachi no Nanbokuchō* 皇子たちの南北朝. Chūō Kōron, 1988.

Ōeiki

Ōeiki 応永記. In vol. 13 of *Gunsho ruijū* 群書類従. Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1965.

Ōmori 1988

Ōmori Kitayoshi 大森北義. *Taiheiki no kōsō to hōhō* 太平記の構想と方法. Meiji Shoin, 1988.

Sakata 2012

Sakata Yūichi 阪田雄一. “Nakasendai no ran to Kamakura shōgun fu 中先代の乱と鎌倉将軍府.” In *Kantō Ashikaga shi to Tōgoku shakai: Chūsei tōgoku ron* 5 関東足利氏と東国社会: 中世東国論 5, ed. Satō Hironobu 佐藤博信. Iwanami Shoten, 2012.

Sakurai Eiji 2009

Sakurai Eiji 桜井英治. *Muromachijin no seishin* 室町人の精神. In *Nihon no rekishi* 日本の歴史 12. Kōdansha, 2009.

Sakurai Yoshirō 1959

Sakurai Yoshirō 桜井好朗. “*Nan Taiheiki-kō: Taiheiki o meguru bunkenteki kōshō no ichi zentei*” 難太平記孝: 太平記をめぐる文献的考証の—前提. *Nihon rekishi* 132:6 (1959), pp. 28–34.

Sather 2015

Jeremy Sather. “Rebel with a Cause: The (Im) Morality of Imagawa Ryōshun.” *Japan Review* 28 (2015), pp. 47–66.

Satō 1990

Satō Kazuhiko 佐藤和彦. *Taiheiki no sekai: Rettō no nairanshi* 太平記の世界: 列島の内乱史. Shinjinbutsu Ōraisha, 1990.

Sesko 2010

Markus Sesko. *Genealogies and Schools of Japanese Swordsmiths*. Books on Demand, 2010.

Shidachi 2008

Shidachi Masatomo 志立正知. “Kamakura-ki ni okeru Kantō bushi no jiko ishiki to *Heike monogatari*” 鎌倉期における関東武士の自己意識と『平家物語』. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 国語と国文学 85:11 (2008), pp. 67–77.

Sonpi bunmyaku 1957–1964

Tōin, Kinsada 洞院公定. *Sonpi bunmyaku* 尊卑文脈. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1957–1964.

Steenstrup 1973

Carl Steenstrup. “The Imagawa Letter: A Muromachi Warrior’s Code of Conduct Which Became a Tokugawa Schoolbook.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 28:3 (1973), pp. 295–316.

Varley 1994

Paul Varley. *Warriors of Japan as Portrayed in the War Tales*. University of Hawai‘i Press, 1994.

von Verschuer 2007

Charlotte von Verschuer. “Ashikaga Yoshimitsu’s Foreign Policy 1398 to 1408 A.D.: A Translation from *Zenrin kokuhōki*, the Cambridge Manuscript.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 62:3 (Autumn 2007), pp. 261–97.

Wada 2008

Wada Takuma 和田琢磨. “Imagawa Ryōshun no *Taiheiki* sakusha” 今川了俊の太平記作者. *Nihon bungaku* 日本文学 57:3 (2008), pp. 52–62.

Wada 2015

Wada Takuma. *Taiheiki seisei to hyōgen sekai* 太平記生成と表現世界. Shintensha, 2015.

Yamashita 1995

Yamashita Hiroaki 山下宏明. *Gunki monogatari no seisei to hyōgen* 軍記物語の生成と表現. Izumi Shoin, 1995.

Yamashita 1997

Yamashita Hiroaki. *Ikusa monogatari to katari to bihyō* 戦物語と語りと批評. Sekai Shisōsha, 1997.

Yasui 1985

Yasui Hisayoshi 安井久善. *Nanbokuchō gunki to sono shūhen* 南北朝軍記とその周辺. Kasama Shoin, 1985.