

# About Some Japanese Historical Terms

Hiroshi Watanabe  
University of Tokyo

Translated by Luke S. Roberts

## Translator's Forward

It may seem strange to publish a translation of what is merely the preface of a book. The book is *Higashi Ajia no ôken to shisô* 東アジアの王権と思想 (East Asian Kingly Authorities and Ideologies, University of Tokyo Press, 1997) by Watanabe Hiroshi 渡辺浩 of the Faculty of Law at the University of Tokyo. It is a collection of many essays previously published separately in journals about Edo-period Tokugawa authority, and comparative intellectual history of China, Korea, and Japan. The essays are fascinating, and if I had the time and skill I would like to translate more. The preface alone, however, is of great interpretive importance, because it presents both theory and research on the use of anachronistic terminology in the history of early modern Japan. The reason why this is presented in the preface is that the author chose to change some of the terminology previously used in these essays and he explains why in the preface.

Another odd aspect of this translation is the retention of many Japanese terms. This is perhaps not appealing in a translation but is necessary because the meaning and importance of the essay hinges on the precise meaning and usage of terms. Words in brackets and the dates of individuals and some of the books are my own explanatory additions.

## Preface: About Some Japanese Historical Terms

In this book I will not use some terms commonly used in the narration of Japanese history. I will use different terms to refer to their objects. This may on occasion look very strange to the reader. However I do not do this just to be strange or different. Some commonly used historical terms are an obstruction to correct historical understanding. Below I will give examples of these words and explain why I choose not to use them.

### 1. Bakufu 幕府

A certain historical chronology of Japan says in the entry for the second month of 1603 "Ieyasu became *seii taishôgun* 征夷大將軍 [barbarian-subduing great general] and

created the *bakufu* in Edo.”<sup>1</sup> It is fine to say that he became the *sei taishōgun*, but what does it mean to say that he “created the *bakufu*?”

If it means that there was a consciousness that becoming a *shōgun* meant creating a government called a *bakufu*, it is well known that this is not the case. Ieyasu and his successors did not call their government a *bakufu*. The term is not used in the laws and proclamations. Neither did the Kamakura nor the Muromachi military authorities make use of the term.<sup>2</sup> Tokugawa Ienobu’s 徳川家宣 chamberlain Arai Hakuseki 新井白石 (1657-1725) wrote at the head of his *Tokushi yoron* 読史余論 (Lectures on Readings of History, 1712): “concerning the military houses, Yoritomo 頼朝 created a *bakufu* and for three generations held administrative authority over the rights of warriors and military preparedness throughout the realm.... Takauji 尊氏 made Kōmeiin 光明院 the head of the Northern Court and created his own *bakufu*.” This offers a very rare example of the usage of the phrase “created a *bakufu*” (*bakufu o hiraku* 幕府を開く).<sup>3</sup>

Secondly, if this is meant to say that the polity under the authority of the *shōgun* was commonly called a *bakufu*, this is also not correct. Of course, there was from ancient times a Chinese term “*mufu*” referring to the general who protects the emperor, and the term *bakufu* does appear in the *Azuma kagami* 吾妻鏡 (Mirror of the East, 13-14th century) to denote the *shōgun* and to denote his residence along with other terms such as *ryūei* 柳営, *bakka* 幕下, and *taiju* 大樹.<sup>4</sup> Because of this, there are a few rare examples of pedantic usage of the term from the earliest years of the Edo period. Hayashi

---

<sup>1</sup> Rekishigaku kenkyūkai 歴史学研究会, ed., *Nihon shi nenpyō* 日本史年表 (Chronology of Japanese History), revised edition (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1993), p. 158.

<sup>2</sup> As an exception there is a document entitled “Muromachi-ke onaiشو an” 室町家御内書案 (Drafts of Directives from the Muromachi House) (dated 1336, 8th month, 18th day), which has: “at this point, the *bakufu* Sahyōei-no-kami Takauji 左兵衛督尊氏, and [his brother Ashikaga] Sama-no-kami Naoyoshi 左馬頭直義, had the retired emperor issue a decree declaring that the evil and rebellious retainer [Nitta] Yoshisada [新田]義貞 and his followers be chastised.” *Koji ruien* 古事類苑 (Categorized Compendium of Ancient Matters), Kan’i no bu 35, “Kamakura shogun” [Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1981-85].

<sup>3</sup> Muraoka Tsunetsugu 村岡典嗣, ed., *Tokushi yoron* 読史余論 (Tokyo: Iwanami bunko, 1936), p. 14. Also on p. 223 it reads: “[Ashikaga Yoshimitsu 足利義満] determined the rules of etiquette and ceremony for the warrior households. This became the standard for the *bakufu* for a long time.”

<sup>4</sup> Hattori Nankaku 服部南郭 (1683-1759) called “Minamoto daishōgun Yoritomo” the “*bakufu*.” “Nigenron” 二源論 (Discourse on the Two Minamotos), in Hino Tatsuo 日野龍夫, ed., *Kinsei Juka bunshū shūsei* 近世儒家文集集成 (Collection of the Writings of Early Modern Confucian Scholars), Vol. 7, *Nankaku sensei bunshū* 南郭先生文集 (The Writings of Teacher Nankaku) (Tokyo: Perikansha, 1985), p. 79. Also, the *Tōshōgū gojikki* 東照宮御実記 (True Record of Ieyasu), kan 5, in *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai* 新訂増補国史体系 (Revised and Enlarged edition, Collection of the Historical Records of the Country), Vol. 38 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1964), pp. 73-74, includes the phrase “Ordering an imperial messenger to go to the *bakufu* originates with the Kamakura great general of the right’s house.... From the time of Ōnin, after rebellion beset the *bakufu*, there were no directives on formal protocol.”

Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657) called Tokugawa Ieyasu 德川家康 a “*bakufu*” on a few occasions.<sup>5</sup> Tokugawa Muneharu 德川宗春 (1696-1764) wrote, “I was made a lord in the *bakufu*, received the great love and munificence [of the *shōgun*], and then quite unexpectedly was made head of the [Owari] main household.”<sup>6</sup> Itō Baiu 伊藤梅宇 (1683-1745) wrote, “Muro Shinsuke 室新助, currently holding office in the *bakufu*, originally held office as a scholar in Kaga. Forty-two or forty-three years ago he was received into the [Edo] government and remains there to this day.”<sup>7</sup> Takahashi Gyokusai 高橋玉齋 (1683-1760) wrote about the Mito school’s *Dai Nihon shi* 大日本史 that it was “offered up to the *bakufu* in the time of Munetaka.”<sup>8</sup> But these are rare exceptions. At least until the Kansei period (1789-1800), *bakufu* was a very rarely used word. For example the scholar Bitō Jishū 尾藤二洲 (1745-1813) listed in his *Shōi shigen* 稱謂私言 (Personal Thoughts on Names) in 1800 the following possible terms to describe the contemporary Tokugawa government (*tōkon jitai* 当今事体) when writing in the Chinese style: *daichō* 大朝, *fuchō* 府朝, *daifu* 大府, *seiifu* 征夷府, *ōfu* 王府, but not *bakufu*.<sup>9</sup> A large tome representative of a richly developed almanac tradition, published in 1831 by Suharaya Mohei 須原屋茂兵衛, the *Dai Nihon eiday setsuyō mujinzō* 大日本永代節用無尽藏 (Inexhaustible Warehouse Almanac of Great Japan) listed *bakka*, *taiju*, *daishōgun*, *kinchū* 禁中, and *kinri* 禁裏, but not *bakufu*.<sup>10</sup>

In recent years we have seen the usage of the term “Bakufu” in English writings on Japanese history. Although the intent of this usage is correct historical method, indeed it does not, as I argue here, reflect reality.

<sup>5</sup> There is a section entitled “Answers to the Questions of the *Bakufu*,” in Kyōto shisekikai 京都史跡会, ed., *Razan sensei bunshū* 羅山先生文集 (The Writings of Teacher Razan), *kan* 1 (Kyoto: Heian kōko gakkai, 1918), pp. 341-43.

<sup>6</sup> *Onchi Seiyō, jo* 温知政要序 (Preface to “Ruminations on the Principles of Government,” 1731), in Naramoto Tatsuya 奈良本辰也, ed., *Nihon shisō taikai*, 38, *Kinsei seidō ron* 日本思想体系 38: 近世政道論 (Discourses on Early Modern Political Theory) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1976), p. 156.

<sup>7</sup> Kamei Nobuaki 亀井伸明, ed., *Kenbun dansō* 見聞談叢 (Collection of Observations and Discussions, 1738), (Tokyo: Iwanami bunko, 1940), p. 54.

<sup>8</sup> *Dai Nihon shi sansō, kōjo* 大日本史贊藪後叙 (Praise for *The History of Great Japan*, 1746), in Matsumoto Sannosuke 松本三之介, et al., eds., *Nihon shisō taikai*, 48, *Kinsei shironshū* 日本思想体系 48: 近世史論集 (Collection of Early Modern Discourses on History) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1974), p. 243.

<sup>9</sup> Seki Giichirō 関儀一郎, ed., *Nihon Jurin sōsho* 日本儒林叢書 (Compendium of Japanese Confucian Writings) (Tokyo: Ōtori shuppan, 1971), Vol. 8, pp. 1-2.

<sup>10</sup> Folios 17 recto, 104 recto, 242 verso. Furthermore, the revised edition of Takai Ranzan 高井蘭山 and Nakamura Keinen 中村経年, eds., *Kaitei zōho Edo dai setsuyō kaidai kura* 改訂増補江戸大節用海内蔵 (Warehouse of the Islands Almanac for Edo, Revised and Expanded) (Suharaya Mohei, 1704 1st ed., 1833 rev. expanded edition, 1863 expanded edition), notes on folio 197 about *bakka* 幕下: “Also called *bakufu*. Appellation of the *daishōgun*. *Bakufu* samurai means *shoshi* 諸士.”

My purpose is not to argue that one must use contemporary terms at all times. Historians probably have no need to use *kubôsama* 公方様 instead of *shôgun* 將軍. However, problems of political ideology may lie hidden in the term *bakufu*.

"*Bakufu*" began to become a common term under the influence of the later Mito school of historical philosophy [an "emperor"-centered vision of Edo politics developed by the scholars of the Tokugawa collateral house at Mito]. Fujita Yûkoku 藤田幽谷 (1774-1826) wrote in his *Seimeiron* 正名論 (1791, Discourse on the Rectification of Names): "If the *bakufu* reveres the emperor, then each lord reveres the *bakufu*. If each lord reveres the *bakufu*, then the higher and lesser retainers will revere each lord. If this is carried out then high and low will keep their place and all of the countries will be in harmony."<sup>11</sup> Yûkoku's student Aizawa Seishisai 会沢正志斎 (1782-1863) and his son Fujita Tôko 藤田東湖 (1806-55) used the term *bakufu* consistently. *Bakufu* probably became a common term together with the Mito phrase *sonnô jôi* 尊王攘夷 (revere the emperor and expel the barbarian) in the 1850's and 1860's largely due to the appearance in 1847 of Tôko's *Kôdôkan kijutsugi* 弘道館記述義 (Records of Discussions at the Kôdôkan).

Well, why did the scholars of the later Mito school use this word? As revealed in the *Seimeiron*, they wanted to emphasize that the government was a government of the "shôgun" appointed by the emperor in Kyoto. This was to clarify and emphasize its correctness and legitimacy under their increasingly strong self-identity as, and definition of the Japanese as, members of the "country of the *tennô*" (*kôkoku* 皇国).<sup>12</sup> The use of the word *bakufu* was a political word to show the legitimacy of the government. When the Mito scholars began regularly using this term, there were probably people who thought it strange. Indeed, in the *Kôdôkan kijutsugi*, Fujita Tôko complains of the following conditions: "Unlearned boors would call the *bakufu* by the name 'chôtei' 朝廷 [court], and the worst would call the *bakufu* the 'ô' 王 [king]!"<sup>13</sup> If the Tokugawa themselves were to use the term *bakufu* it would be a humble, self-explanatory form of expression. From the perspective of anti-Tokugawa people, not using the common terms "*gokôgi*" 御公儀 and "*kôhen*" 公辺 was a way of viewing Tokugawa authority more lightly by situating it underneath the authority in Kyoto. Also when emperor Kôkaku 光格 (r. 1779-1817) wrote "With the assistance of the *kanpaku*'s 関白 way of letters and the *bakufu*'s way of military skills, I have seen my reign continue peacefully for more than 20 years," it may likely have been with his feeling to raise the authority of the Kyoto side.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Kikuchi Kenjirô 菊池謙二郎, ed., *Yûkoku zenshû* 幽谷全集 (The Complete Writings of Yûkoku) (Yoshida Yahei, 1935), p. 229.

<sup>12</sup> Concerning this point, please see the discussion in Chapter 6 of this [Watanabe's] book, "Taihei to 'kôkoku'" (The "Great Peace" and the "Imperial Country").

<sup>13</sup> Imai Usaburô 今井宇三郎, et al., eds, *Nihon shisô taikai*, 53, *Mitogaku* 日本思想体系 53: 水戸学 (The Mito School) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1973) p. 298.

<sup>14</sup> Morisue Yoshiaki 森末義彰, et. al., eds., *Rekidai shôchokushû* 歴代詔勅集 (Imperial Edicts from All the Generations) (Tokyo: Meguro shoten, 1938), p. 717.

Indeed, in the political conditions of the closing years of the Edo period, the term *bakufu* suddenly became very popular and its use spread widely.<sup>15</sup> Calling the “*kôgi oyakunin*” 公義御役人 (officials of the government) “*bakushin*” 幕臣 (bakufu retainers) and “*bakuri*” 幕吏 (bakufu officials) must have felt rather satisfying or even a bit rebellious. Finally with the *ôsei fukko no daigôrei* 王政復古の大号令 (proclamation for the restoration of kingly government) came the declaration that “the *sesshō* 摂政, *kanpaku*, and the *bakufu*, etc. will heretofore be abolished.”<sup>16</sup> After the Meiji period, with the help of a national education system, the term *bakufu* became wholly entrenched. Without a doubt this reinforced a historical image of the emperor as being the only legitimate ruling authority throughout the history of “Japan,” and at best the Tokugawa clan as having ruled by having been entrusted the government by the emperor--a historical view not held in the early Edo period.

Thus, the use of the word “*bakufu*” is an expression of a historical vision focused on the *kôkoku* 皇国 (country of the *tennō*).

Usage of the term *bakufu* makes it difficult to perceive that there was a major shift in relations between Edo and Kyoto in the middle of the Edo period. Furthermore, it privileges the Mito school’s interpretation of the relation between Edo and Kyoto. It also makes it easy to forget how the imperial house met change after change from ancient times (in its relations with the military houses as well), finally managing to survive into the present. Because of this I have chosen not to use the word *bakufu* and related terms (*bakumatsu* 幕末, *bakusei* 幕政, *bakushin*, *bakuri*, *bakugi* 幕議, *bakkaku* 幕閣, etc.) unless I am intending to express its specific nuance. (I have changed all previous usage of those terms in the articles collected in this book to be consistent with this policy.)

What then should it be called? One can think of *Tokugawa seiken* 徳川政権 (the Tokugawa governmental authority). However it would be most natural perhaps to use the word most commonly used then. That term was *kôgi* 公義. The “*kô*” is different from the western word “public” (and the Chinese “*gong*” as well).<sup>17</sup> Therefore, one cannot simply assume that it contains the nuances of public authority and power (*kôkenryoku* 公権力), state public authority (*kokka kôken* 国家公権), or territorial public authority (*ryôdo kôken* 領土公権). New research will need to be done on the meaning of the

---

<sup>15</sup> Mitani Hiroshi 三谷博 has, in his *Meiji ishin to nashonarizumu: bakumatsu gaikô to seiji hendô* 明治維新とナショナリズム：幕末外交と政治変動 (The Meiji Restoration and Nationalism: Foreign Relations in the Closing Years of the Tokugawa and Political Change) (Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppansha, 1997), put the following suggestive footnote between a description of the “early modern Japanese state” and a political history of the aftermath of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship: “From here on, I will stop using the term ‘Tokugawa *kôgi*’ and begin using ‘*bakufu*.’ This is because from this time it became the common pattern to use ‘*chôtei*’ solely for the imperial court in Kyoto, and to distinguish the Tokugawa authority as ‘*bakufu*,’ giving it the meaning of the ruling seat of government under the authority of the imperial court.”

<sup>16</sup> Morisue Yoshiaki, p. 756.

<sup>17</sup> Mizoguchi Yûzô 溝口雄三, *Chûgoku no kô to shi* 中国の公と私 (The “Public” and the “Private” in China) (Tokyo: Kenbun shuppan, 1995).

terms *kôgi* and *kubô* at least from the time of the middle ages on with these points in mind.<sup>18</sup> However people of the Edo period did use it as a common noun to mean “government” (*seifu* 政府)--albeit with more reverence than in the case of the modern term. Indeed it was also possible to replace the term with “*kan*” 官. The *kanpu* 官府 of Russia was its *kôgi*.<sup>19</sup> The *kansen* 官船 of the Qing dynasty in China were also defined as “*kôgi no fune*” こうぎのふね.<sup>20</sup>

It seems more appropriate to use *kôgi* to label the institutions which functioned as the central government in the Edo period than *bakufu*.

## 2. Chôtei 朝廷

As Fujita Tôko complained, the *kôgi* was often called *chôtei* (court). Indeed it would not have been unnatural to call the governmental office of the hegemon (*kunshu* 君主) who ruled the realm (*tenka* 天下) by that term. There are not merely the well-known examples of such usage in the *Akô gijin roku* 赤穂義人録 (Record of the Righteous Retainers of Akô) and *Kokusô seigi* 国喪正議 (Discussions on Proper Funeral Rites for the Country) by Muro Kyûsô 室鳩巢 (1658-1734),<sup>21</sup> the writings of Ogyû Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666-1728)<sup>22</sup> and in the *Keizairoku* 経済録 (Record of Economic Matters) of Dazai

---

<sup>18</sup> One good source concerning *kubô* 公方 is Nitta Ichirô 新田一郎, “Nihon chûsei no kokusei to tennô: rikai e no hitotsu no shiza” 日本中世の国政と天皇：理解へのひとつの視座 (National Government and the Emperor in Japan’s Medieval Period: One Perspective Toward Understanding), *Shisô* 思想 819 (July 1993).

<sup>19</sup> Katsuragawa Hoshû 桂川甫周 (1754-1809) (Kamei Takayoshi 亀井高孝, ed.), *Hokusa bunryaku: Daikokuya Kôdayû Roshia hyôryûki* 北槎聞略：大黒屋光大夫ロシア漂流記 (Abridged Tales of a Shipwreck to the North: The Record of Daikokuya Kôdayû’s Shipwreck to Russia) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1990), p. 34. See also on pages 40, 45, 50, 52, 61, 188, and 194 where *kan* 官 is glossed as “*kôgi*.”

<sup>20</sup> Nakagawa Tadateru 中川忠英 (1753-1830), comp., *Shinzoku kibun* 清俗紀聞 (Record of Tales of Chinese Customs) (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1961), Vol. 2, p. 91. Nakagawa was the Nagasaki Magistrate.

<sup>21</sup> “Despite my own inabilities, I have thought of the following for the benefit of the court (*chôtei*).” *Kokusô seigi*, manuscript copy held in Tokyo University Library (without folio numbers). “The court (*chôtei*) subjected the retainers of Akô to the law;” “the Akô retainers would not accept mercy [shown towards Kira Yoshinaka]. Would those who regard the Akô retainers as just regard the court as unjust?” From the preface to the *Akô gijin roku*. See Ishii Shirô 石井紫郎, ed., *Nihon shisô taikai*, 27, *Kinsei buke shisô* 日本思想体系27：近世武家思想 (Thought of the Warrior Houses in the Early Modern Period) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1974), p. 343.

<sup>22</sup> Some examples are: “Currently the *chôtei* ranks the lords based on the amount of warriors and fief. Furthermore each lord has his own samurai and all great and small are organized into the military units.” “The *chôtei* has remote descendents and relatives offer worship to their ancestors who performed outstanding labors at the time of [shogunal] dynastic change” (*teimei* 鼎命). Hiraishi Naoaki 平石直昭, ed., *Kinsei Juka bunshû shûsei daisankan Sorai shû* 近世儒家文

Shundai 太宰春台 (1680-1747).<sup>23</sup> Yuasa Jōzan 湯淺常山 (1708-81) wrote about Kumazawa Banzan 熊沢蕃山 (1619-91): “He submitted his policy proposals to the *chōtei* in the Eastern capital, setting out to reform the government of the land.”<sup>24</sup> Matsura Seizan 松浦静山 (1760-1841) wrote of Tokugawa Tsunayoshi 徳川綱吉 (1646-1709): “Because at this time there were no children in the *chōtei*...”<sup>25</sup> And, Minamikawa Isen 南川維遷 (1729-81) wrote: “Because the current system is feudal, although there are the great laws of the court, each domainal country has its own law codes.”<sup>26</sup> The nativist scholar Takada Tomokiyo 高田與清 (1783-1847, also known as Oyamada 小山田 Tomokiyo) criticized “scholars,” writing: “There are people who say this and that about the government of the court” (*ōyake no matsurigoto o korekare to ronzuru mono ari* 朝廷 [glossed おほやけ] の政事 [glossed まつりごと] をこれかれと論ずる者あり). As his gloss reflects, he used court with nearly the same meaning as *ōyake* 公, *okami* お上, and *kōgi* 公儀.<sup>27</sup> Takano Chōei 高野長英 (1804-50), writing about the events of the imprisonment of Dutch scholars in 1837, used language such as “the august anger of the authorities” [*kami no gyakurin* 官 [glossed かみ] の逆鱗]. Note: this term means only imperial anger in Chinese] and “criticize the *chōtei*” and other expressions also in this vein of usage.<sup>28</sup>

---

集集成第三卷徂徠集 (Early Modern Confucian Scholars, Vol. 3, Works by Sorai) (Tokyo: Perikansha, 1985) p. 111.

<sup>23</sup> “For want of a better way, I will write *kenkan* 県官. Although *kenkan* is used to refer to the son of heaven (*tenshi* 天子), in truth it is like saying *kōgi* in this age. It is certainly more broad a term than tycoon (*taikun* 大君). I will sometimes also use *kokka* 国家 and *chōtei*.” “Such terms as *kokuchō* 国朝, *honchō* 本朝, and *wagachō* 我朝 are all ways of referring to the current court (*chōtei*.” *Keizairoku*, “hanrei” 經濟録 凡例, in Rai Tsutomu 頼惟勤, ed., *Nihon shisō taikai*, 37, *Sorai gakuha* 日本思想体系 37: 徂徠学派 (The Sorai School) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1972), pp. 11, 13. Examples from *Akō gijin roku* and *Keizairoku* have been previously noted in the additional notes, p. 466, of the source cited in footnote 13.

<sup>24</sup> Taniguchi Sumio 谷口澄夫, et al., eds., *Zōtei Banzan zenshū* 増訂蕃山全集 (Revised and Expanded Edition of the Complete Works of [Kumazawa] Banzan) (Tokyo: Meicho shuppan, 1980), Vol. 7, pp. 310.

<sup>25</sup> Nakamura Yukihiro 中村幸彦, ed., *Kasshi yawa* 甲子夜話 (Evening Discussions Beginning from the Year Kasshi [1814]) (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1977), Vol. 3, p. 254.

<sup>26</sup> From *Kinkei zatsuwa* 金溪雑話 (Random Sayings of Kinkei), in Mori Senzō 森銑三, et al., eds., *Zuihitsu hyakkaen* 随筆百花苑 (A Hundred Flowered Garden of Essays) (Tokyo: Chūō kōron sha, 1983), Vol. 5, p. 192.

<sup>27</sup> From *Sekitoku sōdan* 積徳叢談 (Discussions on the Accumulation of Virtues) in *Nihon keizai sōsho kankōkai* 日本經濟叢書刊行会, ed., *Tsūzoku keizai bunko* 通俗經濟文庫 (Popular Library of Economic Writings) (Tokyo: Nihon keizai sōsho kankōkai, 1916), Vol. 2, p. 304.

<sup>28</sup> *Wasuregatami* わすれがたみ (A Memento Against Forgetfulness), in Satō Shōsuke 佐藤昌介, et al., eds., *Nihon shisō taikai*, 55, *Watanabe Kazan, Takano Chōei, Sakuma Shōzan, Yokoi Shōnan, Hashimoto Sanai* 日本思想体系 55: 渡辺華山・高野長英・佐久間象山・横井小楠・橋本左内 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1971), pp. 174-5.

Furthermore, scholars of Chinese learning thought that the word “*kôgi*” would not be understood by foreigners, because it was a uniquely Japanese term. That is why when the *kôgi* authorities wrote an order to Rezanov to leave Nagasaki in 1805, they wrote of themselves: “This is the intent of the *chôtei*.”<sup>29</sup> And Sakuma Shôzan 佐久間象山 (1811-64) repeatedly used the words “my/our *chôtei*” (*waga chôtei* 吾朝廷) in writing a draft of negotiations in 1858 with Townsend Harris.<sup>30</sup> Neither thought that this was overreaching one’s status vis-à-vis Kyoto.

To think that it is only natural to call Kyoto the court (*chôtei*) and Edo the *bakufu* is highly “modern” and in keeping with the views of the Mito school. Is it not strange that modern historians who may have no sympathy for Mito scholarship nevertheless are engaged in a debate described as being about “court-*bakufu* relations in the Edo period?”

What then should be the appropriate terminology for the imperial court? In the Edo period the most common term was *kinri* 禁裏 (forbidden quarter) or *kinchû* 禁中 (inside the forbidden quarter). Rather than saying court and *bakufu*, a different image is conjured up when we use the terms *kôgi* and *kinri*, “government and forbidden quarter.”

### 3. Tennô 天皇

In a certain sense the *tennô* did not exist in Japan from the middle of the thirteenth century until the end of the eighteenth century. From the time of Juntoku 順徳 *tennô* (r. 1210-21) until its revival at the time of Kôkaku *tennô* (r. 1779-1817), the posthumous title (*shigô* 諡号) *tennô* was not officially used either before or after death. While regnant they were called by such terms as *kinri(sama)* 禁裏(様), *kinchû(sama)* 禁中(様), *tenshi(sama)* 天子(様) (son of heaven), *tôgin* 当今 (the current [reign]), and *shujô* 主上, (my lord); after retirement were called *Sentô* 仙洞 (Sentô retirement villa), *shin'in* 新院 (newly retired), *hon'in* 本院 (the currently retired), and the like; and after death were called for example Gomizunoo-*in* 御水尾院, Sakuramachi-*in* 桜町院, Momozono-*in* 桃園院 [i.e., name with “*in*” appended]. In the previously mentioned *Dai Nihon eidai setsuyô mujinzô* (1854), the section called “Honchô nendai yôran” 本朝年代要覽 (Era Names of Our Court) also refers to Kôkaku and Jinkô 仁孝 and all before (with the exception of the ancient period, Juntoku, and a few other *tennô*) faithfully as somebody-*in* 何々院. People of the Edo period would not have said something like “Gomizunoo *tennô*” 御水尾天皇.

Such scholars as Nakai Chikuzan 中井竹山 (1730-1804)<sup>31</sup> and Yamagata Taika 山県太華 (1781-1866)<sup>32</sup> lamented this situation in which “propriety of naming” was

---

<sup>29</sup> *Tsûkô ichiran* 通航一覽 (Compendium of Foreign Relations) (Ôsaka: Seibundô shuppan, 1967), Vol. 7, p. 193.

<sup>30</sup> From “A Draft of a Petition to the *Bakufu* Concerning a Draft of Negotiations with Harris,” in Satô Shôsuke, et al., eds., pp. 297-98.

<sup>31</sup> From *Sôbô kigen* 草茅危言 (High-Minded Words of a Commoner), in Takimoto Seiichi 滝本誠一, ed., *Nihon keizai taiten* 日本經濟大典 (Great Collection of Japanese Thought on the Economy) (Tokyo: Keimeisha, 1929), Vol. 23, pp. 324-26. Jinno Tadataka 神惟孝 evaluated Chikuzan on this point as follows: “As for the issue of imperial posthumous naming and retirement naming, all thoughtful people would hardly need Chikuzan’s explanation before a thousand with



unclear.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, when we consider that there was someone in Edo called while in office such terms as *kubôsama*, *tenkasama*, *shôgunsama*, and who after retirement was called “ôgoshosama” 大御所様 and the like, and who after death was called majestically, for example, *Daitoku-inden* 台徳院殿, *Daiyû-inden* 台猷院殿, *Jôken-inden* 常憲院殿, then the relationship between Edo and Kyoto was indeed unclear. However, that was the actual situation of the structure of the state. It is said that not until 1925 were all of the former “Somebody-in” [officially] retroactively made into “Somebody-*tennô*.”<sup>34</sup> From the perspective of the official government historical perspective of the day, this was an appropriate measure. But does current historical terminology need to be in accordance with that measure? Is there a need to obscure such fascinating historical phenomena?

In this book, for all emperors before Kôkaku I will use the term “in.” Furthermore, I will not use the term “*tennô*” but rather “*kinri(sama)*.”

#### 4. Han 藩

It is a well known fact that the term *han* was not officially used in the Edo period, but rather was officially used only during the period from the *hanseki hôkan* 版籍奉還 (return of the fief registers from the lords to the emperor) of 1869 to the *haihan chiken* 藩置県 (abolition of the domainal *han* and creation of the prefectures) two years later. Unofficially, it became a common term only after the middle of the eighteenth century.

Early examples are when Kinoshita Jun'an 木下順庵 (1621-98) wrote: “The revered *han*, lord of Kôfu, loved scholarship and found pleasure in the good”; and “Lord Hosokawa of Hizen Province is an important *han* of the western provinces” [referring to the lords themselves by the term].<sup>35</sup> Kinoshita's student Arai Hakuseki referred to the

---

one voice would argue likewise.” *Sôbô kigen tekigi* 草茅危言摘議 (Selected Discussions on *Sôbô kigen*), in *Nihon keizai taiten*, Vol. 38 (1930), p. 501.

<sup>32</sup> In his *Kokushi sanron* 国史纂論 (Collection of Discourses on the History of the Country) (Okadaya Kashichi 岡田屋嘉七, Izumiya Kin'emon 和泉屋金右衛門, 1846), Vol. 4, folio 9 verso.

<sup>33</sup> For the above information on *tennô*, see Teikoku gakushiin 帝国学士院, ed., *Teishitsu seido shi* 帝室制度史 (History of the Institution of the Imperial Household) (Tokyo: Teikoku gakushiin, 1945), Vol. 6, chapter 4, section 4; Kodama Kôta 児玉幸多, ed., *Nihon shi shôhyakka 8 tennô* 日本史小百科 八 天皇 (Little Encyclopedia of Japanese History, Vol. 8, The Emperor) (Tokyo: Kondô shuppansha, 1978), pp. 82-83; and Fujita Satoru 藤田覚, *Bakumatsu no tennô* 幕末の天皇 (The Emperor in the Declining Years of the Bakufu) (Tokyo: Kôdansha, 1994), pp. 129-35. Fujita deals with Nakai Chikuzan and brings out most appropriately the issues and the meaning of the changes in rhetoric.

<sup>34</sup> Yamada Hideo 山田英雄, “Shigô” 諡号, in *Kokushi daijiten* 国史大辞典 (Great Dictionary of National History) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan, 1985), Vol. 6, p. 728. I should note that although this is recorded in many works as fact, no such entry appears in the appropriate years of *Kanpô* 官報 (Government Notices) and *Hôrei zensho* 法令全書 (Complete Laws), and I have not yet seen a clear documentary basis for this point.

<sup>35</sup> *Shi gokyô shishi ki* 賜五經四子記 (A Record on the Five Classics and Four Books Bestowed by the Lord), p. 561; and *Seijo sekishinzu* 静女赤心図 (Concerning a Painting of the Sincerity of

residential palace of Tokugawa Tsunatoyo 徳川綱豊 (1662-1712, later Ienobu 家宣) as a “*hantei*”<sup>36</sup> 藩邸 and then wrote the *Hankampu* 藩翰譜 (Lineages and Letters of the Lords).<sup>37</sup> However on the other hand Itô Tôgai 伊藤東涯 (1670-1736) wrote such phrases as “*honchin*” 本鎮 (this lord/domain), “*chinpei*” 鎮兵 (warriors of the lord/domain), “became a servant of Zeze-‘*chin*’ 鎮 in Ômi province,” and the like.<sup>38</sup> In the Kyôhô period (1716-35) ‘*han*’ was not a commonly used term.

However, it likely began to be a fashionably pedantic phrase inasmuch as Itô Tôgai’s contemporary, Ogyû Sorai, enjoyed using the term. He frequently used in his letters such terms as *kihan* 貴藩 (your *han*), *heihan* 弊藩 (my *han*), *wagahan* 吾藩 (my *han*), *shinpan* 親藩 (Tokugawa collateral *han*), *tohan* 外藩 (outer *han* [*tozama*]), *daihan* 大藩 (great *han*), *ippan* 一藩 (one *han*), *hantaifu* 藩大夫 (minister of a *han*), *han yûshi* 藩有司 (a *han* official), and so forth. His disciple Hattori Nankaku 服部南郭 (1683-1759) also followed this practice. After that, its flavor of being a pedantic expression probably lessened.<sup>39</sup>

This is not merely a question of wording. The household and the *han* are different. “Somebody’s retainer Somebody” 誰々家来誰々 is different from “Some *han*’s somebody” 何々藩誰々. “Somebody fleeing from the authority/protection of Lord Somebody” 誰々様の下より出奔 is different from “fleeing the *han*” 脱藩. In the background there is the reality that over the course of the Edo period retainers shifted from being “a warrior in service of a lord” to “an official employed in a *han*,” and their method of organization shifted from being a private oath of fealty to a “stockholding” federation of households.<sup>40</sup> A new word was needed to fit this new condition. It just happened to be “*han*” and not, for example, “*chin*.”

---

My Lady Shizuka), p. 576, both in Kinoshita Kazuo 木下一雄, ed. and transl., *Kinri bunshû* 錦里文集 (The Writings of Kinri) (Tokyo: Kokusho kankôkai, 1982).

<sup>36</sup> Arai Hakuseki, *Oritaku shiba no ki* おりたく柴の記, in Hani Gorô 羽仁五郎, ed., (Tokyo: Iwanami bunko, 1949), pp. 74, 83.

<sup>37</sup> Ichijima Kenkichi 市島謙吉, ed., *Arai Hakuseki zenshû* 新井白石全集 (The Complete Works of Arai Hakuseki) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa hanshichi, 1906), p. 226.

<sup>38</sup> In Miyake Masahiko 三宅正彦, ed., *Kinsei Juka bunshû shûsei, Shôjutsu sensei bunshû* 近世儒家文集集成、紹述先生文集 (The Writings of Teacher Shôjutsu) (Tokyo: Perikansha, 1988), Vol. 4, *honchin* pp. 62, 99; *chinpei* p. 146, *Zeze-chin* p. 123.

<sup>39</sup> The *Dai Nihon eidai setsuyô mujinzô*, noted above, lists “*han*” and explains it as: “means a castle town.”

<sup>40</sup> From a different perspective on the issue, Asao Naohiro 朝尾直弘 has written the following comments about the early seventeenth century: “Until this point I have written ‘the Hosokawa clan’ and ‘the Shimazu clan’ and did not necessarily use Hosokawa *han* and Shimazu *han*. This is because up until this time there was not a meaningfully independent *han* government, nor the concept of a *han* economy or *han* retainer band. There were just individual lords and their retainer bands, individual lord’s household governments, and individual lord’s civil governments. However, around this time a territorial, politically unified body came into being, although a distinct economy had not yet formed.” *Nihon no rekishi, 17 kan, Sakoku* 日本の歴史 17卷 鎖国 (The History of Japan, Vol. 17, The Closed Country) (Tokyo: Shôgakkan, 1975), p. 350.

This being the case, if we set aside the issue of the latter half of the Edo period, calling something in the early Edo period by the term *han* is likely to invite misunderstanding by the use of anachronistic terminology. In this book the term *han* will be used with this point in mind. Furthermore, insofar as the term “*bakuhan taisei*” 幕藩体制 includes the two problematic terms *bakufu* and *han*, I will not use it. I will simply call the political structure of the Edo period “the Tokugawa political structure” (*Tokugawa seiji taisei* 徳川政治体制).