Title	Them's fightin' words : reevaluating "warrior" terminology of the Sengoku period
Sub Title	売り言葉に買い言葉？： 戦国時代「武士」に関する専門用語を考え直す
Author	Kurashige, Jeff
Publisher	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要刊行委員会
Publication year	2020
Jtitle	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要. 英語英米文学 (The Hiyoshi review of English studies). No.72 (2020. 1) ,p.1- 25
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Departmental Bulletin Paper
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN10030060-20200120-0001

Them's Fightin' Words: Reevaluating "Warrior" Terminology of the Sengoku Period

Jeff Kurashige

Introduction

Warrior. Soldier. *Samurai*. Individuals of these "classes" have too readily been placed in cleanly defined, box-like categories by modern scholars, both Japanese and non-Japanese alike. They have also been labeled *bushi*, retainers, landowners, and a host of other names.[1)] However, these labels fail to describe how so-called warriors were but one of many groups who both farmed the land *and* fought in the daimyo armies of the Sengoku age. Moreover, this terminology masks the importance of these low ranking "fighters" who formed the cornerstone of the main administrative unit of the daimyo, often called the *kashindan* 家臣団 or "retainer corps" by modern scholars. By reevaluating the existing vocabulary and modes used to describe the low-ranking "warriors" of the era, we can observe drastic changes in the economic, political, and social order of the Warring States period. To accomplish this goal, the study focuses upon the topic of land tenure to illustrate these dramatic metamorphoses. This article aims to explore these issues of definition, thereby demonstrating broadly that current forms of discourse — in particular the profusion of ambiguous terminology

in the historiography on Warring States Japan — have led to misunderstandings of the underlying historical realities.

In this vein, the terms used in the historiography that have "pigeon-holed" warriors will be reexamined in this article so as to identify the individuals who suffer what the European medievalist Elizabeth Brown might call "the tyranny of a construct."[2] More specifically, what quickly becomes evident when observing such figures is the mutability of the terms discussed, and more problematically the disappearance of particular historic actors who fail to fit within the preexisting discourse of the historiographic framework. This highlights the failing in many modes of Western, Platonic, and modern investigation into the premodern, where ambiguity often more readily reflected the social reality of the times.

Fighting Historic Inelasticity by Reevaluating the Terms of the *Kashindan*

In his recent work, *A Sense of Place*, David Spafford paints a fascinating image of the medieval Japanese people as living in what he calls the "persistent medieval," which he cleverly juxtaposes with contemporary historians who he suggests find themselves trapped by the "teleology of unification," thereby revealing how intellectual constraints bound both groups.[3] For premodern men and women, Spafford documents how conservatism and inertia drew them toward traditionalist behaviors, whether the topic of discussion was evolving governance or shifting landed tenure. In the case of present day scholars, we too have been thwarted by a particular inertia — one focused upon the reunification of Japan through the actions of Nobunaga, Hideyoshi, and Ieyasu. Spafford hints that both groups have had difficulty breaking from this pull, drawing attention to a behavior that economists might label as an inelastic relationship, wherein an entity's behavior might alter little despite new inputs — regardless of whether those

inputs come in the diverse forms of premodern governance or new scholarship! Spafford has in this way trumpeted the clarion call for a revised approach toward the field of Sengoku studies so that we might avoid an anachronistic pull by a constructed past.

An examination of the retainer corps offers such an opportunity to break free from the draw of the "teleology of unification", with two discoveries evident. First, a comparison of the terms used in the field and an attempt at clarifying definitions of those concepts reveals many ambiguities that have clouded understandings for past historians. If separate scholars used the underlying terms of discussion in different ways, variant conclusions are a foregone result. Second, and arguably more importantly for non-specialists, we can use these historical agents as proxies to understand how the system of local land tenure worked. What were the hierarchies of power? Where did the locus of authority lie? These matters can be clarified, at least at a basic level, by looking at the different agents described in the historiographic terminology.

Why *has* this escape from teleology been so difficult until recently? In the study of Sengoku Japan, one reason was because of the scattered nature of documentary evidence. Now, with the compellation of volumes like the previously mentioned *Sengoku ibun*, new approaches can be used to re-conceptualize the past that could not be accomplished just a few decades ago.[4)] Furthermore, although the impetus of this recent soul-searching remains arguably unknowable, the printing of volumes like *Muromachi sengokuki kenkyū o yominaosu* that question the core assumptions of past historiography and the trajectory of where the Sengoku field will go in the future, along with subsequent conferences debating those conclusions, highlights how Spafford and I are far from alone in identifying the need to assess how the field will evolve.[5)]

Additionally, a note of warning on the very nature of definitions is critical. Although this article examines a number of and provides a rough summary of key concepts, there is an inherent risk in this process as well, as it rests on the assumption that there is a single definition that most suits the *truth* of the term at hand. In reality, regional and temporal differences in terminology existed that prevent a true, single definition from ever being pinpointed. Yet, comparing even rough summaries of these terms will help demonstrate those ambiguities and highlight problems in the past research methodologies. With these notes of caution in mind, this section's reexamination focuses on the central concepts and terms that appear in most discussions of the retainer corps and the system of land tenure: *kashindan* ("retainer corps"), *zaichi-ryōshu* 在地領主 ("resident landlord") , *dogō* 土豪 ("local magnate") , *jizamurai* 地侍 ("local strongman") , and *kokujin* 国人 ("local lord") .

Kashindan

The central construct within our investigation is the *kashindan* itself. While the translation as a "military bureaucracy" of the daimyo most closely fits the phenomenon described in this study, the more common appellation is "warrior band" or "vassal band."[6] Historians like Jeroen Lamers have described this group as a collection of the daimyo's most powerful retainers and generals, who were connected to the lord by personal ties of loyalty.[7] The most significant problem with each of these definitions is the underlying assumption that the members of these "bands" were warriors, since "military" and "vassal" most certainly have this connotation. The reality was far more complex.

The term *kashindan* itself is a construct of modern historians. While the word *kashin* 家臣 (literally "house-minister" or "house-retainer") was a

contemporary [if very rare] term that had emerged by the mid-sixteenth century, present day historians have coined the word *kashindan* (literally "retainer group").[8] Despite the non-contemporary nature of the latter term, daimyo during the Sengoku period unquestionably began to organize their retainers into groups based upon multiple new criteria.[9] The appearance of documents like the 1559 land register called *Odawara-shū shoryō yakuchō* (hereafter *Yakuchō*), which listed the areas controlled and taxes owed by the retainers of the Go-Hōjō, symbolized these efforts to increase military and financial efficiency. The codification process of the *Yakuchō* had begun by at least 1537 with one aim to organize the Go-Hōjō forces into regional units.[10] An arguably more important success was the clarification of the military service tax owed by those retainers, suggesting that a rational and impersonal way of governance had appeared by at least the mid-sixteenth century.[11] For the sake of consistency, I will use the phrase "retainer corps" in place of *kashindan* while exploring the internal workings of this group.

Returning to the question of its membership, certainly armed warriors comprised a portion of the retainer corps. The following order by lord Hōjō Ujimitsu 北条氏光 (thought to be the son of daimyo Hōjō Ujiyasu) to one of his men is evocative of the unsurprising truth that many who served the warlords fought and died in battle:

北条氏光着到定書[12]

一　貳拾五貫二百文　　座間

　　此着到

参人　此内

　　壱本　小旗

　　壱本　鑓

　　壱騎　馬上

以上参人

右御着到之内、壱騎一人も□[13]不足者必々知行を可被召上之條、如件、

（天正十年）

午六月十二日　　（備前守）

座間殿

Note of Summons to War from Hōjō Ujimitsu

Item: Regarding the land at Zama valued at 25 *kan* and 200 *mon*,[14]

From this will be summoned the following:

3 people, including:

1 man bearing a small banner

1 spearman

1 mounted soldier

Total: three men

If there is a shortage of even one horse or one man, the rights to administer the [land in] possession shall be reclaimed [by the lord]. It should be thus.

(1582) 6th month, 12th day　　(Lord of Bizen)

To: the lord of Zama [probably Zama Yasaburo, but actual name unknown]

In the case above, Ujimitsu commanded “lord Zama” to use his resources to bring two infantrymen and one mounted warrior (probably the retainer himself) to an upcoming battle. As can be seen in this example, many of the individuals serving the daimyo were armed and owed a tax of military service on the land they controlled, parallel to how corvée labor taxes were assessed upon earlier shōen.

However, people who did not fight directly upon the battlefield were also members of the retainer corps. In his article discussing daimyo trade and Warring States period commerce, Sasaki Gin’ya proposes that these

groups of retainers also included "powerful merchants [or] …property holding artisans, who were listed in the same manner as other members of the *kashindan*."[15] Michael Birt identifies one such family whom he calls the Uirō 外郎.[16] The word Uirō can refer to both the medicine sold by the Kanto family in question (not the family name itself in this case), or to the Uirō family of Chinese (or possibly Mongol) refugees who fled to Kyoto from the continent upon the fall of the Yuan dynasty. The branch family or possibly a retainer representative of the Kansai Uirō changed its name to Uno upon his arrival in the Kanto.[17] Upon closer examination, one finds that the descendant or retainer (the sources are unspecific) of the original Uirō makers from the Kansai only appear under the name Uno. In particular, one individual named Uno Tōemon Sadaharu 宇野藤右衛門定治 rose to prominence and received the position of *daikan* 代官 or "local land manager," over a portion of daimyo Hōjō Ujitsuna's land in 1539.[18] A person who may well have been Sadaharu's son appears roughly 20 years later in the *Yakuchō* as Uno Genjūrō 宇野源十朗. He administered land worth 200 *kan* and 465 *mon* as part of the elite retainer group known as the *umawari-shū* 馬廻衆.[19] Furthermore, in 1576, Uno Ieharu's 家治 son Yoshiharu 吉治 received monopoly rights from the Hōjō to sell medicines in the town of Nikkō, demonstrating the continued prominence that mercantile activities had within the Uno family finances.[20] Although further details are scarce, the existing texts describe either his rights to sell medicine or his tax-exemptions. Despite his family's high-ranking position in the aforementioned *umawari-shu*, which was theoretically the lord's bodyguard, one finds no records of battles experienced. What is clear, considering the record of over three generations of mercantile activities, is that this was a family of doctors and merchants with trade connections to the center in Kyoto — not a house of dedicated warriors.

Including individuals like the Uno in what has traditionally been called a "warrior band," reveals that previous definitions have been too narrowly conceived, thereby necessitating an exploration of "warrior" nature in this section of the study. A possible reason these individuals are overlooked in the historiography is that there is little or no differentiation in the documentation that lists their holdings in comparison to retainers who were primarily warriors. Yet, one cannot help but suspect that they may also have been overlooked because they did not fit the assumed mold of the warrior class. The image of the "loyal warrior vassal" is strongly imprinted on our collective view of *bushi*, and the lionization of this class is a failing to which even many of us historians still fall prey today.[21] One need only examine Japanese (or Western!) period films to find examples of this bias towards eulogy. This tendency is unsurprising however, considering the *bushi* of the Edo period themselves went to tremendous lengths to call attention to their supposed embodiment of this constructed image, and texts like Inazo Nitobe's *Bushido* popularized this idea globally.

This reevaluation of our assumptions regarding past historical agents has value in helping us deconstruct the image of premodern "warriors" (agents who will be examined in greater detail below). Yet additionally, it also hints at the dynamic metamorphosis in the economy predating the Edo period.[22] We must keep in mind that it would be incorrect to say no change from the premodern world occurred during the Tokugawa years in terms of the speed and scale of urbanization and capitalization of the economy, as documented in numerous classic texts.[23] However, a focus on individuals like Uno gives further support to Amino's famous argument that an expansion of the monetary economy and the creation of credit markets in Japan began far earlier than generally portrayed, and thus the transition from premodern to early modern might well have been earlier and far more

gradual than previously agreed.[24] The following agents are the primary figures that historians have characterized as witnessing this evolution of the economy and society.

Zaichi ryōshu

Zaichi ryōshu, meaning "resident landlord, is an umbrella concept under which falls each of the later terms of discussion. Scholars of the Japanese "middle ages" (called the *chūsei* 中世, beginning approximately in the Kamakura era and ending in the Sengoku period) use the concept to differentiate those individuals who resided upon the land from which they collected tax revenue, from those who lived distant from the *shōen* yet still had a right to shares of landed income. Although each half of the concept derives from separate *shōen* terminology, the amalgamated whole is again a construct of modern scholars. We must be cautious as no all-encompassing definition exists for *zaichi ryōshu*, yet one commonality we can observe is that like the *dogō*, *jizamurai*, and *kokujin* below, they are portrayed as local "warrior" leaders.

The idea has an interesting history, and can be used as a symbol to track the evolution in Japanese historiographical thought during the postwar years. Prior to and during the Second World War, historians took pains to match their terminology to government propaganda, thereby describing landlords as *bushi* or warriors.[25] However, in the years following Japan's military capitulation, academic freedom released scholars to explore Marxist frameworks.[26] One of the pioneers of the era in particular, Ishimoda Sho, sought to differentiate lordship by absentee proprietors in Kyoto (whom he associated with a classic slave state) from that of local proprietors who lived on the land (for him representing "feudal" lordship), fusing two historical terms of *zaichi* ("to reside on the land") and *ryōshu* ("controller of land,

fields, people, and wealth") to differentiate these forms of land tenure.[27] Other scholars, through their disagreement with this paradigm, simultaneously served to further expand Ishimoda's thesis. For example, historians like Suzuki Ryōichi noted that such local lords did not have to be warriors and could be religious institutions or even other "peasants", while scholars like Araki Moriaki argued that such systems of lordship did not eliminate the possibility of slavery's continuation.[28] Nevertheless, although disagreements remained and consensus eluded the field, the differences in lordship styles between center and periphery — and the understanding that lordship did not need to equate with warrior-hood — sharply shifted the rhetoric of historic discourse.

Unquestionably, Ishimoda's ideas benefited the field by forcing a fundamental reconsideration of the relationship between those who ruled and those who *were* ruled. Yet, what is also hopefully clear and of central importance to this study is that multiple conceptual divergences emerged. First, while the more nebulous umbrella concept of *zaichi ryōshu* advanced the historiographical discourse by forcing a reconsideration of structures of power and warrior lordship, it also was grounded firmly in Marxist teleology. With feudalism now accepted by many historians of premodern Japan to be an anachronistic concept, more apt to engender confusion than illumination, "loaded" intellectual frameworks like *zaichi ryōshu* are likely to cause similar amounts of confusion and misunderstanding. Second, while it is true that other scholars have attempted to expand the categorizing rubric of *zaichi ryōshu*, it is fair to say Ishimoda's influence still lingers, such that the predominant imagery surrounding the idea is linked with the image of the "warrior" despite the initial goal of differentiating *zaichi ryōshu* from *bushi*. As described in the section above dealing with the *kashindan*, this nuance can prove problematic by encouraging readers to carry preconceived

notions towards primary sources detailing these historical agents.

Dogō

The *dogō* have been identified as the "central figure" in the retainer corps by a number of Japanese scholars, including Fujiki Hisashi and Owada Tetsuo.[29] *Dogō* literally means "powerful family of the land."[30] More concretely, the *dogō* were prominent locals who were often armed, and governed villages or communities (often called *gō* 郷 in the sources) near which they lived. Although again, there are dangers in providing a direct translation since the borders of the term are ill-defined, for the purpose of discussion this article will use "local magnate." *Dogō* too was not a contemporary term and only began to appear in the historiography during the nineteenth century.[31] Historians commonly suggest that men of this social group replaced (or evolved from) the *jitō* 地頭 or "retainer land stewards" of the shogunate after the weakening of the Ashikaga bakufu during the fifteenth century. However, Imatani Akira, when discussing these local magnates, sagely cautions scholars about the nebulous nature of this and other similar terms. Their use is nonexistent in the primary sources, and it is difficult to classify who was or was not a *dogō* at the time. For example, Imatani points out how some scholars consider *dogō* as subcategories of *kokujin* (i.e. "local lord"), while others separate the two categories entirely.[32] In contrast, Fujiki Hisashi suggests that the *dogō* should be thought of as the top stratum of peasants, in contrast to the *jizamurai* to be described in the next passage, who constituted the bottom rank of warriors.[33]

Resolving the matter of why such terms like *dogō* were utilized and what purpose they served is central to unpacking how past scholars have approached these historical constructs, elucidating the implicit biases in their understanding. This intellectual framework reflects a lingering holdover

from Japan's adoption of the feudal framework from Western scholarship, where Japanese historians tried (and often *forced*) terms and concepts onto teleological skeletons that might not always fit.[34] As for why the term *dogō* itself was made, Hall hints that an over-reliance upon deterministic cleavages in the historiography required an artificial divide between "those who farmed" and "those who fought" — an essential split when pushing Japanese history into a Marxist, class-based narrative.[35] In this case, the *dogō* represented the wealthy former group, whereas the next group to be discussed — the *jizamurai* — were the latter, even while such a division was not inherently necessary to the understanding of landed tenure.

Jizamurai

Jizamurai literally means "samurai of the soil." Similar to the *dogō*, *jizamurai* often are depicted as armed managers of local communities. In fact, *jizamurai* occasionally is written in the primary sources and some historians will still refer to the *jizamurai* as a *dogō* in the scholastic interpretation of the text, using the two terms as synonyms.[36] However, other historians strictly separate the two categories.[37] Unlike *dogō,* the term *jizamurai* is not anachronistic, and is found in contemporary Warring States documents, including within the diary of warriors located in Kyoto.[38] A comparison of *jizamurai* and *dogō* will serve to further clarify the problematic ambiguity in the historiography, but will also illustrate how land tenure functioned in the Sengoku period.

The element that is common between frequent depictions of both *jizamurai* and *dogō* in the historiography is the link of these figures to the land.[39] Scholars suggest both groups directly controlled the communities in which they resided or were related to another group who "claimed" the land as their own.[40] Under their authority lived both free and indentured

individuals who worked the land. By necessity, members of the *dogō* and *jizamurai* were armed, although this commonality was sometimes muted as described above. It should be noted that the connections of these individuals to the land often were not "legal" before their incorporation into the retainer corps of the daimyo.[41] This illegality existed as all rights to draw income from the land were technically held by elite groups in the capital, like nobles and temples, or their local representatives living in the provinces in accordance with the *shōen* land system — a system that had diminished in significance by the fifteenth century, but which still held sway legally and administratively.[42] In this economic infrastructure, the basic unit of taxation was the *shōen* or "manor." Although this is an oversimplification, before the Sengoku daimyo overturned the system, "shares" of income from these manors were claimed by the elites mentioned above. In essence, the individuals who are identified by scholars as *dogō* and *jizamurai* were illegal "squatters" (at least from the viewpoint of the Kyoto elites). The historian Miyagawa Mitsuru thus labels these two groups as illegal successors of the Kamakura *jitō*.[43]

What cannot be overemphasized, however, in terms of the significance of these historical agents towards an understanding of landed tenure (and thus how the medieval economy functioned), is that scholars suggest both groups of "warriors" militarily and politically controlled the local communities from which they derived income. This trend toward local control of landed wealth was a fundamental difference between the Sengoku economy and the older *shōen* based economy described above. Previously, large portions of income went from the *shōen* that were often located far away from the capital to Kyoto itself. There the wealth was concentrated in the hands of an elite few like the emperor, nobles, and powerful temples. Instead, during the Sengoku period, income rights were primarily

concentrated for the first time in premodern Japan in the hands of the warrior or armed cultivator who lived on the land and the daimyo who replaced the older shōen elite as purveyors of legal authorization.[44] These figures who held direct control of the land have been labeled by Japanese historians as the aforementioned *dogō* and *jizamurai*. Their rise thus signaled the final transformation (some would call it a weakening) of the *shōen*, which had been the defining unit of the Japanese medieval economy from arguably the tenth through fifteenth centuries. Certainly much of the older terminology and features like the splitting of revenue shares among different hierarchical participants continued, but the central difference was that new, local parties were now awarded legal authority for the possession of landed rights. After 500 years, landed control had finally been consolidated into the possession of local individuals, instead of diffusing into the hands of many in the center.

Kokujin

If not for the argument that many of the aforementioned men did not reside within fortifications, the English term *castellan* might prove a good match for their behavior. *Castellan* is problematic however, as it could theoretically be used to describe the next group of individuals as well. *Kokujin* (also used synonymously with the word *kunishū*) is a term much older than those above. The word *kunibito* (the eighth century pronunciation) appears in documents from Japan's earliest days, including within the *Nihon shoki* itself.[45] However, its usage evolved dramatically over time — a critical concern when historians attempt to identify the *core* idea in the term. Initially a simple indicator of a person living in a particular area, by the twelfth century such individuals tended to either serve as functionaries of the court on "public" lands called *kokuga* 国衙 or rule over a small area as a local military leader. Later, following the fall of the Kamakura regime, many

jitō cemented their positions as figures of local authority, absorbing strong peasants under their control, and in the process becoming centers of power opposed to shogunate governance. These nascent authorities are frequently identified by historians as the originators of *kokujin* as lords, and thus can be described as a parallel, peripheral evolution of government during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries when compared to the *shugo*, who represented the authority of the shogunate.[46] Other scholars argue that local, "non-warrior" leaders, such as the *dogō* should be given credit as the source of future *kokujin*, demonstrating again a lack of consensus when defining this and other historical terminology.

The term *kokujin*'s literal meaning, "a man of the provinces," might conjure the image of an individual similar in stature to the *dogō* examined above. One description with which Japanese historians generally agree is that by the Sengoku period these were local warrior leaders who directly controlled the comparatively large domains upon which they lived. The difference between these two groups in the Japanese scholarship is generally one of scale, where *kokujin* are defined as more powerful in arms and political power than the *dogō*.[47] Unlike the *dogō*, these individuals frequently are depicted as having retainers serving under them (this was not a necessity for the *dogō* and *jizamurai* "classes" in the historiography).[48] In fact *dogō* and *jizamurai* are occasionally depicted as serving the *kokujin* as those same retainers. Also, it is often argued among scholars that it was from this *kokujin* "stratum" of the social hierarchy that Sengoku daimyo emerged. For example, Miyagawa describes how strong *kokujin* manipulated politically weak *dogō*, which led to the rise of *kokujin* leagues where the most powerful among the local lords became Sengoku daimyo.[49] In the traditional hierarchy, *dogō* and *jizamurai* are depicted as the base of a pyramid upon which the *kokujin* stood as subordinates to — or equals of —

the Sengoku daimyo.

What hopefully has become clear in the description above is the ambiguity in terms of scale and the variable nature of the concept over time. How large were the areas they controlled? While they are often described as leaders in leagues banding together to resist outside powers, the *jizamurai* too have been labeled as such.[50] Obviously regional and individual differences would have caused variation within this "class", yet if they run the gamut from village level power to nascent daimyo, the terminology creates more problems than it solves, thus suggesting that a *single* definition that encompasses the many aspects identified by historians cannot exist.

Conclusion

The questions we thus arrive at are: What are we to do with these terms? How are we to understand them? Most importantly, as noted at the start of this article, how does an analysis of their meanings help clarify the nature of medieval land tenure, and by extension challenge existing historiographic teleologies of the Sengoku period? These bearers — whether legally or illegally — of the right to land have been labeled as *zaichi ryōshu* by historians, suggesting that each of the above categories of historical agents had fully privatized the land under their individual control through the securing of certain layers within a larger hierarchy of power. Previously the *shōen* system allowed both political and economic control of the land to be dispersed among different elites, with aristocratic and religious proprietors securing portions of income to landed wealth. However, with the empowerment of these landed lords at the local level during the Sengoku age, that older system of divided land rights linked to Kyoto elites gradually disappeared. In order to extend control from the top to the bottom, the main Japanese paradigms thus suggest that within the body of the *kashindan*,

these historic agents were either coopted or forced to align with the daimyo, or in some instances became daimyo themselves. This narrative is not incorrect in and of itself, but it does rest upon a problematic assumption.

That assumption is the belief that an exhaustive exploration of terms or constructs as a framework of study will lead to a greater historical truth. As Mikael Adolphson argued in his deconstruction of the *sōhei*, many historians attempt to isolate a particular historical phenomenon within "a single category of historical actor."[51] While this may partially be a result of the usage of the Marxist paradigm described above, the problem is not simply one of Japanese scholarship, as one can just as easily argue that the Western model of analysis still derives from the concept of absolutist Platonic ideals. Numerous faulty modes of analysis can thus follow from this pursuit of *singular* definitions. In the case of terms invented after the historic period in examination, like *sōhei, dogō*, or *zaichi ryōshu*, our modern classifications may well not fit the complexity of the past. Ambiguity, *not* clarity, marked premodern status and "class" relations. If a term is a later invention, it becomes impossible to determine an exact definition, as the placement of *dogō* among both peasants and warriors by previous scholars demonstrates.

Even for non-anachronistic terms that did exist historically, such as *jizamurai* and *kokujin*, the usage of the terms was often not fixed, leading to near unending debates among historians with no resolution. As hopefully was clear in the descriptions above, it is unsurprising that not all individual lords were equal in scale and power, and thus demonstrates a significant overlap between the terms. At least in theory, each warrior leader directly resided on land or belonged to a kinship network that controlled land. Yet small differences in status or legal rights existed among them. Due to these shades of nuance, it is unsurprising why there remains to this day a great deal of debate among the scholars in Japan over what stratum of local armed

landholder held what importance.

This desire for clarity in terminology is mirrored by a push towards a narrative of teleological progression and centralization in the historiography of Sengoku Japan — in particular towards a unifier-centric paradigm. As with the terminology related to *kashindan* listed above, where an attempt by previous historians to explain particular phenomena was ascribed to singular categories of historic actors, so too have past scholars attributed excessive credit to the unifiers Nobunaga, Hideyoshi, and Ieyasu for their roles in what has been dubbed the reunification of Japan. If the excessive focus given to defining terminology constrained us, an argument can be made that a similar constraint bound us when our research concentrated upon the unifiers and a teleology of unification. After all, the English-language historiography on Warring States Japan is only now truly beginning to move beyond these three figures, since even previous non-unifier monographs most often focused upon the "jewel" of the unifiers in the form of Kyoto. One can but hope that future research will try to travel beyond this unifier-focused discourse, pushing the analysis both away from the center of Kyoto and towards non-elite segments of medieval society examined herein.

Notes

1) For an example of this trend, one need look no further than the prolific historian Owada Tetsuo. Owada uses multiple labels for men of similar socio-economic standing. The term *gesō kashin* 下層家臣, or "low ranking retainer," on page 279 of his text describes the group that received wages while fighting for the daimyo. In the *Sengoku daimyo kashindan jiten*, a work edited by Owada and Yamamoto Dai, soldiers are also called *myōshūsō* 名主層, or "members of the class of local landholders."

   Owada and Yamamoto, *Sengoku daimyo kashindan jiten: Tōgoku hen*, p. 279.

2) Elizabeth A. R. Brown, "The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of

Medieval Europe," *American Historical Review* 79:4 (1974), p. 1063–1088.

3) David Spafford, *A Sense of Place* (Cambridge: Harvard East Asian Monograph, 2013), p. 12.

4) (ed.) Sugiyama Hiroshi, *Sengoku ibun: Go-Hōjō-hen,* vol. 1–6 (Tokyo: Tokyodō Publishing, 1989–1995).

5) Chūsei kōki kenkyūkai, ed. *Muromachi sengokuki kenkyū o yominaosu*. For a more in-depth exploration of this work, please see my article in the following: (ed.) Karl Friday, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Premodern Japanese History* (London: Routledge, 2017).

6) See Ryavec, "Political Jurisdiction in the Sengoku Daimyo Domain," p. 166 for the previous translation. One example of the many cases of the later translation can be found in: Jeroen Pieter Lamers, *Japonius Tyrannus* (Leiden: Hotei Publishing, 2000), p. 37.

7) One noted exception is Peter Arnesen, who describes the system not as one where pledges of "honor" linked together the warriors, but where instead ties of rational co-dependence bound together lord and retainer.

   Peter Arnesen, *The Medieval Japanese Daimyo* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), p. 210.

8) John Whitney Hall, "The Ikeda House and its Retainers in Bizen." in *Studies in the Institutional History of Early Modern Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 80.

   Also see the *Bunmeibon setsuyōshū* for an example of its usage during the Muromachi age. (ed.) Nakada Norio, *Bunmeibon setsuyōshū* (Tokyo: Kazama Shobō, 1970), p. 284.

   It is worth noting that the term *kashin* only occasionally appeared in the documents of the era, despite Hall's commentary on the word, while the near synonym *kachū* 家中 was utilized far more frequently.

9) (ed.) Sawaki Eichi, *Odawarashū shoryō yakuchō* (Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1998), p. 1. As can be observed in the Sawaki's explanation about the *Odawara-shu* group of retainers, the divisions within the *yakuchō* are clearly distinguishable by any reader.

10) Ibid, p. 3–7.

11) (ed.) Sugiyama Hiroshi, *Odawarashū shoryō yakuchō* (Tokyo: Kondō Publishing, 1969), p. 1–3.

12) (ed.) Sugiyama Hiroshi, *Sengoku ibun: Go-Hōjō-hen,* vol. 3, p. 148.

13) The text in the original document is damaged in the area marked "□." A phrase like 「有らずんば」was probably written in that location.

14) Calculating the equivalent value of *kan* and *mon* in terms of modern currency is very difficult, but Japanese scholars often use a rough, "off-the-cuff" approximation of 1 *mon* (i.e. one "copper coin") to 100 Japanese yen when attempting to estimate the worth of land-grants such as these. 1 *kan* is 1000 *mon*.

15) Sasaki Gin'ya, "Sengoku Daimyo Rule and Commerce," in *Japan Before Tokugawa* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 143.

16) Michael Birt, "Warring States" (PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 1983), p. 232. The Uirō name does not appear in the *Yakuchō*.

17) (ed.) Nagahara Keiji, *Iwanami nihonshi jiten* (Tokyo: Iwanami Printing, 1999), p. 98.

18) (ed.) Sugiyama, *Sengoku ibun: Go-Hōjō-hen, vol. 1*, p. 57.

19) (ed.) Sawaki, *Odawara-shū shoryō yakuchō*, p. 45.
Birt refers to the Uno as the Uirō on p. 232 of his study, but presents an identical *kandaka* value for Uno's son's holdings, so I believe he is discussing the same family.

20) Shimoyama Haruhisa, *Go-Hōjō-shi kashindan jinmei jiten* (Tokyo: Tokyodō Publishing, 2006), p. 106.

21) Ikegami Hiroko, *Oda Nobunaga* (Tokyo: Jinbutsu sōsho, 2012). Arguably the central premise of Ikegami's biography of Nobunaga is the demystification of this unifier as a means to counter what she considers unwarranted praise given to the daimyo.

22) This metamorphosis will be unpackaged more fully in two of my forthcoming articles currently submitted for publication. For further details in the interim, please see my dissertation.
Jeff Kurashige, "Serving Your Master: The Kashindan Retainer Corps and the Socio-Economic Transformation of Warring States Japan." PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 2011.

23) One of the finest examples of work discussing the proto-capitalization during the Edo period that have maintained relevance even over time is Thomas C Smith's *Native Sources of Japanese Industrialization, 1750–1920* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

24) Amino Yoshihiko 網野善彦. "Commerce and Finance in the Middle Ages: The Beginnings of 'Capitalism'." *Acta Asiatica*, no. 81 (2001), p. 1–19.

25) Suzuki Kunihiro, "Zaichi ryōshu," *Kokushi daijiten vol. 6* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1985), p. 193.

26) Yuasa Haruhisa, "Zaichi ryōshusei," *Nihon chūseishi kenkyū jiten* (Tokyo: Tokyodō Publishing, 1995), p. 61.

27) Ishimoda Sho, *Chūseiteki sekai no keisei* (Tokyo: Iwanami bunko, 1946 (1985 reprint)), 1946.

28) Irumada Nobuo, "Ryōshūsei," *Nihonshi daijiten*, vol. 6 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1994), p. 1169–70.

29) Owada Tetsuo, *Go-Hōjō-shi Kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1983), p. 233–234.

30) In his classic article on the translation of medieval Japanese words and concepts, Hall labels the *dogō* as "affluent villagers", but does not discuss the anachronistic nature of the term or militant dimension that colors such individuals in the Japanese historiography. John Whitney Hall, "Terms and Concepts in Japanese Medieval History," *Journal of Japanese Studies* 9, no. 1 (1983), p. 18.

31) Kokugo jiten henshūbu (ed.), *Nihon kokugo daijiten* (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 2006), p. 618. The original term appears to be a Chinese one used within the *History of the Southern Dynasties* and appropriated by later Japanese historians.

32) Imatani Akira, "Muromachi Local Government: *Shugo and Kokujin*," *The Cambridge History of Japan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 253.

33) Fujiki Hisashi, "Jizamurai," *Nihonshi daijiten* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1994), p. 832.

34) See Friday's "The Futile Paradigm" for a longer discussion of the issue.
Karl Friday, "The Futile Paradigm: In Quest of Feudalism in Early Medieval Japan." *History Compass* 8:2 (2010), p. 179–196.

35) Hall, p. 18.

36) Owada, p. 305.

37) Imatani, p. 253.

38) Kokugo jiten henshūbu (ed.), *Nihon kokugo daijiten*, vol. 9, p. 492.

39) Mizubayashi Takeshi, *Hōkensei no saihen to nihonteki shakai no kakuritsu* (Tokyo: Yamakawa Publishing, 1987), p. 41.

40) Yoshida Yuriko, "*Heinō bunri to mibun*," *Nihonshi kōza vol. 5: Kinsei no keisei* (Tokyo: Tokyo University Publishing, 2004), p. 145–147. Also: Mizubashi, p. 41. Yoshida demonstrates in her article that it was the magnate families that claimed dominion over the local communities from which they drew income. Even when their younger sons went off to war, they maintained the family connection to the land that they lived upon when not fighting for the daimyo.

41) Katsumori Sumiko, "Go-Hōjō-shi goryōsho (chokkatsuchi) no kenkyū." *Shichō* 10 (1959), p. 52.

42) Nagahara Keiji, "The Sengoku Daimyo and the Kandaka System," *Japan Before Tokugawa* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 37.

43) Miyagawa Mitsuru, "From Shōen to Chigyō: Proprietary Lordship and the Structure of Local Power," *Japan in the Muromachi Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), p. 93.

44) The process may well have begun earlier, such as during the reign of Ashikaga Yoshimitsu, but certainly the Onin War and the associated weakening of central power played a huge role in this transition. See Katsumori p. 59 to observe the parallels in the newer economic mode with the older shōen — wherein the daimyo now received a share of landed wealth.

45) Kokugo jiten henshūbu (ed.), *Nihon kokugo daijiten*, vol. 8, p. 20.

46) Sato Kazuhiko, *Kokushi daijiten* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1985), p. 660.

47) Miyagawa, p. 94.

48) Ibid, p. 100.

49) Ibid.

50) Fujiki, p. 832.

51) Mikael Adolphson, *The Teeth and Claws of the Buddha* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press), p. 12.

Reference List

Primary Sources

Nakada Norio 中田祝夫, ed. *Bunmeibon setsuyōshū: Kenkyū narabi ni sakuin* 文明本節用集：研究並びに索引. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō, 1970.

Sawaki Eichi 佐脇栄智, ed. *Odawarashū shoryō yakuchō: Sengoku ibun Go-Hōjō-hen* 小田原衆所領役帳 戦国遺文後北条編. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1998.

Sugiyama Hiroshi 杉山博, ed. *Odawarashū shoryō yakuchō* 小田原衆所領役帳. Tokyo: Kondō Publishing, 1969.

Sugiyama Hiroshi 杉山博, ed. *Sengoku ibun: Go-Hōjō-hen* 戦国遺文後北条氏編, vol. *1–6*. Tokyo: Tokyodō Publishing, 1989–1995.

Japanese Secondary Sources

Chūsei kōki kenkyūkai 中世後期研究会, ed. *Muromachi sengokuki kenkyū o yominaosu* 室町・戦国期研究を読みなおす. Tokyo: Shibunkaku Publishing, 2007.

Fujiki Hisashi 藤木 久志. "Jizamurai 地侍." In Shimonaka Hiroshi 下中弘, ed. *Nihonshi daijiten* 日本史大辞典, vol. 3. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1994. p. 832.

Ikegami Hiroko 池上裕子. *Oda Nobunaga* 織田信長. Tokyo: Jinbutsu sōsho, 2012.

Irumada Nobuo 入間田宣夫. "Ryōshūsei 領主制." In Shimonaka Hiroshi 下中弘, ed. *Nihonshi daijiten* 日本史大辞典, vol. 6. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1994. p. 1169–70.

Ishimoda Sho 石母田正. *Chūseiteki sekai no keisei* 中世的世界の形成. Tokyo: Iwanami bunko, 1946 (1985 reprint).

Katsumori Sumiko 勝守すみ子. "*Go-Hōjō-shi goryōsho (chokkatsuchi) no kenkyū* 後北条氏御領所（直轄地）の研究." *Shichō* 史潮 10 (1959), p. 52–71.

Kokugo jiten henshūbu 国語辞典編集部, ed. *Nihon kokugo daijiten* 日本国語大辞典. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 2006.

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

Nagahara Keiji 永原慶二, ed. *Iwanami nihonshi jiten* 岩波日本史辞典. Tokyo: Iwanami Printing, 1999.

Owada Tetsuo 小和田哲男. *Go-Hōjō-shi kenkyū* 後北条氏研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1983.

Owada Tetsuo and Yamamoto Dai 山本大. *Sengoku daimyo kashindan jiten: Tōgoku hen* 戦国大名家臣団事典 東国編. Shinjinbutsu Ōraisha, 1981.

Sato Kazuhiko 佐藤和彦. “Kokujin 国人.” In *Kokushi daijiten henshū iinkai* 国史大辞典編集委員会編, ed. *Kokushi daijiten* 国史大辞典, vol. 5. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1985. p. 660.

Shimoyama Haruhisa 下山治久. *Go-Hōjō-shi kashindan jinmei jiten* 後北条氏家臣団人名辞典. Tokyo: Tokyodō Publishing, 2006.

Suzuki Kunihiro 鈴木國弘. “Zaichi ryōshu 在地領主.” In *Kokushi daijiten* vol. *6* 国史大辞典. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1985. p. 193.

Yoshida Yuriko 吉田ゆり子. “Heinō bunri to mibun” 兵農分離と身分. In *Nihonshi kōza* vol. *5: Kinsei no keisei* 日本史講座〈5〉近世の形成. Ed. Rekishigaku kenkyūkai’s 歴史学研究会日本史研究会. Tokyo: Tokyo University Publishing, 2004. p. 133–166.

Yuasa Haruhisa 湯浅治久. “Zaichi ryōshusei 在地領主.” In *Nihon chūseishi kenkyū jiten* 日本中世史研究事典. Ed. Sato Kazuhiko 佐藤和彦 et al. Tokyo: Tokyodō Publishing, 1995. p. 61–63.

English-Language Secondary Sources

Adolphson, Mikael. *The Teeth and Claws of the Buddha*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2007.

Amino Yoshihiko 網野善彦. “Commerce and Finance in the Middle Ages: The Beginnings of ‘Capitalism’.” *Acta Asiatica*, no. 81 (2001), p. 1–19.

Arnesen, Peter. *The Medieval Japanese Daimyo: The Ōuchi Family’s Rule of Suō and Nagato*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Birt, Michael. “Samurai in Passage: The Transformation of the Sixteenth-Century Kanto.” *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 11:2 (Summer 1985), p. 369–399.

Birt, Michael. “Warring States: A Study of the Go-Hōjō Daimyo and Domain, 1491–1590.” PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 1983.

Brown, Elizabeth. “The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe.” *The American Historical Review* 79:4 (Oct. 1974), p. 1063–1088.

Friday, Karl. “The Futile Paradigm: In Quest of Feudalism in Early Medieval Japan.” *History Compass* 8:2 (2010), p. 179–196.

Hall, John Whitney. “The Ikeda House and its Retainers in Bizen.” In *Studies in the Institutional History of Early Modern Japan*, ed. John Hall and Marius Jansen, p. 79–88. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Hall, John Whitney. "Terms and Concepts in Japanese Medieval History: An Inquiry into the Problems of Translation." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 9, no. 1 (1983), p. 1–32.

Imatani Akira. "Muromachi Local Government: *Shugo and Kokujin*." Trans. Suzanne Gay. In vol 3 of *The Cambridge History of Japan*, ed. Kozo Yamamura, p. 231–259. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Kurashige, Jeffrey. "Serving Your Master: The Kashindan Retainer Corps and the Socio-Economic Transformation of Warring States Japan." PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 2011.

Kurashige, Jeffrey. "The Sixteenth Century: Identifying a New Group of "Unifiers" and Reevaluating the Myth of "Reunification."" In *Routledge Handbook of Premodern Japanese History*, ed. Karl Friday. London: Routledge, 2017.

Lamers, Jeroen Pieter. *Japonius Tyrannus: A Political Biography of Oda Nobunaga*. Leiden: Hotei Publishing, 2000.

Miyagawa Mitsuru. "From Shōen to Chigyō: Proprietary Lordship and the Structure of Local Power." Trans. Cornelius Kiley. In *Japan in the Muromachi Age*, ed. John Hall and Takeshi Toyoda, p. 89–106. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Nagahara Keiji. "The Sengoku Daimyo and the Kandaka System." Trans. Kozo Yamamura. In *Japan Before Tokugawa*, ed. John Hall et al, p. 27–63. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Ryavec, Carole Ann. "Political Jurisdiction in the Sengoku Daimyō Domain: Japan, 1477–1573." PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1978.

Sasaki Gin'ya. "Sengoku Daimyo Rule and Commerce." Trans. William B. Hauser. In *Japan Before Tokugawa*, ed. John Hall et al, p. 125–148. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Smith, Thomas C. *Native Sources of Japanese Industrialization, 1750–1920*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Spafford, David. *A Sense of Place: The Political Landscape in Late Medieval Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard East Asian Monograph, 2013.