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INTRODUCTION

Among written accounts of medieval Japanese warfare, *Baishōron* remains relatively obscure.[[1]](#footnote-1) *Taiheiki*, the more popular and far larger chronicle of the age, overshadowed it for centuries.[[2]](#footnote-2) While *Taiheiki* recounts a generation of warfare in forty chapters and over a thousand pages, *Baishōron,* just over a tenth as long, covers six years in detail.

*Baishōron*’s survival is remarkable, since the work was ideologically obsolescent when it was written. It recounts the glory of the Ashikaga brothers Takauji, the first shogun, and Tadayoshi. These two founded a warrior government and worked together until 1350, when they became embroiled in a mortal struggle known as the Kannō no jōran (the Kannō Anarchy, 1350-52). This conflict resulted in Tadayoshi’s death and the near destruction of the Ashikaga regime. By presenting an early justification of Ashikaga rule, *Baishōron* is critical to understanding why Takauji and Tadayoshi succeeded so well between 1333 until 1350. The only comparable surviving monument of their authority consists of two remarkable portraits, one of Takauji and one Tadayoshi, likewise executed before 1350.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The earliest reference to *Baishōron* dates from 1420,[[4]](#footnote-4) and the oldest manuscripts of it date from the general time of the Ōnin War (1467-77). However, the work attracted little attention until it was copied again in the seventeenth century.[[5]](#footnote-5) Late in that century, scholars became interested in the epic *Taiheiki* and published a comparative analysis of its variant texts, entitled *Sankō Taiheiki*. The *Sankō Taiheiki* compilers dismissed *Baishōron* as being riddled with errors and characterized it as unreliable because it repeatedly contradicted *Taiheiki*.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Japanese historians more rigorously debated the reliability of sources during the Meiji era (1868-1912), while the state promoted the compilation of *Dainihon shiryō*, a voluminous chronological compendium of historical sources. The process of compiling this work revealed the inaccuracies of *Taiheiki*, which Suga Masatomo argued was filled with errors and omissions. In so doing he relied on fourteenth century documents and on *Baishōron*, which he introduced to a scholarly audience in 1890.[[7]](#footnote-7) His work, expanded in 1894, remained for decades the definitive study of *Baishōron*.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Ultimately, the *Dainihon shiryō* compilers decided to begin their compilation of post-Genkō [1331-333] sources with a quotation from *Taiheiki*.[[9]](#footnote-9) The much shorter *Baishōron* first appears on p. 61 of this volume,[[10]](#footnote-10) and is used most prominently as a major source for the battles of Tadarahama and Minatogawa, the decisive encounters of 1336.[[11]](#footnote-11)

*Distinctive Features of the Text*

The *Baishōron* author has remained anonymous, but analysis of the text provides ample clues to his identity. First, and most remarkably, the *Baishōron* account of the battles of Tadarahama and Minatogawa seems to come from an eye witness.[[12]](#footnote-12) Unlike the formulaic description of battles in most literary accounts of warfare, the *Baishōron* accounts of Tadarahama and Minatogawa describe the coloring of armor or horses in a way consistent with how an actual observer would have noted them.[[13]](#footnote-13) Details like the sunlight on the eve of battle, a sudden dust storm impacting the battle, or for that matter, the fact that the billowing cape (*horo*) of one warrior prevented his armor from being recognized suggests a careful narrator who recounted what he actually saw. This is a rare account of medieval Japanese warfare by a participant.[[14]](#footnote-14)

The next notable element of the text is its accuracy with respect to place and chronology. In comparison with *Taiheiki*, *Baishōron* provides remarkably precise dates for major events, as well as a chronology consistent with actual geographical movement. For example, *Baishōron* correctly shows that Takauji first rebelled on Genkō 3.4.27 (1333) at Shinomura.[[15]](#footnote-15) *Taiheiki,* by contrast, contains significant errors, most notably the notion that he switched sides on Genkō 3.5.7.[[16]](#footnote-16) Likewise, the *Baishōron* narrative matches other documents, and is geographically and temporally possible. An example is Takauji’s advance from Kamakura late in 1335.[[17]](#footnote-17) Its chronology for the battle of Minatogawa, too, can be verified. [[18]](#footnote-18) Finally, *Baishōron* correctly shows that Kenshun brought an edict from the Jimyōin emperor (Kōgon) legitimating Takauji’s rebellion midway through the second month of 1336. This is confirmed by a letter written by Takauji on Kenmu 3.2.15 (1336) and a mobilization order dating from two days later.[[19]](#footnote-19) *Taiheiki* claims that this edict was not issued until nearly ten weeks later, on Kenmu 3.5.1.[[20]](#footnote-20)

*Taiheiki* exaggerates the size of armies and provides no consistency at all with respect to numbers.[[21]](#footnote-21) *Baishōron*, too, mentions impossibly large numbers, but these are invariably reported as hearsay, not as fact.[[22]](#footnote-22) It describes actual encounters in far more limited, plausible fashion. For example, *Baishōron* mentions fifty troops dying in one encounter during the battle of Minatogawa, and it describes the destruction of the Kusunoki army as resulting in 700 deaths. Such numbers are consistent with the number of casualties in an overwhelming defeat.[[23]](#footnote-23)

The narrative portrays individuals and shrines associated with Northern Kyushu vividly. These include warriors such as the Shōni, and the Aeba, and also the important regional shrines of Kushida, Kashii, and Munakata. The Kyushu connection helps to determine who wrote the work.

*The Question of Authorship*

By analyzing the offices and ranks of figures mentioned in *Baishōron*, Koakimoto Dan has demontrated that the work was completed, or at very least reached its current form, between the eighth and tenth months of 1351.[[24]](#footnote-24) The timing is both significant and ironic, since this work devoted to glorifying the Ashikaga was written precisely at the moment when the two Ashikaga brothers, Takauji and Tadayoshi, had started fighting each other. The situation in Kyoto was chaotic, but in Kyushu only a handful of warriors still supported Takauji. The Shōni, one of whom might logically have been the author, sided with Tadayoshi. Nevertheless, Tadayoshi was killed, and his supporters later transferred their allegiance to the Southern Court. None of these would have retained favor with the Ashikaga beyond 1351.

Thus the field of likely candidates for authorship narrows to an individual (or individuals) familiar with Kyushu, who witnessed the battles of Tadarahama and Minatogawa and steadily supported Ashikaga Takauji through the time when the work was written. The most plausible possibility is therefore a member of the Munakata family or someone closely affiliated with them.

*Munakata Authorship*

The Munakata, a family from Northern Kyushu, staffed the Munakata shrine. Some also served under the Rokuhara as administrators (*tandai*), Kamakura’s judicial representatives in Kyoto.[[25]](#footnote-25) For some reason, most such officials sympathized with the claims to legitimacy made by candidates of the Daikakuji lineage. Some, such as Iga Kanemitsu, actively supported the Daikakuji emperor Go-Daigo against Kamakura. The Munakata in Kyoto also came to support Go-Daigo.[[26]](#footnote-26) This sympathy for Go-Daigo and the Daikakuji emperors pervades the early narrative, complete with indignation when Kamakura forced a Daikakuji emperor to abdicate in favor of his Jimyōin rival (Kōgon). Likewise, a lack of detail concerning important members of the noble Hino family suggests that the author was not in close contact with people affiliated with the Jimyōin emperors. However, these sympathies dissolved in 1336, once the unpopular Go-Daigo himself became a target of rebellion.

Minor but significant mistakes early in the narrative show that the author was not thoroughly familiar with the court. The claim that Emperor Go-Horikawa was the grandson of Go-Toba is incorrect.[[27]](#footnote-27) The narrative also records imperial reigns as beginning not from the moment of an emperor’s accession, but rather from the first full year of his reign.[[28]](#footnote-28) These errors and inconsistencies contrast with the accuracy of the work’s accounts of the battles of the 1330s.

The *Baishōron* author accepted the notion of inviolate imperial authority. Epitomizing these sentiments, the narrative portrays the eastern warriors as being unable to stand against the monarch, who in 1221 was felt to rule by moral suasion. They won the war nonetheless, simply because of Emperor Go-Toba’s moral failings. These sentiments closely match those express in *Masukagami*, another fourteenth century narrative with a court perspective. *Baishōron* is unusual, however, in that a provincial warrior possesses attitudes resembling those prevalent at the court.

Because *Baishōron* has been seen as a counterpart to *Taiheiki,* both works’ pro-Daikakuji bias has encouraged those who discuss the relationship between court and Kamakura through 1333 to ignore the rival perspective, that of the emperors and courtiers of the Jimyōin lineage. This caution particularly applies to claims that Go-Saga’s testament required Daikakuji succession. Jimyōin documents suggest a different interpretation.[[29]](#footnote-29) Until recently, the Jimyōin perspective and claim to legitimacy were little understood, although it was the Jimyōin emperors whom the Ashikaga supported and who are the forebears of the current imperial line.[[30]](#footnote-30)

Although Munakata administrators linked to the capital may have had a hand in this work, not all of the Munakata immediately turned against Kamakura. Those in Northern Kyushu continued to support Kamakura officials through Genkō 3.4.2 (1333), before abandoning them, like many others, in the fifth month of Genkō 3.[[31]](#footnote-31) The Munakata with the strongest court ties later became the most influential at the shrine during 1333-36, but they quickly shifted allegiances from the Daikakuji emperor Go-Daigo to Ashikaga Takauji when Takauji rebelled in 1335. One Munakata collateral, Yakurō Ujiie, is described in his genealogy as following Lord Takauji and fighting on his behalf. [[32]](#footnote-32)

Munakata Ujinori, the chief priest of the shrine, was ordered to quell “rebels” who, early in 1335, still supported the defeated and all but destroyed Kamakura bakufu.[[33]](#footnote-33) He resigned his position on the fifteenth day of the third month, not long after the battle of Tadarahama, so as to fight for the Ashikaga. Ujinori and his son Ujitoshi traveled to Kyoto, where for nine years they fought in many battles.[[34]](#footnote-34) Although Ujinori and Ujitoshi left few documents recounting their exploits, other relatives, who adopted the surname Asamachi, can be documented as shifting their allegiance to Takauji late in 1335.[[35]](#footnote-35) Asamachi Mitsuyo fled with Takauji on Kenmu 3.2.18 (1336) to Onomichi, as the retreating forces made their way west, and then fought at Tadarahama on Kenmu 3.3.2 under the command of the Shōni.[[36]](#footnote-36) Another Asamachi, Taneyasu, fought under the Shōni and the Aeba, and served as a witness to the valor of others fighting in Kyoto in 1336. [[37]](#footnote-37)

The Munakata can be verified as fighting in Kyushu and Kyoto in 1336, and as serving under commanders who occupy a prominent role in the narrative. On Kenmu 3.4.2, before the decisive battle of Minatogawa, they also received rewards for their services from Ashikaga Takauji.[[38]](#footnote-38) Takauji rarely granted rewards before his authority stabilized. His bestowal of these lands on the Munakata, while still advancing on the capital, reveals the significance of the Munakata’s valor at Tadarahama.

With close ties to the Ashikaga, the Munakata remained steadfast supporters of Takauji through the 1350s, even though Takauji’s support all but collapsed in the west when he warred against his brother Tadayoshi. Ujiie, described in the Munakata genealogy as fighting bravely at Tadarahama, received an edict (*onkudashibumi*) from Takauji on Kannō 2.11.29 (1351) and a concurrent appointment to the *jitō* post of Miyanaga Katakuma, in Kurate district of Chikuzen province.[[39]](#footnote-39) This is around the time when the *Baishōron* was written. In this case, one can therefore affirm that a veteran of Tadarahama remained in Takauji’s good graces in 1351.[[40]](#footnote-40) Ujiie ultimately lost his autonomy and transferred his records to the main Munakata line, and most were lost. Whether he or his brothers, nephews, and uncles were mostly responsible for the narrative is presently unknowable, but the probability of a Munakata connection remains high.[[41]](#footnote-41)

Baishōron *as a Counterpart to the Oldest Versions of* Taiheiki

*Baishōron* seems to have been written in response to the earliest versions of *Taiheiki*, none of which now survives. Koakimoto Dan’s research suggests that its narrative most closely matches the oldest *Taiheiki* variants.[[42]](#footnote-42) Its author was aware of *Taiheiki* or had access to a shared narrative tradition that influenced both texts. For example, the parodic poem about watchfires at Amida-ga-mine appears in both works.[[43]](#footnote-43) Likewise, *Baishōron* has Takauji rebel because he was forced to attack Kamakura while still in mourning for his father. However, his father died in 1331, not 1333. This same mistake, corrected in later versions of *Taiheiki*, appears also in the oldest extant version (the *Kandabon*)of this work.[[44]](#footnote-44)

*Baishōron* also resembles *Taiheiki* in its coverage of the battle of Minatogawa and its focus on Kusunoki Masashige. *Jinnō shōtōki* of Kitabatake Chikafusa, one of the the oldest accounts of the Southern Court, mentions Masashige as fighting at Chihaya in 1333 and briefly ackowledges his role in establishing a Southern Court presence at Yoshino, but it omits the battle of Minatogawa and Masashige’s death.[[45]](#footnote-45) In contrast, both *Baishōron* and *Taiheiki* praise Masashige extravagantly. The former portrays him as a prudent and skilled warrior, while the latter has him so devoted to the imperial cause that he vows to be reborn fighting for Go-Daigo and ultimately becomes a vengeful spirit. This emphasis on Masashige stems from a perspective shared with *Taiheiki* or some other early source but foreign to Kitabatake Chikafusa.

Nevertheless, *Baishōron* shares some motifs with *Jinnō shōtōki*. Chikafusa argued that the Daikakuji line was Japan’s legitimate lineage (*shōtō*). *Baishōron* exploits the same rhetoric, in early 1336, to argue that the Jimyōin emperors are legimate. The ideas that pervade Kitabatake Chikafusa’s work seem to have been widely discussed and disseminated, even though in this case they were applied to the Jimyōin rather than the Daikakuji lineage.

1. Ogawa Makoto found 20 variants among 23 surviving texts, the vast majority copied during the Tokugawa period (1600-1868) but some early ones dating from the fifteenth century. (Ogawa Makoto, “*Baishōron* shohon no kenkyū hosetsu” *Kokugakuin zasshi* vol. 80 no. 11 [1966]: 181-98). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Hyōdō Hiromi, *Taiheiki “yomi” no kanōsei* (Kōdansha, 1995), particularly pp. 178–79, and Wakao Masaki, *“Taiheiki yomi” no jidai* (Heibonsha, 1999) discuss the significance of this work in the early modern era. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Yonekura Michio, *Minamoto Yoritomo zō* (Heibonsha, 1995). Yonekura has shown that Tadayoshi’s portrait was long mistaken for Minamoto Yoritomo’s, while Takauji’s was thought to have been Taira no Shigemori’s. A third, of the second shogun, Yoshiakira, was later added to this collection. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A catalogue dating from Ōei 27.11.13 (1420) reveals that Prince Sadafusa possessed the *Baishōron* along with texts such as *Heiki,* the *Hōgen monogatari, Heiji monogatari, Jōkyū monogatari,* and *Taiheiki.* See Kunaichō Shoryōbu hen, *Kanmon nikki shihai monjo; Kanmon nikki bekki* (Tenri: Yōtokusha, 1965), doc. 149, Ōei 27.11.13 Monogatari mokuroku, pp. 219-21 (273-74). This was first noted by Ichizawa Tetsu, “*Baishōron* ni okeru Kenmu sannen Ashikaga Takauji seisō no ichi-mō hitotsu no Tatarahama kassen Minatogawa kassen,”*Kōbe daigaku shigaku nenpō* 16 (2001): 104-24. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. A 1466 (Kanshō 7) copy of the latter half of *Baishōron* is the oldest datable version, while the *Kyōdaibon*, copied in the sixth month of Bunmei 2 (1470), is the oldest verifiable complete text. See Yashiro et al., eds, “Kaidai,” Baishōron, p. 17 for the date of the *Kyōdaibon*. The Tenri version has an earlier date of 1442, but this date appears to have been written in later. For the most detailed analysis, see Takahashi Sadaichi, “Kyōdaibon Baishōron kaisetsu,”*Kokugo kokubun*, vol. 33, no. 8, pp. 1-6. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. They nevertheless included it because of its references to the Southern Court. See *Sankō Taiheiki*, p. 2 and Kama Kisaburō, “*Taiheiki* to shijitsu tsukete *Kanshōbon Baishōron* no koto*,” Kokubungaku* 11-2 (2.1966): 52-59, p. 59. Kama also mentions that the 1466 manuscript of *Baishōron* was not discovered until after this work was compiled. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Suga Masatomo, “Taiheki no byōmō iro ōki koto o bensu,” *Shigaku zasshi,* 1, no. 3, p. 28-34 (1890) and no. 4, pp. 38-46 (1890). Suga first quoted *Baishōron* in vol. 3, pp. 33-34. His work was overshadowed by the more famous critique of *Taiheiki,* the following year, by Kume Kunitake of the Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo. Kume famously described *Taiheiki* as “worthless” as a historical source. (Kume Kunitake “Taiheiki wa shigaku ni eki nashi.” *Shigaku zasshi* 2 no. 17, 18, 20, 22 [1891].) For an overview of the work’s shortcomings see Conlan, *From Sovereign to Symbol* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 9-13. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Suga Masatomo, “*Baishōron* kō,” *Shigaku zasshi* 1, no. 4 (1890): 61-65 and vol. 5 no. 1 (1894): 44-48. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The prominence accorded *Taiheiki* is surprising, since scholars such as Suga and Kume had questioned its accuracy. Miura Shūkō and Tanaka Yoshinari admitted that *Taiheiki* contained errors but still felt that it was essential for study of the age. For an overview of Miura’s arguments, see Mori Shigeaki, *Taiheiki no gunzō* (Kadokawa, 1991), p. 306. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. *Dainihon shiryō* (hereafter DNSR)Series 6 no. 1 (1901), pp. 1 and 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. DNSR 6.3 (1903), pp. 133-139-46 for Tadarahama and pp. 409-15, 452 for Minatogawa. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Fujimoto Masayuki first made this important observation in his, *Yoroi o matou hitobito* (Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000), pp. 179-83. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Fujimoto, *ibid*., pp. 181-83. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The only comparable work would be the Mongol invasion scrolls (*Mōko shūrai ekotoba*), which consists of Takezaki Suenaga’s narrative of battle. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Takeuchi Rizō, comp., *Kamakura ibun* (hereafter KI)(42 vols., Tōkyōdō shuppan, 1971-91)*,* vol. 41, docs. 32109-14, pp. 243-44 for Takauji’s mobilization orders of 1333 (Genkō 3).4.27. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Washio Junkei, ed. *Taiheiki* (*Seigen’in bon*) (Tōkō shoin, 1936), maki 9, “Gogatsu nanoka kassen no koto onajiku Rokuhara ochiru koto,” particularly pp. 212-18. Similar variation appears in the *Kandabon* version. See *Taiheiki (Kandabon)* (Kokusho Kankōkai, 1907), maki 9, “Gogatsu nanoka miyako kassen no koto,” pp. 90-110 (hereafter *Kandabon Taiheiki*). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Comparison of the *Baishōron* narrative with the petition of Nomoto Tomoyuki reveals the narrative’s fundamental accuracy. For the Nomoto document, see Conlan, *State of War: The Violent Order of Fourteenth Century Japan* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, 2003), pp. 12-47. For further analysis, see Takeda Masanori, “‘Taiheiki’ Hakone Takenoshita kassen kō: *Taiheiki* to *Baishōron,” Ibarajō kokubun 6* (3.1994). Takeda showed the impossibility of the *Taiheiki* accountand the fundamental accuracy of *Baishōron.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Compare the narrative with Seno Seiichirō, comp., *Nanbokuchō ibun Kyushu hen* (hereafter NBIK), (7 vols. Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1980-92), vol. 1, doc.616, 5.25.1336 Ashikaga Takauji kakikudashi an, p. 193. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. *NBIK* vol. 1, doc. 417, 2.15 Ashikaga Takauji shojō an, p. 144 and doc. 418, Kenmu 3.2.17 (1336) Ashikaga Takauji gunzei saisokujō, p. 145. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. See the *Kandabon Taiheiki*, maki 9, “Shōgun kairiku yori semenoboru koto,” p. 230. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. See Conlan, *State of War,* p. 9 for one example of how *Taiheiki* exaggerates numbers. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. The *Kandabon Taiheiki* states that 300 Ashikaga warriors fought 30,000 Kikuchi enemies. See maki 15, “Tatarahama kassen [no] koto,” p. 221. The *Seigen’in* version has the same numbers. See maki 15, “Tatarahama kassen [no] koto,” p. 424. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. The battle, which resulted in the death of Kitabatake Akiie, resulted in 700 dead. See NBIK vol. 1, docs. 1215-7, 1338 (Kenmu 5).urū 7.6 Isshiki Dōyū segyōjō, p. 367, and vol. 7, docs. 6995-8, 1338 (Kenmu 5).urū 7.6 Isshiki Dōyū segyōjō utsushi, pp. 15-16. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Koakimoto, *Taiheiki Baishōron no kenkyū*, Kyūko shoin*,* 2005, pp. 352-61, 394-95. Koakimoto also showed that the work does not recognize Southern Court promotions and therefore betrays a Northern Court bias. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Their ranks included Motouji, who served in 1315, and Nagauji, who served from 1313 through 1320, as well as a lay priest named Shinsei, who served in 1323-24 and 1327. See *Munakata shishi shiryōhen 1* (Munakata, 1995), doc. 261, Genkō 4.8.13 (1324) Rokuhara seisatsu, p. 610 for reference to the Munakata as serving as Rokuhara administrators (*bugyōnin*). See also Mori Yukio, *Rokuhara tandai no kenkyū* (Zoku gunsho ruijū kanseikai, 2005), pp. 78-79. For a list of all known administrators, see pp. 140-54. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. *Rokuhara tandai no kenkyū*, p. 77 for analysis of the Rengeji kakochō (KI, vol. 41, doc. 32137, pp. 252-58). This record of the Rokuhara dead reveals that only one administrator perished at Banba. The Munakata had abandoned Rokuhara by this time. Amino Yoshihiko discusses the duplicity of Iga Kanemitsu in his *Igyō no ōken* (Heibonsha, 1986), pp. 160-68. The *Baishōron* author mentions Iga Kanemitsu when describing Go-Daigo’s new institutions of governance. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Go-Horikawa was the grandson of Emperor Takakura, while Go-Toba was Takakura’s son (hence Go-Horikawa’s uncle). [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Perhaps the New Year *sechie* rites played a larger role in determining the start of an imperial reign than has been commonly assumed. *Baishōron* consistently dates imperial reigns to the year after the emperor succeeded to the throne. The one exception is that of Hanazono, who came to the throne on Enkyō 1.12.28 (1308). The fact that this happened so close to the New Year apparently led to this inconsistency, in that his reign should have been listed as starting from the following year. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Murata Masashi, ed., *Fūjinroku* (*Murata Masashi chosakushū,* vol. 7 (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 1986), pp. 13-14. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. For analysis of the Jimyōin perspective, see Conlan, *From Sovereign to Symbol.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. For the head of Munakata shrine aiding Hidetoki, see *Hakata Nikki*, 1333.4.2, reproduced in *Munakata shishi shiryōhen* 1, p. 629. For the son of Munakata Ujikatsu taking part in the destruction of Hidetoki, see Genkō 3.6.2 (1333) Hizen Munakata Dotomaru chakutōjō, p. 632. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. See his genealogy, reproduced in *Munakata shishi shiryōhen* 1, p. 626 and 721. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. *Munakata shishi shiryōhen* 1, 1.21 Go-Daigo tennō rinji, p. 646. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Teisei Munakata Daigūji keifu, in *Munakata shishi shiryōhen* 1, See p. 677 for the Munakataki tsuikō, which refers to Ujitoshi and others following Takauji to Kyoto in 1336 and remaining there for 9 years. For Ujinori’s resignation, see doc. 315, Munakata mokuroku, p. 673. For another narrative of Ujinori and Ujitoshi, see pp. 704-5. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. *Munakata shishi shiryōhen* 1, doc. 309, Kenmu 2.12.20 (1335) Asamachi Zen’e moshijō, p. 651. See also the mokuroku for the Munakata documents revealing that on Kenmu 2.11.8 Ashikaga Takauji confirmed an Asamachi will, suggesting their early support, since this was just when when his initial rebellion against Go-Daigo was becoming manifest. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. *Munakata shishi shiryōhen* 1, Kenmu 3. 2.18 (1336) Asamachi Mitsuyo chakutōjō, p. 652-53 and 1336.3.26 Ashikaga Takauji bugyōnin rensho hōsho, pp. 656-66. A Shōni wrote this document, but his identity is unknown. Printed versions attribute it erroneously (as Seno Sei’ichirō has shown) to Shōni Fuyutsuke. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. For the genealogy of the Asamachi, see *Munakata shishi shiryōhen* 1, p. 617; for the military documents, see *ibid*., doc. 324, Kenmu 3.25 9 (1336) Nagano Suketoyo gunchūjō utsushi, pp. 679-80. Taneyasu’s name appears as Kyoku Yagorō. Tellingly, this document also mentions the Aeba, who figure in *Baishōron* as well. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. See *Munakata shishi shiryōhen* 1, Munakata mokuroku, doc. 317, p. 674. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. See his genealogy, reproduced in *Munakata shishi shiryōhen* 1, pp. 626 and 721. Yakurō Ujiie gave these lands to the head of the shrine in 1363. See the listing of Munakata documents on pp. 765-66. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. One can verify Ujiie’s ownership of this Katakuma post, and the fact that he passed it to the Munakata main line in 1363. However, the edict from Takauji himself is missing. This is perhaps not surprising, since some of the most vivid military petitions were taken from the Munakata during the Tokugawa era. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
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