the kabuki, dramatized the same issue of samurai loyalty versus the claim to "public" authority questionably asserted by the shogunate. Both the scholarly debate and the popular dramatization reflect the uneasy coexistence of Neo-Confucian civil culture with many feudal values persisting not only in the samurai class but in the popular mind as well.

As the Way of the warrior became increasingly codified in literary form, other long-standing religious influences showed themselves. One of the most famous of these is found in *In the Shadow of Leaves* (*Hagakure*), which reflects the persistent influence of Zen in the Tokugawa period (see chap. 33), especially Zen in the cult of swordsmanship—the cult that Ruth Benedict referred to in her classic characterization of Japanese culture, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*.

THE DEBATE OVER THE AKŌ VENDETTA

Few events both fascinated and frightened the peaceful world of eighteenth-century Tokugawa Japan as much as the Akō vendetta of 1703. The vendetta had its beginnings in the spring of 1701, when a *tozama daimyō*, Asano Naganori (1667–1701), lord of the Akō domain, attacked and wounded Lord Kira Yoshinaka, a high-ranking master of shogunate court ritual. The reason for the attack remains unclear, but the usual explanation is that Lord Asano lost his temper because Lord Kira continually humiliated him. The attack occurred on the final day of an important state ceremony in which the shogunate hosted imperial emissaries sent from Kyoto to convey the emperor's New Year greetings to the shogun. Lord Asano, who had been serving as one of the shogunate's representatives during the ceremony, was detained, interrogated, and sentenced to die by committing *seppuku* on the very same day.

After learning of their master's death, the now masterless samurai (*rōnin*) of Akō disagreed about the appropriate response. Some advocated the peaceful surrender of Akō Castle. Others recommended defending the castle to the death. Still others called for immediate revenge on Lord Kira. The matter was resolved when most of them agreed to surrender Akō Castle in the hope that the Asano family would be allowed to continue as daimyo of Akō. After the shogunate decreed that Naganori's branch of the Asano family would be discontinued and the domain confiscated, the castle at Akō was surrendered and Asano's retainers became *rōnin*. A number of them had vowed in Akō to protest what was regarded as an unjust punishment by the *bakufu*, and after many months of debate on how to accomplish their goals, in the late summer of 1702 they resolved on revenge. A contingent of forty-seven of the Akō *rōnin*, led by Ōishi Yoshio (Kuranosuke), took their revenge on Lord Kira one year and ten months after their master's suicide. The *rōnin* next marched to Sengaku Temple and presented Kira's severed head to the grave of their deceased master. They

then reported their deed to the shogunate and awaited its verdict. After long deliberations, the shogunate decided that the *rōnin* had broken the law and would have to be punished: each was sentenced to die by *seppuku*.

A lengthy debate over the revenge vendetta soon followed, centering on issues of the samurai code, duty, and ethics but also, implicitly, issues related to religious practice, such as the possibility of venerating figures otherwise sentenced to death as felons.

Much of the debate hinged on the interpretation and importance of Japanese concepts of loyalty (J. *chū*, Ch. *zhong*) and duty or righteousness (J. *gi*, Ch. *yi*). To Chinese Confucians, *zhong* had strong connotations of personal fidelity, or being true to oneself, and not necessarily blind loyalty to a ruler. To the Japanese, in keeping with earlier feudal traditions of the samurai class, *chū* had more emphasis on self-sacrificing loyalty to one's lord. Here the Chinese Confucian term *yi* is rendered as "rightness" because it has a contingent, contextual character (what is right or proper in a given situation), whereas Japanese writers tend to assign to *gi* an absolute value and religious intensity, translated here as "righteousness." Much of the Akō debate was spent assessing priorities among the universalistic values and particularistic duties affirmed in each case. We should also note the difference in the meaning of the term *chen* (J. *shin*), which Chinese Confucians generally understand as "minister" (usually civil) and Japanese regard as "retainer," harking back to the medieval, feudal traditions of the samurai. A certain asymmetry and incongruity was inevitable in the adaptation of Confucian concepts to the different Japanese scene.

Along with the debate, the Akō vendetta inspired numerous dramatic productions, including one of the most famous of the Japanese stage, *The Treasury of Loyal Retainers* (*Kanadehon chūshingura*), excerpts from which follow the passages presented here from some of the most important early statements in or related to the debate.

OKADO DENPACHIRŌ

Okado Denpachirō (1659–1723), a deputy inspector (*ometsuke*) serving the shogunate, was on duty overseeing the ceremony when Lord Asano attacked Lord Kira. Immediately after the attack, Denpachirō interrogated both men and reported his findings to the junior councillors (*wakadoshiyori*) serving the shogun. After interrogating the two men, Denpachirō and the other inspectors submitted their reports to their superiors. These ultimately reached Lord Matsudaira, the governor of Mino, who was also known as Yanagisawa Yoshiyasu and was the shogun's favorite and arguably one of the most powerful men in the shogunate. Later the same day, the shogunate's verdict was read by Nagakura Chin'ami, the chief of servants at Chiyoda Castle.

more civil context as "loyal ministers and dutiful officers" (Ch. *zhongchen yishi*) and was defined in *Neo-Confucian Terms Explained* (*Xingli ziyi*) by Chen Beixi (1159–1223), a disciple of Zhu Xi. Beixi suggested that "loyal ministers and dutiful officers" were men who had sacrificed themselves, or had met some violent death, in fidelity to a dynasty. Beixi added that "loyal ministers and dutiful officers" could be legitimately venerated at shrines built to honor their spirits. Hayashi Razan (1583–1657) wrote a colloquial version of Beixi's work, which became a text widely read in Tokugawa Japan. Indeed, many scholars participating in the debate were familiar with it. Whether the common Japanese understanding of *chūshin gishi* as "loyal retainers and righteous warriors" (*samurai*) included this nuance is open to question, but if it did, the shogunate might face the prospect that men it had sentenced to die as criminals could later be apotheosized at shrines dedicated to them.

Razan quoted the *History of the Tang Dynasty*, which says that Xu Yuan and Zhang Xun defended the city of Suiyang during the final year of the An Lushan (d. 757) rebellion. After they were killed by rebel troops, Xu and Zhang were enshrined as *zhongchen yishi* because of their heroic defense of the dynasty. Razan next presented an account from the *History of the Song Dynasty*, that Su Jian was enshrined after he burned himself to death following defeat by an invading barbarian force from areas south of China. Razan turned to the *History of the Tang Dynasty* and the *History of Fukien* for information about Chen Yuanguang, enshrined for his successful defense of the Tang dynasty against invaders from the north. None of these Chinese cases, however, involved revenge or a vendetta, and Razan's account of them was written well before the Akō incident. Japanese Confucians familiar with Razan's explications of Beixi's accounts interpreted the notion of *chūshin gishi* as signifying a loyalist martyr who could be legitimately venerated. In 1912 the Ōishi Shrine was built for Ōishi Kuranosuke and the other Akō *rōnin*. At the time of the Akō incident, the religious aspects of the case as it appears in the eighteenth-century version of the popular play *Chūshingura* were connected to a Buddhist temple celebrating the feudal values of revenge and honor redeemed.

In the following extract, because Razan is translating from Beixi's Chinese, the English rendering of the key terms first gives the Chinese meaning and then the way they might be understood in the Japanese samurai context.

"LOYAL RETAINERS AND RIGHTEOUS WARRIORS"

In later ages, loyal ministers [retainers (*chūshin*)] and dutiful officers [righteous warriors (*gishi*)] threw themselves against unsheathed blades to avert disaster. For example, both Zhang Xun (709–751) and Xu Yuan died in defending Suiyang. Twin temples were erected for them there. Su Jian (d. 1076) died in Yongzhou, and so a temple was founded for him there. The King of the Manifest

Spirit of Zhangzhou sacrificed his life to defend his people. Therefore the people of Zhangzhou built a temple so that they could offer sacrifices. These temples for loyal ministers (retainers) and dutiful officers (righteous warriors) were, in each case, legitimate ones. These temples must be closely supervised so that they open and close at certain times. Vandals must not be allowed to desecrate them. To show their respect for the loyal ministers (retainers) and dutiful officers (righteous warriors) enshrined at these temples, commoners should be allowed only to burn incense at them. . . .

[Hayashi Razan, *Seiri jigi genkai*, vol. 7, pp. 27a–29a; JAT]

HAYASHI HŌKŌ

In 1691, the shogun Tsunayoshi appointed Hayashi Hōkō (Nobuatsu, 1644–1732), the son of Gahō (1618–1680) and the grandson of Razan, to a newly created post, *daigaku no kami*, head of the Confucian academy. The same year, the academy, known as the Hall of Sages (Seidō), was moved from Shinobugaoka to the top of Shōhei Hill, named after Confucius's birthplace and located in the Yushima district of Edo. The new site served primarily as the venue of semiannual *sekiten* ceremonies held in the spring and autumn to honor Confucian masters and their teachings. "On Revenge" (Fukushū ron) reveals Hōkō's admiration of the "forty-six men," as well as his ultimate respect for the integrity of the law.

"ON REVENGE" (FUKUSHŪ RON)

Forty-six men, including Ōishi Yoshio's[2] samurai retainers of a certain Kansai daimyo, united their hearts in forming a league to avenge the death of their deceased lord. On the fourteenth day of the twelfth lunar month in the winter of Genroku 15 [1703], they took revenge on his enemy and were arrested. The shogunate commissioned a thorough and official investigation of the crime and

2. Although forty-seven *rōnin* took part in the revenge attack, one of the group, Terasaka Kichiemon, apparently was ordered to leave before the *rōnin* reached the Sengaku Temple and thus neither surrendered himself to the *bakufu* nor was forced to commit suicide with the others, living instead for another forty-five years to the ripe old age of seventy-eight. Essayists have thus variously referred to the participants as being either forty-six or forty-seven in number, with those seeking to justify the *bakufu* verdict citing the number of those sentenced to die, forty-six, and more sympathetic writers referring to forty-seven. Also, the participants in the vendetta were variously described as "men," "*rōnin*," or "samurai," depending on the extent to which praise or condemnation was intended.

then handed down its verdict: the members of the league were asked to commit suicide.

Someone asked the following question:

> The Three Bonds and the Five Constant Virtues[3] are the great substance of ritual propriety and the foundations of our moral transformation by means of education and learning. Throughout history and the entire world, there has never been any deviation from these. Based on them, the early kings of antiquity established laws and formulated detailed regulations, promulgating them throughout the realm and transmitting them to posterity. Now the relationships between a ruler and his ministers and between a father and his sons are most essential and basic to the Three Bonds and the Five Constant Virtues. Those relationships represent the pinnacle of heaven's principles and human ethics. Nowhere between heaven and earth can one escape them. Therefore the *Book of Rites* states, "One should never live under the same sky with the enemy of one's ruler or one's father."[4] This injunction issued from a natural and irresistible human feeling; in no respect is it the product of selfishness. Forbidding revenge contradicts the regulations established by the early kings and wounds the hearts and souls of loyal retainers and filial children (*chūshin kōshi*). Executing those who take revenge is an extreme example of destroying the ethical models of the early kings and violating the laws they formulated. Thus, how can forbidding revenge possibly help rectify human ethics or conform to the law?

I replied that the rightness [or duty (*gi*)] of revenge is evident in the *Record of Rites*, the *Institutes of the Zhou Dynasty*, and the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. Moreover, many Tang- and Song-dynasty Confucian scholars who discussed revenge came to the same conclusion. A Ming-dynasty scholar, Qiu Jun [1420–1495], also discussed revenge in considerable detail in his "Supplement" to the *Extended Meaning of the Great Learning* (J. *Daigaku engi*, Ch. *Daxue yanyi*).

I, too, would like to analyze the matter, noting relevant insights from the ancient Confucian classics and commentaries on them. First, I will view their vendetta from the perspective of the hearts of the forty-six men. It was imperative that they "not share the same sky with their master's enemy" and that they "sleep on reeds, using their sword as a pillow" [*Record of Rites*]. To hang onto

3. The Three Bonds refer to the proper relations between ruler and minister, parent and child, and husband and wife. The Five Constant Virtues are humaneness, rightness, ritual decorum, wisdom, and trustworthiness.

4. The *Record of Rites* makes this remark only in reference to one's father. The *Rites of Zhou*, however, suggests that the same ethic can be legitimately applied to one's ruler.

life by enduring shame and humiliation is not the way of the samurai. We must also consider the vendetta from the perspective of the law. Anyone who sees the law as his enemy must be put to death. Although the forty-six men were carrying out the last wishes of their deceased lord, they could not do so without committing a capital crime in the process. Stubbornly rebellious, they blatantly defied the authorities. They were arrested and punished in order to clarify the laws of the nation for the realm and for posterity.

These two perspectives are hardly identical, but they might complement each other in operation, without contradiction. Above, there must be humane rulers and wise ministers who govern by clarifying law and promulgating decrees. Below, there must be loyal retainers and righteous samurai (*chūshin gishi*) who readily vent their anger in the determined pursuit of their cause. In doing so, if the forty-six men had to sacrifice their lives because they broke the law, what could they possibly regret? The vendetta let the world know that a lord can indeed trust his retainers and that retainers are loyal to their lord. . . .

[Hayashi Razan, *Kinsei buke shisō*, in NST, vol. 27, pp. 372–75; BS, JAT]

MURO KYŪSŌ

Muro Kyūsō (1658–1734) was born in Bitchū Province, the son of a *rōnin*. At fifteen, he entered the service of Maeda Tsunanori (1643–1724), daimyo of Kanazawa domain. Soon thereafter, Kyūsō was sent to study in Kyoto under the Neo-Confucian scholar Kinoshita Jun'an (1621–1698). In 1711, with the recommendation of Arai Hakuseki, Kyūsō became a scholar serving the eighth shogun, Yoshitsune. Kyūsō's *Records of the Righteous Men of Akō Domain* (*Akō gijin roku*), one of his longer works, was written in 1703, shortly after the suicide of the *rōnin*. It offers a detailed narrative of the incident from beginning to end and was one of the earliest writings to proclaim the righteousness (*gi*) of the *rōnin* vendetta. In the form of a dialogue with three of Kyūsō's students, the preface suggests that the vendetta of the Akō samurai was grounded in a Confucian tradition, dating back in ancient China to Bo Yi and Shu Qi, when ministers remonstrated against unwise policies adopted by their rulers.

PREFACE TO *RECORDS OF THE RIGHTEOUS MEN OF AKŌ DOMAIN* (*AKŌ GIJIN ROKU*)

Now that autumn is here, the rain has at last given way to clear skies. Outside my door I hear footsteps approaching. Looking out to welcome my visitors, I see that they are several of my students. I take out my *Records of Righteous Men* (*Gijin roku*), and we read it together. Once we stop reading, with tears we lament that loyalty and goodness are not rewarded and that no one seems to

seven men took revenge on their lord's enemy. Furthermore, it was because the lord of Akō had tried to kill Lord Kira that the Asano family lost their domain. Lord Kira did not destroy their domain. Therefore, again, the forty-seven men cannot be said to have exacted revenge for their lord's death.

Forgetting his ancestors and acting no more courageously than a common fellow, Lord Asano yielded to a moment of anger that morning and thus failed in his attempt to kill Lord Kira. Lord Asano's behavior must be deemed unrighteous (*fugi*). At best, the forty-seven men can be said to have deftly carried out their master's evil intentions. How can that be called right (*gi*)?

Lord Asano's samurai, unable to save their lord from his unrighteousness in life, chose to die in the process of completing his unrighteous intention. Circumstances led them to their fate. Even if we try to empathize with them, how can the whole matter not be deemed an enormous tragedy? Thus I judge the forty-seven men much as I do the five hundred followers of Tian Heng who killed themselves on an island in the sea.

Let us consider the loyal servant Ichibei,[10] who was by far superior to Lord Asano's retainers. Diligently and intelligently, Ichibei applied his strength to the way of loyally serving his master, persistently doing what he should have done. Ichibei's sincere intentions eventually persuaded the shogunate to restore his master's family to their former position among the good people of the realm. How could such behavior not be deemed superior to the deeds of Lord Asano's retainers? Alas! Although Ichibei's circumstances were not the same as those of the forty-seven men, his intentions must be praised as righteous (*gi*).

[Ogyū Sorai, *Kinsei buke shisō*, in *NST*, vol. 27, pp. 400–401; BS, JAT]

SATŌ NAOKATA

Unlike Hayashi Hōkō and Ogyū Sorai, who were born in Edo, Satō Naokata (1650–1719) came from the castle town of Fukuyama, in southwestern Japan, between Okayama and Hiroshima. After studying Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism under Yamazaki Ansai, he served as a Neo-Confucian scholar to daimyo in Fukuyama, Maebashi, and Hikone domains. Unlike Ansai, who advocated a

10. In "On the Loyal Servant Ichibei," Sorai recounts that the peasant Ichibei, a native of the village of Anesaki in Kazusa, assumed responsibility for the family of his village headman, Jirōbei, after the latter was exiled to Ōshima because of his supposed complicity in a murder. Convinced of his master's innocence, Ichibei petitioned the shogunate for the return of his master's estate. In Hōei 2 (1705), Ichibei's petition was granted. Sorai notes that Ichibei abstained from sexual relations with his wife during the eleven years of petitioning for fear that her pregnancy might curtail his efforts on behalf of his lord. Noting that conjugal relations were among the few pleasures that Ichibei might otherwise have enjoyed, Sorai praises the loyalist for his sacrifice for his master.

blend of Neo-Confucianism and Shinto religiosity, Naokata strongly rejected mixing Shinto with Neo-Confucianism, instead defending the Zhu Xi orthodoxy against all other versions of the Confucian Way. Although Naokata and Asami Keisai were Ansai's most prominent disciples, they eventually formed opposite views of the vendetta. Naokata, one of their most severe critics, denounced the *rōnin* as utterly lacking righteousness.

NOTES ON THE FORTY-SIX MEN (SHIJŪROKU NIN NO HIKKI)

At two o'clock in the morning on the fifteenth day of the twelfth month of Genroku 15 [1703], the chief retainer of Lord Asano, Ōishi Kuranosuke, and his band of forty-six men entered the main residence of Lord Kira. The men wore helmets and armor and carried bows, arrows, and spears. They decapitated Lord Kira, wounded his son Sabei, and killed or wounded many of Lord Kira's retainers. Later that morning, the men retreated to Sengaku Temple in Shiba. Before the grave of their deceased lord, they offered up Lord Kira's severed head. There they remained.

On the way back from Lord Kira's residence, the men sent two members of their band, Yoshida Chūzaemon and Tomimori Suke'emon, to the residence of an inspector general, Sengoku Hisanao, the governor of Hōki Province. Chūzaemon and Suke'emon were supposed to report the incident to the inspector, deliver a letter to him, and await the shogunate's verdict regarding their fate. The shogunate decreed that the forty-six men be placed in the custody of four daimyo: (1) Hosokawa Tsunatoshi, governor of Etchū; (2) Matsudaira Sadanao, governor of Oki; (3) Mizuno Tadamoto of Yamagata (Dewa); and (4) Mōri Tsunamoto, governor of Kai. On the fourth day of the second month of Genroku 16 [1703], the shogunate handed down its death sentence, which was promptly carried out. The verdict read as follows:

> The shogunate asked Lord Asano to assist in entertaining imperial emissaries from Kyoto visiting Edo. Lord Asano, showing no regard for the occasion or the fact that he was inside the palace, acted in an outrageous (*futodoki*) manner, for which the appropriate punishment was ordered. Lord Kira committed no crime and so was not punished. Because of this, the forty-six men banded together to take revenge against their master's enemy; forced their way into Lord Kira's mansion armed with bows, arrows, and spears; and killed him. The shogunate deems this whole matter, from beginning to end, to be disrespectful to the authorities and most outrageous. Thus, it decrees that they commit *seppuku*.

The ethical principles of honorable behavior (*giri*) informing the shogunate's verdict are clear. The forty-six men were allowed to disembowel themselves

rather than be put to death by decapitation. The forty-six men should consider themselves fortunate that the shogunate decided to give them a compassionate sentence. Despite this, the common people chime in, praising the forty-six men as "loyal retainers and righteous samurai" (*chūshin gishi*).

It is understandable if uneducated people not familiar with the ethical principles of honorable behavior (*giri*) make mistakes like these. But even Master Hayashi Hōkō eulogized their passing, comparing them with Yu Rang and Tian Heng and praising them as "loyal and righteous retainers" (*chūgi no shin*). Hōkō further stated that the forty-six men "took revenge on their lord's enemy and thus promoted righteousness."[11] Many scholars have joined the refrain, similarly regretting the deaths of the forty-six men. Some, like Hōkō, even claim that the verdict was in accordance with ethical principles (*ri*) and that the intentions of the forty-six men were righteous (*gi*). But if the shogunate's verdict was in accordance with ethical principles, how could the forty-six men not have been unrighteous (*fugi*)? Such claims are groundless errors resulting from ignorance of righteous principles [of honorable behavior] (*giri*).

The common people regard as a teacher anyone who reads Confucian literature and then has something to say about ethical principles. But it is truly sad when mistakes are made and the minds of the people are misled. The forty-six men indeed made an egregious error when they deemed Lord Kira to be their deceased lord's enemy and invoked the *Record of Rites*' statement that "one should not coexist under the same sky with the murderer of one's lord or father." Lord Kira was not their enemy, although he might have been if he had actually attacked Lord Asano. Lord Asano was sentenced to death because he was a criminal who violated the great law of the land and defied the authorities.

Moreover, if we consider the matter in terms of the dedicated spirit (*kokorozashi*) appropriate to a samurai, then if Lord Asano's rancor against Lord Kira was irrepressible, he should have waited until his ceremonial duties were completed and then found a more appropriate place to attack Lord Kira. To attack Lord Kira during the great ceremony hosting the imperial emissaries was a reckless, unmanly, and cowardly way of acting. Lord Kira was standing and chatting with Kajikawa Yosobe when Asano approached him from behind, suddenly drew his short sword, and slashed him even as he attempted to flee. Lord Kira was not fatally wounded, and Kajikawa apprehended Lord Asano before he could finish his task. Lord Asano's lack of courage and skill were laughable in the extreme! That he was sentenced to death and his domain confiscated was indeed in accordance with the ethical principles proper to such matters.

11. This remark is in the preface to another version of the poem that Hōkō composed to conclude his essay "On Revenge." Both the preface and the other version of the poem are in *Hōkō Hayashi gakushi shū*. See *NST*, vol. 27, p. 375.

Lord Kira never even drew his short sword. He collapsed in surprise, and his face turned pale, making him the laughingstock of samurai throughout the realm. He behaved so shamefully that even death would have been a better fate. What could the shogunate have done to punish him any further? Clearly Lord Kira was not the mortal enemy of [the forty-six men's] master, Lord Asano.

Rather than regretting their master's crime, the forty-six men defied the shogunate's verdict, armed themselves, and used passwords, secret signals, and military strategy to murder Lord Kira. Thus they too committed a capital crime. Nevertheless, obsessed with their master's anger toward Lord Kira, their muddled minds became totally intent on taking revenge. If later they had reflected on the nature of their crime, a violation of the shogun's law, and committed suicide at Sengaku Temple, their intentions would have merited sympathy despite the wrongness of their deed.

Instead they reported their deed to the inspector general and waited for a verdict from the shogunate. In both the letter they presented explaining their deed and in their first remarks to the inspector general, the men declared that they respected the authorities. But was not such behavior part of a scheme meant to win them praise, help them escape the death penalty, and perhaps even be given a stipend? Having committed a capital crime and blatantly disobeyed the authorities, there was no need for them to report anything, nor was there any need to wait for a verdict. These were not the acts of men who had readied themselves for death.

The Asano family had long revered Yamaga Sokō's teachings on military science. Ōishi had thus studied these teachings from the start. [The forty-six men's] plot arose out of their virulent reaction to the prospect of being reduced to the status of masterless samurai. Their attack was the product of calculation and conspiracy; it did not arise from any real sense of loyalty (*chūgi*) to their lord or from any feelings of commiseration with their lord in his misfortune. Someone who presumes to be a samurai should instead analyze things in detail and make clear distinctions so that he can resolve the confusion clouding the common people.

Examining the matter further, there is a reason why people join in praising the forty-six men as loyal and righteous retainers (*chūgi no shin*): Lord Kira was by nature a very greedy man. The world hated his arrogance, deceitfulness, and perverseness. Thus people overlooked Lord Asano's crime and felt sad over his death and disgust that Lord Kira still lived. Upon hearing that the forty-six men had taken revenge, killing Lord Kira, they were overjoyed, praising the forty-six as loyal and righteous retainers. Alas! Because of the perverseness of this one person, so many others ended up being killed, all of Edo was put in an uproar, and people's minds were thrown into confusion. Lord Kira is indeed the one whom we all should despise.

[Satō Naokata, *Kinsei buke shisō*, in *NST*, vol. 27, pp. 378–80; BS, JAT]