

The Word *Monosugoshi* and Changing Perceptions of Nature in Medieval Japan

Paul S. Atkins

In the popular consciousness, the Japanese are believed to enjoy a privileged, harmonious coexistence with nature, in contrast to the ostensibly antagonistic relationship with nature that abounds in the West.¹ (Other Asian cultures are usually ignored in this comparison.) Of course, this view has been thoroughly debunked, as modern Japan has proved as adept as Europe, the United States, Russia, and others in damaging its natural environment. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that representations of the natural world do occupy an extraordinarily prominent role in Japanese cultural discourse. This apparent paradox has been convincingly reconciled by two interrelated conceptual frameworks: the positing of a “pet” relationship with the natural world, in which only “tame” nature (e.g., a river with dams that never floods), as opposed to “wild” nature (an undammed river that occasionally floods with loss of human life), is valued and tolerated; and a differentiation between “real” nature and the “created” nature depicted in art and literature.²

Needless to say, these relationships occur over time and in ever-shifting spaces, and therefore exhibit change and variation. While broad theories are indispensable, they must be supplemented by closer work that provides detail and examines historical, regional, and other types of differences. In order to attain this level of detail, we must limit our scope of inquiry and probe deeply into individual cases. In this article, I propose using the single classical Japanese adjective *monosugoshi* as an index for gauging human attitudes toward the natural environment in medieval Japan. Using examples from a range of genres and periods, I will attempt to demonstrate that this word was used in literary and dramatic works exclusively to depict natural scenes associated with a sense of benign, forlorn melancholy until about the year 1500, when

monosugoshi began to be used also in descriptions of frightening, threatening landscapes. This shift is not reflected in modern dictionary definitions, which emphasize the latter connotations of *monosugoshi*, displacing and, at times, effacing its earlier meaning. In the conclusion, I propose a number of possible reasons for this semantic shift, including political, environmental, and literary-historical factors.

Dictionary Definitions of *Monosugoshi* Past and Present

In contemporary colloquial usage, the modern adjective *monosugoi* (derived in the Muromachi period from *monosugoki*) often serves simply as an intensifier, a stronger form of the adjective *sugoi* (*sugoshi*) from which it is derived. Here is a recent example: “*Monosugoi gōkai de jōnetsu no hito.*” (“[He was] a very vigorous and passionate person.”)³

Many users of the language, however, are likely aware that the word has a wider, and older, range of meaning. What are the parameters of that range?

The *Nihon kokugo daijiten* (second edition), the most comprehensive dictionary of the Japanese language, provides two definitions for *monosugoi*:

1. Very frightening; very eerie (*Hijō ni osoroshii. Hijō ni kimi ga warui*).
2. Extreme in degree; extreme(ly) (*Hodo ga hageshii. Hanahadashii*).⁴

In the second definition, we recognize what the word has become for the most part in contemporary times; in the first, we encounter other meanings, which, I will attempt to demonstrate, do not appear until around the turn of the sixteenth century. Absent from this list is what the word *monosugoshi* connoted for the first few centuries of its existence: a sense of forlorn desolation that was not necessarily frightening.

The *Jidai-betsu kokugo daijiten* (*Muromachi-hen*) (Chronological dictionary of the Japanese language, Muromachi volumes) also offers two definitions of *monosugoshi*, both ostensibly from the Muromachi period:

1. A scene that causes one to feel a chilly sense of loneliness, such that it gives people an eerie feeling (*zoku-zoku saseru*). Or, for one’s heart to feel a chill, with such a scene before one’s eyes.
2. A situation that is so horrible that one cannot bear to watch it.⁵

Unfortunately, these definitions are incomplete; for example, none of them can accommodate the sense of the word *monosugoshi* as used in the following poem, which dates from the 14th century:

*yamagiwa ni / tanabiku kumo ni / kari nakite / aki monosugoki / yūgure
no iro*

Geese cry
in trailing clouds
above the mountain's rim—
in *monosugoki* autumn,
the colors of dusk.⁶

(Appendix, no. 6b.)

This verse, which is by Fujiwara no Takaie (979–1044) from the poetry contest *Kōgon-in sanjūroku-ban utaawase* (Poetry contest in thirty-six rounds sponsored by Retired Emperor Kōgon, 1349), demonstrates the somber, but unthreatening, character of the term as used by early medieval writers. (Takaie was affiliated with the Kyōgoku school of poets, who were known for their innovation; it is not altogether surprising that his poem is not only among the earliest, but one of a very few examples of the usage of *monosugoshi* in medieval waka.) I have left the word *monosugoki*, the adnominal form (*rentaikei*) of *monosugoshi*, untranslated in order to allow the reader to deduce what it might mean here. It should be clear—both from the other words used in the poem itself and from the context in which it was presented (disturbing or frightening imagery was forbidden in Japanese court poetry)—that there is no hint of terror, dread, or horror.⁷

In fact, some of the passages cited along with these dictionary definitions do not even conform to the sense of the word that they are adduced to illustrate. For example, to exemplify its second definition (something which is so awful one cannot bear to look at it), *Jidai-betsu kokugo daijiten* cites this passage from *Shiga jikkai* (Four rivers emptying into the sea, 1534), a compendium of four Japanese commentaries on the poetry of Su Shi (also Su Dongpo, 1036–1101):

[These lines] say that [the speaker] is bored and has no medicine; is there something that can relieve his boredom? After saying this, he sees fires lit by fishermen, and realizes that they will relieve his boredom. There is a sense of lament in this statement. It is saying that, long ago, [the speaker] was in the capital amid the hustle and bustle ... but now he is in Huizhou, and feeling *monosugoshi*.⁸ (Appendix, no. 27h.)

In a similar way, *Nihon kokugo daijiten* inexplicably attempts to demonstrate the eerie, frightening sense of *monosugoshi* with this undeniably benign passage from *Giya do pekadoru*, (Guide for the sinner, 1599) a Christian text: “Even hearing the faint, *monosugoki* chirping of insects living in a stand of grass cleansed one’s heart...” (Appendix, no. 42.)

Much of the confusion can probably be attributed to excessive emphasis on the first but relatively late definition of *monosugoshi* in a dictionary, the *Vocabulario da Lingoa de Japam* (Lexicon of the Japanese language). Also known as *Nippo jisho*, this Japanese-Portuguese dictionary was compiled by Jesuit friars residing in Japan and published in 1603. *Monosugoshi* appears as *monosugoi*, according to contemporary pronunciation and usage—during the Muromachi period, the final form *monosugoshi* had been replaced by the adnominal *monosugoki*, which underwent sound change to *monosugoi*. *Monosugoi* is defined as “Something solitary, and which makes one afraid, like a vast and solitary forest” (*Cousa solitaria, & que faz medo, como hum mato grande, & solitario*).⁹ No examples of usage are given. It was apparent to the Portuguese Jesuits and their Japanese colleagues that the concept expressed by the word *monosugoi* implied not merely a generic sense of fear, but a feeling of uneasy desolation that was most closely associated with a forbidding or haunted landscape. *Nippo jisho* describes what *monosugoi* meant at the time, and is probably accurate in that sense. It might also have exerted a disproportionate influence upon the compilers of *Jidai-betsu kokugo daijiten* and *Nihon kokugo daijiten*, thereby obscuring what *monosugoshi* meant in earlier eras, and its shift in meaning. In order to capture this shift, we will have to examine the history of the word’s formation and study its usage in a variety of textual examples pre-dating the early-modern period.

Origins of *Monosugoshi* in *Sugoshi*

Monosugoshi is clearly a combination of the prefix *mono-* and the adjective *sugoshi*. In order to understand *monosugoshi* we must understand both of its constituent parts, but especially its relationship to the earlier word *sugoshi*. How do *monosugoshi* and *sugoshi* differ in meaning and usage? And why was it necessary for *monosugoshi* to emerge as a separate word?

Extensive studies on *sugoshi* have been conducted by Umeno Kimiko. Synthesizing Umeno’s results, a history of the word *sugoshi*

might proceed as follows. There are no known examples of it before the Heian period (795–1185). Before ca. 1000, it appears that the form *kokorosugoshi* was used more frequently than *sugoshi*. *Sugoshi* is a *-ku* conjugation adjective; such adjectives generally, but not exclusively, describe objective physical states as opposed to feelings or states of mind.¹⁰ Thus, *sugoshi* may have originally denoted some kind of physical quality, and the word *kokorosugoshi* was possibly coined in order to indicate that the word was being used in an emotional context. From *Genji monogatari* (The Tale of Genji, ca. 1008) onward, *sugoshi* eclipsed *kokorosugoshi* as the more common form. What was described as *sugoshi* varied over time, but some referents remained constant: the sound of the wind, the appearance of the sky, the season of autumn. *Sugoshi* did not connote fear. In fact, it was often used in conjunction with the adjective *aware-nari* (moving, touching). It frequently appeared in references to settings that were located outside or away from the capital, and at specific seasons (autumn) and times of day (dusk). *Sugoshi* in the Heian period was a positive aesthetic quality, connoting a not unpleasant sense of forlorn melancholy.

Up until the Muromachi period, commentators on *Genji monogatari* shared this understanding of *sugoshi*, but in the Edo period, *sugoshi* began to be associated with feelings of fear. It may have been erroneously associated with the adjective *susamaji* (often written with the characters 寒 and 冷; its early connotations including cold, whiteness, and desolation). Umeno says that *susamaji* was used by *nō* playwrights as if it had frightening connotations. In his Sinological study *Kiga* (The pursuit of elegance, 1816), Suzuki Akira (1764–1837) glossed the character 凄 with three readings: *samushi* (cold), *sabishi* (lonely), and *monosugoshi*. At about the same time, Tanikawa Kotosuga (1709–76) claimed in his dictionary *Wakun no shiori* (Guide to Japanese glosses, 1777–1887) that the Heian *sugoshi* was equivalent to the Edo word *monosugoshi* (which clearly connoted fear). In the dictionary *Gagen shūran* (Compilation of views on elegant language, 1826–87), the association between *sugoshi* and the character 凄, with its cold and fearful connotations, was complete; since then, *sugoshi* (and *sugoi*) have been most commonly written with the 凄 character. The main point of Umeno's work is that this usage is anachronistic and improperly distorts our understanding of what *sugoshi* means in Heian and later texts.¹¹

The Prefix *Mono-*

Monosugoshi first emerged in the early fourteenth century; the earliest example that can be dated with confidence comes from the *Engyō-bon Heike monogatari* (The Tale of the Heike, Engyō edition). Why not earlier or later? Assuming this is not merely a matter of chance, the question can be approached in two ways. First, we can try to deduce how adding the prefix *mono-* might have changed the meaning of *sugoshi*, by analyzing what *mono-* means and, especially, by comparing *monosugoshi* with other adjectives that contain the prefix *mono-*. Second, we can examine examples of usage of *monosugoshi* paying attention to how the meaning intended differs from the meaning of *sugoshi* proposed in Umeno's study. The second method is the central focus of this essay and will be applied later. For now, let us consider theoretically how adding the prefix *mono-* might have changed the meaning of *sugoshi*.

The *Nihon kokugo daijiten* describes the prefix *mono-* as typically appearing before adjectives, adjectival verbs, and verbs that indicate a state. It means that a given state "somehow" (*nan to naku, soko wa ka to naku*) exists. Examples given are *monoui* (gloomy), *monosabishii* (lonely), *monoguruoshii* (maddening), *monokezayaka* (prominent, apparent), *monoshizuka na* (quiet), and *monofuru* (old).¹² On its face, this definition seems vague and therefore unsatisfactory, and this suspicion is reinforced by the dictionary's inadequate definition of *monosugoshi*.

The most common meaning of the noun *mono* in Japanese is "thing" or "object." It takes on a variety of other meanings, however, such as "matter" or "affair" (overlapping with functions typically fulfilled by the noun *koto*). *Mono* can be used to refer to supernatural beings, such as monsters and ghosts; the term *mononoke* (supernatural spirit) is well known. But this is not necessarily because of some perceived connection between objects and supernatural beings. According to the entry on *mono* from the *Nihon kokugo daijiten* cited above, the use of *mono* to refer to such beings is a euphemistic circumlocution. Such usage is enabled not by the materiality of *mono* but rather by its vast range of meanings. It covers such a broad expanse of semantic territory that it can mean almost anything, and therefore almost nothing. Such a word is the perfect substitute for words that cannot be uttered. Therefore, the assertion that *mono-* as prefix serves to "blur" the word it precedes is not implausible on its face. The question remains, however, what exactly is it blurring?

Shinagawa Michiaki has studied the use of *mono-* as a prefix in the works of Murasaki Shikibu (*Genji monogatari* and *Murasaki Shikibu*

nikki [*Diary of Murasaki Shikibu*, ca. 1010]). He found that when *mono-* precedes a verb, it is usually functioning as a noun with an omitted object marker; thus the phrase “*mono iu koto*” is really an abbreviated form of “*mono o iu koto*,” and therefore *mono-* is not really functioning as a prefix. But *mono-* does act as a prefix when it precedes adjectives. Shinagawa argues that when *mono-* precedes a “subjective” adjective (e.g. *kanashi*, “sad”), it indicates that the adjective refers to the subject’s state of mind or feelings (as opposed to those of someone else). When it precedes an “objective” adjective (e.g., *kiyoshi* “clear”) it creates an “emotional ambience” (*jōchoteki fun’iki*).¹³ Once again, we find ourselves facing a dead end created by an imprecise explanation.

The reader will recall Umeno’s view that *kokoro-* originally preceded the adjective *sugoshi* because *sugoshi* was originally an “objective” adjective (suggested by its *-ku* conjugation, although no early examples are extant). As *sugoshi* became established as a “subjective” rather than “objective” term, there was less need to stress its subjective aspect, and therefore the need to preface it with *kokoro-* receded. Why did *mono-* then emerge in the medieval period as a new prefix for *sugoshi*? If we extend Shinagawa’s thesis to *monosugoshi* (he never addresses the word, since it postdates Murasaki), we should first determine whether *sugoshi* bore a subjective or objective aspect when *mono-* was added to it. Based on what we know about *sugoshi*, it was a purely subjective word in the early thirteenth century. Therefore, *mono-* would indicate that the sense of *sugoshi* is personal, that it is being felt by the enunciating subject. Shinagawa’s most telling examples are of citations from Murasaki’s works in which she uses emotional adjectives, such as *ushi* and *osoroshi*, with and without the prefix *mono-*. He concludes that *mono-* functions in a manner equivalent to that of the prefix *kokoro-*.¹⁴ Is *monosugoshi*, then, a return of *kokorosugoshi* in a different guise? If *mono-* is more or less equivalent to *kokoro-*, then the answer is yes. The questions then remain, why was it necessary to emphasize the emotional aspect of *sugoshi*, when it had already been established; and why did writers not simply revive the old form *kokorosugoshi*, if this was the goal?

In answer to the first question, I hypothesize that *sugoshi* had perhaps been “tamed” by virtue of its inclusion in the fixed poetic vocabulary and that its impact had diminished over time. Also, as Umeno went to great lengths to show, in the Heian period, *sugoshi* had an emotionally and aesthetically pleasing aspect that was subsequently lost. The landscapes that are described by most medieval writers are not

frightening, but they are not pleasant either; they are forlorn and desolate. It is in this regard that *monosugoshi* differs from *sugoshi*.

In response to the second question (why not simply resurrect *kokorosugoshi*?) I suggest that the *mono-* of *monosugoshi* indeed functions as a form of circumlocution, but what is being avoided is not god, demon, or ghost, but the word *kokoro* itself. Late medieval Japanese aesthetics is distinctive for its oblique or repressed expression of emotion, as crystallized in the performance traditions of *nō* theater. But this was the product of a process that took several centuries. In his *Mumyōshō* (Untitled commentaries, ca. 1211), for example, Kamo no Chōmei (1155–1216) cites a poem by Fujiwara no Shunzei (1114–1204):

*yū sareba / nobe no akikaze / mi ni shimite / uzura nakunari / fukakusa
no sato*

When evening comes
the autumn wind off the fields
sinks into me
and I hear the quails cry
in the village of Fukakusa.¹⁵

This poem is followed by the critique of another poet, the monk Shun'e (b. 1113): "I think that poem is very weak in the third verse's *mi ni shimite* ["sinks into me"]. A poem of that kind would sound subtle and graceful if it depicted the atmosphere with fluency, just suggesting the feeling of the penetrating autumn wind. When everything is stated bluntly and the feeling which is the major point of the poem appears in actual words, it gives an extremely shallow impression."¹⁶ Shun'e's criticism suggests that a preference for the oblique statement of personal emotions and feelings was not universal, and emerged out of a process of aesthetic regulation. It brings us back to the question of why *monosugoshi* emerged for the first time in the early medieval period. I suggest that the prefix *mono-* is a euphemism for the earlier prefix *kokoro-*. As Shinagawa observed in his study of *mono-* in the works of Murasaki Shikibu, it serves to emphasize that the aspect of landscape manifested by the adjective *sugoshi* does not serve merely to describe the scene at hand, but rather the feelings of the enunciating subject as a perceiver of that scene. However, unlike the earlier *kokorosugoshi*, *monosugoshi* accomplishes this effect by avoiding explicit mention of *kokoro*, the affective faculty. This creates the sense that the emotions in

question are not subjectively generated, but naturally arise in the enunciating subject on perceiving a scene that qualifies as *sugoshi*.

Examples from Early Medieval Texts

The dictionary definitions of *monosugoshi* cited earlier collectively and even individually reveal uncertainty regarding the meaning of *monosugoshi*. Does it connote fear, loneliness, a combination of both, or something altogether different? Even if the definitions were consistent internally and with one another, they cannot help us understand *monosugoshi* better than a study of the textual examples upon which they are ostensibly based. With that in mind, let us examine a representative selection from the ninety or so examples that I have collected in which *monosugoshi* or its conjugated forms appear in medieval Japanese texts. (See the Appendix for a list and full bibliographic information.)

It is often impossible to date pre-Edo texts with satisfactory precision, so broad periodizations are necessary. For the sake of convenience, I divide the examples into three chronological groups: pre-Muromachi (i.e., before 1392); Muromachi (1392–1573); and post-Muromachi (1573–). The Muromachi examples are so numerous that they must be further divided by genre.

The earliest example of *monosugoshi* that I have found appears in *Shōgu mondō shō* (Conversation between a sage and an unenlightened person), which is attributed to the monk Nichiren (1222–82), founder of the eponymous Buddhist sect, who is said to have written it in 1265. In the passage in question, a sage is demonstrating to his interlocutor the superiority of the Lotus School to other forms of Buddhism, and relates how the father of the historical Buddha contrived to show his son the wonders of the four seasons: “In the west there were the autumn reddened leaves mingling with the evergreens to weave a pattern of brocade, the breezes blowing gently over the reed flowers, or the stormy winds that swept *monosugoku* through the pines.”¹⁷ (Appendix, no. 4.)

The authenticity of this text has been questioned, and from the limited point of view of the history of *monosugoshi*, the appearance of the word in a text decades before any other known citation is indeed suspicious. Also, the trope of the “room that miraculously contains scenes of the four seasons,” which appears in classical Chinese works, figures most prominently in Japanese literature in the short narrative fictional works of the Muromachi period (the so-called *otogi zōshi*).¹⁸

Both points suggest that the text was written a century or more later than 1265 and therefore was not composed by Nichiren, who died in 1282.

Although the text may not have been written by Nichiren in 1265, it is interesting to note that *monosugoshi* is not used here to suggest a threatening or forbidding landscape; far from it. In this regard, the use of *monosugoshi* accords with other examples from the pre-Muromachi period. It functions much like the word *sugoshi* did in the Heian period and later.

Three examples appear in waka compiled in *Kōgon-in sanjūroku-ban utaawase*; one has already been quoted. Here is another verse from that event, by the Daughter of Lord (Saionji) Kinmune:

*muramura ni / tanabiku kumo ni / kari nakite / sora monosugoki /
akikaze no kure*

Geese cry among the clouds
that spread in drifts
over the villages.
dusk in the autumn wind,
with a *monosugoki* sky.

(Appendix, no. 6c.)

Monosugoshi also appears in a waka included in the tale *Matsukage chūnagon monogatari* (The Tale of Counselor Matsukage, late Kamakura–early Nanbokuchō; Appendix, no. 5.). In all these examples, the imagery is gentle: autumn evenings, drifting clouds, crying geese, smoke from a village.

Another potential pre-Muromachi example appears in the Engyō-bon version of *Heike monogatari*. The most commonly used edition, the Daitōkyū kinen bunko manuscript, dates from 1419–20 and includes a colophon that indicates it is a copy of an earlier manuscript dated 1309–10.¹⁹ At two points in the texts, the word *monosugoshi* appears. One instance occurs in a scene in which a Taira courtier travels from Fukuhara (to which Taira no Kiyomori has recently ordered the capital moved) to the “old capital” (Kyoto) with some ladies-in-waiting to view the full moon, play music, and reminisce. “. . . Then, since the night had grown late and even the moon had declined toward the western hills, the sound of the mountain wind was *monosugoshi*, and the dew crowded the blades of grass. . . .” (Appendix, no. 7b.)

Two other appearances of the word *monosugoshi* in versions of *Heike monogatari* are found at different places in the same chapter, the final “Initiate’s Chapter” (*Kanjō no maki*). They describe a visit by

Cloistered Emperor Go-Shirakawa (1127–92) to his daughter-in-law, the former Empress Kenreimon'in (1155–1213), daughter of Kiyomori (1118–81) and widow of Emperor Takakura (1161–81), now a nun living in a simple convent amidst the woods at Ōhara north of Kyoto. The purpose of the chapter is to illustrate once again the principle of impermanence by showing how the once wealthy and beautiful empress and her attendants eke out a meager existence in the aftermath of the war. One passage reads, “At the temple in the meadows, the sound of the evening bell was *monosugoshi*, and the sad belling of the stags and the chirping of the insects was wondrous.” (Appendix, no. 3.) The other says, “The first month of the year had passed, and it was already around the twentieth day of the second month, so the branchtips of the trees deep in the mountains appeared, and the *sakura* showed themselves in blossoms; there was not a single mountain without white clouds on it, and it was all the more extremely *monosugoshi*.” (Appendix, no. 2.)

All of these examples of *monosugoshi* in *Heike monogatari*—the visit to Ohara, Munemori's stop at Fuwa Barrier, the return to the abandoned capital—have one thing in common; they are variations on the literary trope, “Look what has become of X.” This *vanitas*-type gesture has a long history in Japanese literature, dating as far back to an elegy by Hitomaro (n.d.) on the ruined capital at Ōmi, included in the *Man'yōshū* (Collection for ten thousand generations, mid-8th c.).²⁰ The important point is that these are *not* frightening landscapes; rather, they evoke feelings of nostalgia and sadness.

Examples from Muromachi-era *Renga* Sessions

There are so many instances in which *monosugoshi* or forms thereof appear in texts of the Muromachi period (1392–1573) that it is necessary to subdivide them by genre. These examples fall into three distinct genres: *renga* poetry, commentaries on *kanshi* (typically by monks associated with elite Rinzaï Zen monasteries), and *nō* plays.

Using the *renga* database developed by the International Center for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken), I was able to find eighteen appearances of *monosugoshi* and its derivative forms in *renga* sessions held between 1425 and 1670; one example was undated (Appendix, nos. 7–21). The first few examples exhibit the familiar understanding of *monosugoshi* as connoting a sense of forlorn desolation that is not unpleasant. Then, in *Bunmei manku* (Ten thousand verses composed during the Bunmei era),

a *renga* session held in 1482, something interesting happens; *monosugoshi* is used to create a forbidding atmosphere:

(098) *kitsune atsumaru / furutsuka no moto*

Base of the old burial mound
where foxes gather.

(099) *monosugoku / ana osoroshi no / michisugara*

It is *monosugoshi*
and frightening
along the trail.

(Appendix, no. 12a.)

It is clear from the reference to the foxes and burial mound in the earlier verse that the supernatural is suggested. The latter verse associates *monosugoshi* with this atmosphere, and even adds *osoroshi* (frightening), an explicit sign of how the connotations of *monosugoshi* have changed. As mentioned above, Umeno found that *sugoshi* often appeared in combination with the adjectival verb *aware-nari* (“moving,” “touching,” “pathetic”), which illustrated how users of *sugoshi* regarded it.²¹ In a similar way, we can approximate the meaning of *monosugoshi* by examining other adjectives that are used with it in a descriptive string. By 1482, at the latest, *monosugoshi* is keeping company with *osoroshi*.

This is not to say that, all of a sudden, the meaning of *monosugoshi* changed. In fact, *monosugoshi* appears twice in other verses of the 1482 session, carrying the overtones of quiet desolation that it always had. Another poet uses the word in its old sense:

(071) *kasumitsutsu / hana chiru yama no / yūmagure*

Twilight in the hills,
where blossoms fall among the mist

(072) *monosugoku furu / harusame no oto*

The sound of the spring rain
falling *monosugoku*

(Appendix, no. 12b.)

Moreover, later *renga* sessions return to the old understanding of *monosugoshi*. Nevertheless, the new meaning endures alongside the old. We can see further examples of the threatening sense of *monosugoshi* in a series of three links from a thousand-verse sequence, *Tenbun nijūyonen*

ume senku (One thousand verses composed for the plum blossoms in the twenty-fourth year of the Tenbun era, 1555):

- (072) *kotae o kiku wa / kodama amabiko*
 When I listen for a reply,
 echoes and echoes
- (073) *kaze kayou / kure monosugoku / hi mo kienu*
 Crossed by winds,
 the dusk is *monosugoku*,
 and the light vanishes
- (074) *tora no usobuku / toki mo koso are*
 There are times when
 a tiger roars. (Appendix, no. 16.)

Another example appears in a hundred-verse sequence, *Tenbun nenkan hyakuin* (Sequence of one hundred *renga* verses composed during the Tenbun era, 1550):

- (095) *monosugoki / yūbe no tsuki no / izayoi ni*
 Underneath the waning moon,
 on a *monosugoki* evening
- (096) *yami no mayoi no / inazuma no kage*
 a flash of lightning
 in the confusion of the dark (Appendix, no. 15.)

These verses and other examples show that, by the mid-sixteenth century, *monosugoshi* was appearing in or adjacent to *renga* verses that included frightening images, such as a tiger, lightning, and echoes (*amabiko* and *kodama* were, in folklore, believed to be the voices of mountain spirits).

Examples from Monastic Commentaries on Poetry in Chinese (*kanshi*)

The most avid users of the word *monosugoshi* during the medieval era, by a wide margin, were the authors of commentaries on Chinese poetry during the 14th–16th centuries, who were for the most part monks in monasteries belonging to Rinzaï Zen temples of the official Gozan (Five

Mountains) hierarchy. In my view, they inherited the classical understanding of *monosugoshi* that appears in *Heike monogatari* and other early medieval texts, and invested it with an indescribable spiritual quality that did not really connote a sense of fear or dread. The Gozan commentators were poets, too, and their poetry is intensely metaphorical. Any object of the intellect—whether it be a landscape or a love story—could be converted into a metaphor for enlightenment, delusion, or the passage between these states.

Many Gozan monks were also deeply steeped in the art, history, thought, and literature of what is now China (they typically referred to it by dynastic names, such as Ming, Tang, or Song). Some of them actually went to China to study; some studied with Chinese masters who had come to Japan. Some monks compiled anthologies of Chinese poetry written by Chinese and Japanese poets, and annotated them in Japanese. *Monosugoshi* appears again and again, in kana, in these glosses.

The largest number of examples of *monosugoshi* from the premodern era that may be attributed to any single author appears in the pages of *Shiga nikkai*, edited by the Rinzai monk Shōun Seisan (n.d), the commentary on Su Shi's poetry that was cited above. Of the sixteen examples, the one that most concisely illustrates what we might call the Gozan understanding of *monosugoshi* occurs in a discussion of an ostensibly autobiographical poem in which the speaker, alone at the home of his son, who has been called away for official service, recalls a happier past. The line is 搔首淒涼十年事 (“I scratch my head—the sad desolation of the past ten years”).²² The connotations of *qiliang* 淒涼 are clearly ones of loneliness and cold.²³ The *Shiga jikkai* commentary on this poem says that “the two characters *qiliang* mean *monosugoshi* (*Seiryō no niiji wa monosugoki o iu nari*; Appendix, no. 27i.). *Shiga jikkai* uses *monosugoshi* consistently in this way; it describes scenes in which the speaker is listening to the sound of the rain, with a sense of sadness but not fear.

The experience of listening to the sound of rain in autumn is addressed directly in another text, *Chūka jakuboku shishō* (Commentaries on Chinese and Japanese poems), a sixteenth-century anthology of some two hundred kanshi, half by Japanese and half by Chinese poets. Commenting on a poem by the Gozan monk Gidō Shūshin (1325–88), the author writes, “When one listens to the rain even without feeling a sense of grief, it is *monosugoshi*; but when one listens to it with that sense of grief, it is all the more sad.” (Appendix, no. 26a.)

It is clear that for this writer as well, *monosugoshi* indicated sadness, not fear.

These are not the only Muromachi *kanshi* commentaries in which *monosugoshi* appears; a full list would also include *Toshi zoku suishō* (ca. 1439), a commentary by the Rinzai monk Kōsei Ryūha (1375?–1446) on poems by Du Fu (712–70); *Mōgyūshō* (1529–34), a commentary on *Meng qiu*, a Tang-period textbook, by the Confucian scholar Kiyohara no Nobukata (1475–1550); *Shigaku taisei shō* (ca. 1558–70), a lexicon for *kanshi* poets; *Kajō shūshō* (after 1489), a commentary on a collection of *kanshi* written by Japanese monks; *Chōgonka shō* (1542) a commentary on the “Song of Everlasting Sorrow” (*Chang hen ge* 長恨歌) by Bo Juyi (772–846); and *Kobun shinpō genryūshō* (ca. 1490, a commentary by the Rinzai monk Genryū Shūkō [1458–91] on the late Song/early Yuan-dynasty poetry anthology *Guwen zhenbao*). Such a survey exceeds the scope of this article, but it appears that the sense of *monosugoshi* remains consistently unthreatening throughout this genre.

Examples from Nō Plays

Monosugoshi appears in no fewer than twelve nō plays, including works outside as well as in the current repertory. It is especially common in plays attributed to Komparu Zenchiku (1405–ca. 1470).²⁴ All of the plays attributed to Zenchiku and almost all of the other plays in which *monosugoshi* appear share the usual understanding of *monosugoshi* as inspiring feelings of loneliness, sadness, and desolation, but without a sense of fear.²⁵ A representative example appears in the play *Yashima*, which is believed to date from no later than 1430.²⁶ In the play, some traveling Buddhist monks encounter an aged fisherman at Yashima (located in present-day Kagawa Prefecture), the site of a famous battle during the Genpei War (1180–85); the old man later reveals himself as the ghost of the brilliant general Minamoto no Yoshitsune (1159–89). In the first act, the old man and a companion sing of the autumn moon shining over the sea

“An old fisherman takes shelter for the night by the western bank,
At dawn he gathers water from the Xiang River and lights a fire of Chu
bamboo.”

Now at last I can picture that scene, as I begin to catch sight
Of the reed fires burning in the desolation [*monosugosa*] here.

(Appendix, no. 31.)²⁷

As the punctuation indicates, the first two lines are a quotation; the source is a poem by the Tang poet Liu Zongyuan (773–819) that is included in *Guwen zhenbao*, the collection of Chinese poetry mentioned above that enjoyed considerable popularity among literate elites in Muromachi Japan, and which was annotated by Gozan monks.²⁸ In libretti used by *shimogakari* schools of *nō* (i.e., the Komparu, Kongō, and Kita), in place of the word *monosugosa* (desolation), the word *omoshirosa* (charm) is used.²⁹ That substitution and the tone and context of the lines confirm that, for the author of *Yashima* (possibly Zeami), *monosugoshi* lacked any attributes of fear.

But, just as in the case of later *renga*, later *nō* plays exhibit a new understanding of *monosugoshi*. In the play *Sesshōseki* (The Killing Rock, written by 1503), a Taoist adept en route to the capital from the northern provinces stops at the Nasuno meadow (in present-day Tochigi Prefecture) and encounters a famous rock that is said to kill everything that touches it. A woman tells him that the rock's powers are the realization of the attachments (*shūshin*) of Lady Tamamo, a mysteriously talented and beautiful woman from the time of Retired Emperor Toba (1103–56; r. 1107–23) who was expelled from court because she was really a fox in disguise. The woman eventually confesses that she herself is the ghost of Tamamo and the spirit of the rock. In the second act, the rock splits open and it and Tamamo are led by the efforts of the Taoist to enlightenment.

In the first act, before the woman tells the story of Tamamo, the chorus sings lines that describe the landscape:

...*fukurō shōkei no*
eda ni nakitsure kitsune
rangiku no kusa ni kakuresumu
kono hara no toki shi mo
monosugoki aki no yūbe ka na.

Owls hoot on the branches
of the pines and cypresses, and foxes
dwell hidden among the grasses
of the orchids and chrysanthemums.
At this moment in the meadow
it is a *monosugoki* autumn evening.

(Appendix, no. 36.)

Like the example from *Yashima* cited above, this passage incorporates a Chinese poem—in this case, a verse by the Tang poet Bo

Juyi—but the forbidding atmosphere, created by the hidden foxes and otherworldly owls, lends it a much different tone. Although the traveler is a holy man who fears nothing, the setting is remote, a deadly rock stands nearby, and the woman is the ghost of a woman who was herself the apparition of a fox. This is the world of fantastic *setsuwa* narratives, or of Chinese tales of the supernatural, not the elegant and serene realm of waka poetry, the Heian court classics, or even of the elite Gozan monasteries and the poetry they produced and revered. The earliest extant record of a performance of *Sesshōseki* dates from 1503, making it most likely much later than any of the other Muromachi-era plays that include the word *monosugoshi*. (See Appendix for a full list of the plays.) Therefore, it may have been written around the same time as the 1482 *renga* session that contains the earliest known example of a *renga* verse in which *monosugoshi* connotes a sense of fear.

Post-Muromachi Examples

While some writers continued to use the word *monosugoshi* in its older sense, others reserved *monosugoshi* for descriptions of scenes that were truly eerie or frightening. This dual usage underpins the definition of *monosugoshi* in the *Nippo jisho* of 1599 as something both lonely and frightening, “like a vast, deserted forest.”

Later examples do show that the expansion in the range of meaning of *monosugoshi* was permanent. These include an appearance in the nō play *Yūrei Shuten dōji* (*Ghost of the sake-swilling boy*), an Edo-period piece about the legendary drunken demon; after a traveling priest describes the deep windswept mountains at night as *monosugoshi*, he exclaims, “How frightening!” (*osoroshi ya*) and observes a figure walking toward him out of the shadows.³⁰ In the 1698 haikai collection *Zoku saru no mino* (*Monkey’s raincoat, continued*), a boy contributed this verse:

hitori ite / rusu monosugoshi / ine no tono

Home alone:

how *monosugoshi*!

Lord Lightning³¹

Ihara Saikaku uses *monosugoshi* in both senses, in different works. *Kōshoku ichidai otoko* (*The life of a playboy*, 1682) includes a description of a journey by the hero to the shore at Suma (present-day

Hyōgo Prefecture), where he enjoys the moonlight: “gradually even the moon became *monosugoshi*, and he wondered ‘Was that the cry of the “bird without a mate”?’ and felt even more lonely. ‘It’s going to be impossible to spend the night here. Maybe there are some fisher girls around?’”³² In this context, as the annotator indicates, *monosugoshi* means “joyless” (*kyō ga usurete*).³³ Just four years later, in *Honchō nijū fukō* (Twenty unfilial sons from this realm, 1686), Saikaku describes a scene in which a ship runs aground and is surrounded by an assortment of odd monsters and beasts: “And there was also one in the form of a human, with wings; and there was one with the voice of a dog and ears over ten feet long; none of them looked familiar. They were *monosugoshi*, and when they approached [the men on the ship] cringed.”³⁴ Both of these usages of *monosugoshi* are emblematic of two facets of the Edo mentality: the first appropriates it to the epicurean; the second, to the grotesque. In Saikaku, nonetheless, we still see in miniature the broader shift in the meaning of *monosugoshi*, from loneliness to fear.

Conclusions

To summarize, the word *monosugoshi* first appeared in depictions of landscapes in early medieval Japanese texts, in which it connoted a desolate but benign sense of loneliness, and therefore differed little from the traditional meaning of *sugoshi* in poetic and other literary texts. This originary meaning is largely missing from modern dictionaries and, consequently, the word is often mistranslated when it appears in earlier texts because it is interpreted anachronistically. Beginning around the year 1500, however, we can see *monosugoshi* appearing in close proximity to words that express fear or describe things that are usually regarded as frightening. Yet *monosugoshi* still continues to be used by other writers in its older sense. In specific genres, we see this shift occur in *nō* plays and *renga* poetry; the shift does not seem to occur in commentaries on Chinese poetry written by Japanese Zen monks.

I propose that the shift was not random or coincidental. It is very difficult to conclusively prove influence, to move from correlation into causality; nonetheless, the shift, in my view, is caused by at least two factors. First, this shift is related to changing perceptions of the natural landscape and attitudes toward the environment that were occurring during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. As Nagahara Keiji has observed, although natural disasters and anomalies have occurred

regularly over the span of Japanese history, in the middle of the fifteenth century we see a remarkable increase in floods, droughts, famines, and epidemics. The meteorologist Yamamoto Takeo suggested the existence of a “mini Ice Age” around this time that might account for these events.³⁵ In turn, the meteorological irregularities exacerbated and accelerated growing social and political dislocations that culminated in the Ōnin War of 1467–77, which left Kyoto in ruins and effectively dismantled the Muromachi shogunate. Japan had no ruling central authority until the ascension of Oda Nobunaga a century later. Describing the context of a village uprising that occurred after the war in a village not far from Kyoto, Pierre Souryi notes, “The rural landscape was changing. . . . Villagers deserted the insecure countryside, leaving it to outlaws and the armies that roamed the area, and banded together behind fortified works.”³⁶ When the social and political order breaks down, individuals lose the ability to move safely alone or in small groups, and the deserted mountains that once might have seemed inviting refuges or bucolic poetic locales now become sites of danger and dread.

The second relevant factor is intrinsic to the production of literature itself. It is the early modern, or Edo, period (1600–1868) that is most closely associated with a rapid increase in literacy and a surge of literary production by commoners, but this is only the resumption of a trend that began in the Muromachi era. The production of *renga* was a popular pastime that necessitated the creation of handbooks to allow, for example, poets who had never read *The Tale of Genji* to allude to it. And the foremost nō playwrights—Zeami, his son Motomasa, and his son-in-law Zenchiku—were highly literate and socialized with high-ranking political and religious figures, but did not themselves belong to the elite courtier, warrior, or clerical classes. It does not seem to be coincidental that both of these genres registered a shift in the meaning of *monosugoshi* around the same time (1483 for a *renga* poem cited above, and before 1503 for the nō play *Sesshōseki*). Furthermore, we observed that Gozan monks writing during this period never abandoned the traditional meaning of *monosugoshi*. We can attribute this in turn to two reasons. First, it is unseemly for monks of any creed to express fear of supernatural beings or events. Second, and perhaps more importantly, Gozan monks came largely from warrior families and required social or financial capital in order to advance in the hierarchy.³⁷ Although the Kyoto Gozan temples were destroyed in the Ōnin War, both spiritually

and materially, the monks who lived in them were of the least vulnerable section of the population.

Perhaps *monosugoshi*'s semantic expansion was part of a broader movement in Muromachi Japan toward a culture of fear. In studies of the adjective *kowashi*, Kobayashi Kenji has observed a similar tendency in the scripts of *kyōgen* plays and other texts of the late Muromachi and early Edo eras. Originally synonymous with *tsuyoshi* ("strong") and written with the same graph (強), *kowashi* eventually took on the meaning of "fearsome" (i.e., *osoroshi*) and came to be written with a different graph (怖).³⁸

It is not that courtiers and other elites did not use the word *monosugoshi*; they did. But when they used it, they had in mind a natural order in which landscapes and the natural environments upon which they were based served as prompts for poignant but not unpleasant emotions. This is perhaps an understandable tendency for writers who rarely leave the capital, or do so only surrounded by an armed entourage, or express themselves only through the linguistic filters of Japanese court poetry, which held its own canon of proper word usage. But the popular understanding of the word *monosugoshi*, which came to dominate usage of the word for the reasons I have proposed above, gives us a rare glimpse into another aspect of Japanese perceptions of nature, which have been largely construed (in my view, accurately) as expressing a preference for "tamed" nature, for nature as "pet."³⁹

This movement toward fear of the landscape has been observed in the medieval West as well. The Italian medievalist Vito Fumagalli notes:

In the early Middle Ages anything unusual, however much it departed from the norm, was still regarded as a product of nature. Though it might be of strange appearance, it was undisputedly part of the natural order. Later, however, any oddities of the human, animal or vegetable world came to be regarded as unnatural. The shift in thinking coincided with the gradual physical separation from the natural world as over the centuries many natural features were destroyed when the forests were cleared for cultivation. Those forests which survived the long campaign of clearance gradually came to be perceived as alien, even frightening places, and it is significant that it was there that the spirits of the dead began to be seen.⁴⁰

The difference between the case of medieval Europe and medieval Japan seems to be that, in Japan, the change in thinking (if what we have observed in the history of the word *monosugoshi* is representative of

broader trends) preceded forest depletion, rather than following it (as in the case of Europe). As Conrad Totman observes, in medieval Japan “[s]ome Kinai areas deteriorated biologically; elsewhere forest composition changed, but serious biosphere decline appears to have been negligible.” It was the “early modern predation” of 1570–1670 that “stripped the archipelago of nearly all its high forest.”⁴¹ In the present study we have seen how a single word used to describe the natural environment shifted in meaning for some writers and speakers in Japan beginning ca. 1500, taking on malevolent connotations. Did the striking changes in attitudes toward landscapes and the environment that we tend to associate with the early modern and modern eras actually originate in the late medieval period?

Notes

The author wishes to thank Professors Kanechiku Nobuyuki, Matsuoka Shinpei, Sakamoto Kiyoe, David Spafford, and Michael Watson for their advice and assistance, and gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the Japan Studies Program, University of Washington.

¹ I am aware that “nature” and “environment” are deeply problematic terms—the latter, for example, implicitly enacts a conceptual separation between humans and the rest of the planet that does not obtain in the physical world. Nevertheless, I have not been able to find adequate replacements for these words.

² See in particular Haruo Shirane, *Japan and the Culture of the Four Seasons* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), for his useful distinction between “secondary nature” (representations of nature in various media) and “primary nature” (natural phenomena themselves). On the domestication of nature, see Arne Kalland and Pamela J. Asquith, “Japanese Perceptions of Nature: Ideals and Illusions,” in their edited volume *Japanese Images of Nature: Cultural Perspectives* (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 1997), 1–35. Another notable work is Watanabe Yasuaki and Kawamura Teruo, eds., *Utawareta fūkei* (Tokyo: Kasama shoin, 2000).

³ Asahi Shinbun, “Sokuhō: Ō kaichō: ‘Naiyō-teki ni wa 10-bai ikita’/itamu.” *Asahi Shinbun Dijitaru*, December 28, 2012. <http://www.asahi.com/showbiz/nikkan/NIK201212280001.html> Accessed July 26, 2013. This comment was

made by the former baseball player and coach Ō Sadaharu (now a company director) regarding the late kabuki actor Nakamura Kanzaburō (1955–2012). Strictly speaking, the use of *monosugoi* to modify another adjective (here, *gōkai na*) would require the adverbial form *monosugoku*, but Ō's use of the adjectival form instead is quite typical.

⁴ Nihon Daijiten Kankōkai, Dainihan Henshū Inkaï, eds. *Nihon kokugo daijiten*, 2nd ed. (Shōgakusan, 2000–02), s.v. “monosugoi.” The entry gives a number of textual examples from medieval texts, which correspond to nos. 1b, 22b, and 42 in the Appendix.

⁵ Muromachi Jidaigo Jiten Henshū Inkaï, eds., *Jidaibetsu kokugo daijiten, Muromachi jidai hen* (Sanseidō, 1985) 5: 459, s.v. “monosugoshi.” This entry also includes some textual examples, which appear as nos. 26a, 29b, 27h, 23, and 41 in the Appendix.

⁶ Fujiwara (Aburanokōji) no Takaie (1338–67) later became a senior noble; he was quite young at the time he wrote this. The sponsor, Retired Emperor Kōgon (1313–1364; r. 1331–1364) had been dethroned after the Kemmu Restoration, but returned to power as retired emperor after Ashikaga Takauji displaced Retired Emperor Go-Daigo.

⁷ *Monosugoshi* or forms thereof also appears in poems 35 and 61 of the same contest, in similar contexts and with similar connotations.

⁸ The lines in question are 猶堪慰寂寞、漁火亂黃昏 (“And the only thing that can relieve this loneliness / is the fishermen’s fires flickering in the dusk”). The title of the poem is 新年五首 其一 (Five Poems on the New Year: No. 1).

⁹ Doi Tadao, ed., *Nippo jisho: Vocabulario da lingua de Iapam* (Iwanami shoten, 1960), 331, s.v. “Monosugoi.”

¹⁰ Yamamoto Toshihide, “Keiyōshi ku-katsuyō, shiku-katsuyō no imijō no sōi ni tsuite,” *Kokugogaku* 23 (December, 1955), 71–75. Cited in Umeno Kimiko, *En to sono shūhen: Heian bungaku no biteki goi no kenkyū* (Kasama Shoin, 1979), 245 n. 3.

¹¹ The above summary is based on Umeno, *En to sono shūhen*, 219–99.

¹² *Nihon kokugo daijiten*, 2nd ed., s.v. “mono.”

¹³ Shinagawa Michiaki, “Murasaki Shikibu no sakuhin ni mirareru iwayuru settōgo no kōsatsu: ‘mono’ o chūshin to shite,” *Yamaguchi kokubun* 8 (1985), 25.

¹⁴ Shinagawa, “Murasaki Shikibu no sakuhin,” 22.

- ¹⁵ Also translated in Hilda Katō, “The *Mumyōshō*,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 23:3/4 (1968), 394.
- ¹⁶ Katō, *Mumyōshō*, 395.
- ¹⁷ Translation adapted from Gosho Translation Committee, *The Writings of Nichiren Daishonin* (Tokyo: Soka gakkai, 2003), 123. I have replaced the English equivalent “wildly” with the original *monosugoku*. For background on the text, including the question of its authenticity, see the commentary by Watanabe Yasumichi in Nichiren Shōnin Roppyakugojū Onki Hōon Kinenkai, eds. *Nichiren shōnin goibun kōgi* (Nichiren shōnin ibun kenkyūkai, 1958), 9:1–4.
- ¹⁸ On this trope, see Tokuda Kazuo, *Otogi-zōshi kenkyū* (Miyai shoten, 1988), 47–79, and Shirane, *Japan and the Culture of the Four Seasons*, 147–50.
- ¹⁹ David T. Bialock, *Eccentric Spaces, Hidden Histories: Narrative, Ritual, and Royal Authority from ‘The Chronicles of Japan’ to ‘The Tale of the Heike,’* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2007), xiii.
- ²⁰ *Man’yōshū* 29. “His great palace stood / Upon this spot, as I have heard; / ... / Where now spring grasses / Choke the earth in their rife growth....” Translated by Edwin A. Cranston in *The Gem-Glistening Cup*. Vol. 1 of *A Waka Anthology* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993), 191. For the original, see Satake Akihiro, Yamada Hideo, Kudō Rikio, Ōtani Masao, and Yamazaki Yoshiyuki, eds. *Man’yōshū* (Iwanami shoten, 1999) 1:34–35.
- ²¹ Umeno, *En to sono shūhen*, 234.
- ²² Iwadare Noriyoshi, Kubo Tenzui, and Shaku Seitan, trans., *So Tōba zen shishū* (Kokumin Bunko Kankōkai, 1928–31; rept. Nihon Tosho, 1978), 6: 8–9.
- ²³ Morohashi Tetsuji, *Dai kanwa jiten*, (Taishūkan shoten, 1989) 7: 16, s.v. *seiryō* 淒涼.
- ²⁴ Paul S. Atkins, *Revealed Identity: The Noh Plays of Komparu Zenchiku* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2006), 31. The plays named are *Bashō*, *Teika*, and *Ohara gokō*. To these should be added *Yōkihi*; *monosugoshi* appears only in *shimogakari* versions of that play. See Nishino Haruo, ed., *Yōkyoku hyakuban*. Vol. 57 of *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikai* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 1998, rept. 2003), 175 n. 19. Zenchiku’s usage of *monosugoshi* is also addressed in Inoue Ai, “Monosugoshi kō,” *Tessen* 585 (2009), 4–5.

- ²⁵ In addition to the three attributed to Zenchiku, they are *Yashima*, *Yūgao*, *Yamanba*, *Kuzu*, *Hajitomi*, and *Tomoe*.
- ²⁶ A play titled *Yoshitsune*, which is believed to be the same play as *Yashima*, appears in *Sarugaku dangi*, a record of remarks on *nō* by Zeami, which was completed in this year. See Omote Akira and Katō Shūichi, eds., *Zeami, Zenchiku* (Iwanami shoten, 1974), 286.
- ²⁷ Translation from Thomas Blenman Hare, *Zeami's Style: The Noh Plays of Zeami Motokiyo* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1986), 212.
- ²⁸ Yokomichi and Omote, eds., *Yōkyokushū ge* (Iwanami shoten, 1963), 266 n. 10. The quotation is discussed in Hare, *Zeami's Style*, 287 n. 36. For the poem, see Hoshikawa Kiyotaka, ed., *Kobun shinpō zenshū (jō)*. Vol. 9 of *Shinshaku kanbun taikai* (Tokyo: Meiji shoin, 1967), 249–51.
- ²⁹ Yokomichi and Omote, eds., *Yōkyokushū ge*, 267, textual note 10.
- ³⁰ Tanaka Makoto, ed., *Mikan yōkyokushū* (Tokyo: Koten bunko, 1971), 17: 132. For background on the play, including dating, see pp. 42–43 in the same volume.
- ³¹ Shiraishi Teizō and Ueno Yōzō, eds., *Bashō shichibu shū* (Iwanami shoten, 1990), 534.
- ³² See Ihara, Saikaku, *Saikaku shū jō*, ed. Asao Isoji, Itasaka Gen, and Tsutsumi Seiji (Iwanami shoten, 1957), 53. Translated by Kengi Hamada as “As the night wore on, even the moon seemed ghastly. Then the lonely cry of a sea bird suggested to Yonosuke that perhaps the creature had lost its mate. This provoked the further thought that traveling alone was much too solitary. ‘Isn’t there a young fisher wench around,’ he asked.” Ihara Saikaku, *The Life of An Amorous Man*, trans. Kengi Hamada (Rutland, Vt. and Tokyo: Tuttle, 1964), 29. Emphasis added.
- ³³ Ihara, *Saikaku shū jō*, 53, n. 31.
- ³⁴ Ihara, Saikaku, *Kōshoku nidai otoko, Saikaku shokoku-banashi, Honchō nijū fukō*, ed. Fuji Akio, Inoue Toshiyuki, and Satake Akihiro (Iwanami shoten, 1991), 425. Also cited in Nakamura Yukihiro, Okami Masao, and Sakakura Atsuyoshi, eds., *Kadokawa kogo daijiten*, (Kadokawa shoten, 1982–99), s.v. “monosugoshi.”
- ³⁵ Nagahara Keiji, *Nairan to minshū no seiki* (Shōgakukan, 1992), 385–86.
- ³⁶ Pierre François Souyri, *The World Turned Upside Down: Medieval Japanese Society*, trans. Käthe Roth (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 184.

- ³⁷ Martin Collcutt, *Five Mountains: The Rinzaï Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan* (Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University), 226.
- ³⁸ Kobayashi Kenji, “Osoroshi to kowashi: kyōgen daihon ni okeru yōsō,” *Waseda Nihongo kenkyū* 17 (March, 2008), 113–22, and “Kowashi no seiritsu to tenkai: chūsei kara kinsei zenki kamigata-go made,” *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 89:10 (October, 2012), 48–63.
- ³⁹ In addition to the volume by Haruo Shirane mentioned above, see also Watanabe Kenji, Noda Ken’ichi, Komine Kazuaki, and Haruo Shirane, eds., *Kankyō to iu shiza: Nihon bungaku to ekokuritishizumu, Ajia yūgaku* 143 (July, 2011), in particular Jakku Stōnman (Jack Stoneman), “Chūsei waka ni okeru niiji-teki shizen to yasei-teki shizen: Saigyō, Jakunen no ‘yamazato’ zōtōka o chūshin ni,” 53–59.
- ⁴⁰ Vito Fumagalli, *Landscapes of Fear: Perceptions of Nature and the City in the Middle Ages*, trans. Shayne Mitchell (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1994), 7.
- ⁴¹ Conrad D. Totman, *The Green Archipelago: Forestry in Preindustrial Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 49–50.

Appendix

Citations of *monosugoshi* and related forms in medieval Japanese texts.

Heike monogatari

No.	Date	Title of Text	Finding information
1.	1309–10 (?)	<i>Engyō-bon Heike monogatari</i>	(a) <i>Engyō-bon Heike monogatari: Daitōkyū kinen bunko-zō</i> , ed. Kōten kenkyūkai (Tokyo: Kōten kenkyūkai, 1964), vol. 1, p. 865; (b) vol. 3, p. 461.
2.	1400 (ca.?)	<i>Nagato-bon Heike monogatari</i>	<i>Heike monogatari Nagato-bon</i> , ed. Ichishima Kenkichi (Kokusho kankōkai, 1906), p. 751.

3.	1447	<i>Shibu kassenjō-bon Heike monogatari</i>	<i>Kundoku Shibu kassenjō-bon Heike monogatari</i> , ed. Takayama Toshihiro (Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1995), p. 458.
----	------	--	---

Other early texts

4.	1265 (con- tested)	<i>Shōgu mondō shō</i>	Watanabe Yasumichi, <i>Nichiren shōnin goibun kōgi</i> (Tokyo: Nichiren shōnin ibun kenkyūkai, 1958), vol. 9, 111.
5.	1300 (ca.?)	<i>Matsukage chūnagon monogatari</i>	Ichiko Teiji and Misumi Yōichi, eds., <i>Kamakura jidai monogatari shūsei</i> , vol. 5, p. 95.
6.	1349	<i>Kōgon-in sanjūroku-ban utaawase</i>	(a) <i>Chūsei wakashū</i> , ed., Yōmei bunko, vol. 6 of Yōmei sōsho kokusho hen (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 1978), p. 69 (round 31, left); (b) p. 48 (round 13, left); (c) p. 54 (round 18, left). Also viewable in the Nichibunken waka database (http://tois.nichibun.ac.jp/database/html2/waka/menu.html).

Renga sequences. All citations from Nichibunken *renga* database (<http://tois.nichibun.ac.jp/database/html2/renga/menu.html>). Accessed January 12, 2013.

7.	n.d.	<i>Hiramatsu bunkobon senku</i>	Session 8, no. 034.
8.	1425	<i>Kanmon nikki shihai</i> (matsu wa ame),	no. 067.
9.	1426	<i>Kanmon nikki shihai</i> (hitotose ni)	no. 036.
10.	1469	<i>Ōnin nenkan hyakuin</i>	no. 097.
11.	1480	<i>Bunmei jūninen senku</i>	Session 2, no. 019.
12.	1482	<i>Bunmei jūyonen manku</i>	(a) Session 44, no. 099; (b) Session 60, no. 072; (c) Session 73, no. 094.

13.	1518	<i>Eishō nenkan hyakuin</i>	no. 015.
14.	1526	<i>Sōchō kankei oimimi Tenribon</i>	(a) no. 00625; (b) no. 01372.
15.	1550	<i>Tenbun nenkan hyakuin</i>	no. 095.
16.	1555	<i>Tenbun nijūyonen ume senku</i>	Session 9, no. 073.
17.	1561	<i>Imori senku</i>	Session 3, no. 057.
18.	1576	<i>Tenshō yonen manku</i>	Session 54, no. 080.
19.	1620	<i>Genna nenkan hyakuin (Saohime ya)</i>	no. 071.
20.	1621	<i>Genna nenkan hyakuin (kiete fure)</i>	no. 083.
21.	1670	<i>Kanbun nenkan hyakuin (yomo ni utsu)</i>	no. 065.

Commentaries on Chinese poetry (*shōmono*)

22.	1439 (ca.)	<i>Toshi zoku suishō</i>	(a) <i>Toshi zokusuishō 1</i> , ed. Ōtsuka Mitsunobu, vol. 1 of <i>Zoku shōmono shiryō shūsei</i> (Osaka: Seibundō, 1980), p. 401; (b) p. 475; (c) <i>Toshi zokusuishō 3</i> , vol. 3 of <i>Zoku shōmono shiryō shūsei</i> , ed. Ōtsuka Mitsunobu (Osaka: Seibundō, 1981), p. 67; (d) p. 113; (e) p. 129; (f) p. 465.
23.	1489 (after)	<i>Kajōshūshō</i>	<i>Gogaku shiryō toshite no Chuka jakuboku shishō (keifu)</i> , ed. Kamei Takashi, (Osaka: Seibundō, 1980).*
24.	1490 (ca.)	<i>Kobun shinpō genryūshō</i>	<i>Kobun shinpō keirinshō, Kobun shinpō genryūshō</i> , vol. 5 of <i>Zoku shōmono shiryō shūsei</i> , ed. Ōtsuka Mitsunobu (Osaka: Seibundō, 1980), p. 350.

25.	1500 (ca.)	<i>Sankokushō</i>	<i>Sankokushō</i> , ed. Ōtsuka Mitsunobu, vol. 6 of <i>Zoku shōmono shiryō shūsei</i> (Osaka: Seibundō, 1980), (a) p. 206; (b) p. 389; (c) p. 390; (d) p. 448; (e) p. 501; (f) p. 502.
26.	1520 (ca.?)	<i>Chūka jakuboku shishō</i>	(a) <i>Chūka jakuboku shishō</i> , <i>Yunoyama renku shō</i> , ed. Mitsunobu Ōtsuka, Yūjirō Ozaki, and Hisashi Asakura (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1995), p. 250; (b) p. 266.
27.	1534	<i>Shiga jikkai</i>	<i>Shiga jikkai</i> , 3 vols., ed. Nakata Norio (Tokyo: Benseisha, 1971). (a) 1:3, 56b (2x); (b) 4:1, 40b; (c) 4:1, 43a; (d) 4:3, 33b; (e) 5:3, 32b; (f) 5:3, 38b; (g) 5:4, 17b; (h) 6:1, 27a; (i) 6:1, 58a; (j) 6:4, 38a; (k) 14:1, 42b; (l) 17:4, 15a; (m) 19:2, 76a; (n) 19:4, 67a; (o) 20:3, 53a; (p) 22:3, 56a
28.	1534 (ca.)	<i>Mōgyūshō</i>	<i>Mōshishō</i> , <i>Mōgyūshō</i> , ed. Okami Masao and Ōtsuka Mitsunobu, vol. 6 of <i>Shōmono shiryō shūsei</i> (Osaka: Seibundō, 1971), p. 424, no. 26b.
29.	1558– 70 (ca.)	<i>Shigaku taiseishō</i>	(a) <i>Chūkō zenrin fūgetsushūshō</i> , <i>Shigaku taiseishō</i> , <i>Chūkō zenrin fūgetsushū</i> , <i>Tsukumono kishō</i> , ed. Ōtsuka Mitsunobu, vol. 1 of <i>Shin shōmono shiryō shūsei</i> (Osaka: Seibundō, 2000), p. 292a; (b) p. 294b (2x); (c) p. 297a (2x); (d) p. 298b; (e) p. 299.

Nō plays (14th–15th c.)

30.	1430 (by)	<i>Yamanba</i>	<i>Yōkyokushū ge</i> , ed. Yokomichi Mario and Omote Akira, vol. 41 of <i>Nihon koten bungaku taikai</i> (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1963), p. 283.
31.	1430 (ca.)	<i>Yashima</i>	<i>Yōkyokushū 1</i> , ed. Koyama Hiroshi and Satō Ken'ichirō, vol. 58 of <i>Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū</i> (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1997), p. 130.
32.	1430 (ca.)	<i>Bashō</i>	(a) <i>Yōkyokushū 1</i> , p. 312; (b) p. 320; (c) p. 323.
33.	1450 (ca.)	<i>Ohara gokō</i>	<i>Yōkyokushū 1</i> , p. 425 (3x)

34.	1465 (by)	<i>Yūgao</i>	<i>Yōkyokushū ge</i> , ed. Itō Masayoshi (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1988), p. 40.
35.	1470 (by)	<i>Teika</i>	(a) <i>Yōkyokushū 1</i> , p. 329; (b) p. 335.
36.	1503 (by)	<i>Sesshōseki</i>	<i>Yōkyokushū chū</i> , ed. Itō Masayoshi (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1986), p. 229.
37.	n.d.	<i>Kuzu</i>	<i>Yōkyokushū ge</i> , p. 364.
38.	n.d.	<i>Hajitomi</i>	<i>Yōkyokushū 1</i> , p. 345 (2x).
39.	n.d.	<i>Tomoe</i>	<i>Yōkyokushū ge</i> , ed. Itō Masayoshi (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1988), p. 236.
40.	(Edo)	<i>Yūrei Shuten Dōji</i>	<i>Mikan yōkyokushū</i> , vol. 17, ed. Tanaka Makoto (Tokyo: Koten bunko, 1971), p. 132.

Christian texts (late 16th c.)

41.	1591	<i>Santosu no gosagyō</i>	<i>Santosu no gosagyō: honji kenkyūhen</i> , ed. Fukushima Kunimichi (Tokyo: Benseisha, 1979), p. 131.
42.	1599	<i>Giya do pekadoru</i>	<i>Giya do pekadoru</i> , ed. Ohara Satoru (Tokyo: Kyōbunkan, 2001), p. 128.

* Cited in Muromachi Jidaigo Jiten Henshū Inkaï, eds., *Jidaibetsu kokugo daijiten, Muromachi jidai hen*, 5 vols., (Sanseidō, 1985–2001), s.v. “monosugoshi.” This book is not available in North America. The citation is from the second book of the text; the first book was transcribed in Asakura Hitoshi, “Kokuritsu kōmonjokan Naikaku bunko-zō ‘Kajōshū shō’ kenkan no honbun (honkoku),” *Hiroshima shōsen kōtō senmon gakkō kiyō* 34 (March, 2012), 157–78.

Bibliography

- Asahi Shinbun. “Sokuhō: Ō kaichō: ‘Naiyō-teki ni wa 10-bai ikita’/itamu.” *Asahi Shinbun Dijitaru*, December 28, 2012. <http://www.asahi.com/showbiz/nikkan/NIK201212280001.html>. Accessed July 26, 2013.
- Asakura Hitoshi. “Kokuritsu kōmonjokan Naikaku bunko-zō ‘Kajōshū shō’ kenkan no honbun (honkoku).” *Hiroshima shōsen kōtō senmon gakkō kiyō* 34 (March 2012): 157–178.

- Asquith, Pamela J. and Arne Kalland, eds. *Japanese Images of Nature: Cultural Perspectives*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 1997.
- Atkins, Paul S. *Revealed Identity: The Noh Plays of Komparu Zenchiku*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2006.
- Bialock, David T. *Eccentric Spaces, Hidden Histories: Narrative, Ritual, and Royal Authority from 'The Chronicles of Japan' to 'The Tale of the Heike.'* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Collcutt, Martin. *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan*. Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1981.
- Cranston, Edwin A. *The Gem-Glistening Cup*, vol. 1 of *A Waka Anthology*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Doi Tadao, ed. *Nippo jisho: Vocabulario da lingoa de Iapam*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1960.
- Fukushima Kunimichi, ed. *Santosu no gosagyō: honji kenkyūhen*. Tokyo: Benseisha, 1979.
- Fumagalli, Vito. *Landscapes of Fear: Perceptions of Nature and the City in the Middle Ages*, trans. Shayne Mitchell. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1994.
- Gosho Translation Committee. *The Writings of Nichiren Daishōnin*. Tokyo: Sōka gakkai, 2003.
- Hare, Thomas Blenman. *Zeami's Style: The Noh Plays of Zeami Motokiyo*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1986.
- Hoshikawa Kiyotaka, ed. *Kobun shinpō zenshū (jō)*, vol. 9 of *Shinshaku kanbun taikai*. Tokyo: Meiji shoin, 1967.
- Ichiko Teiji and Misumi Yōichi, eds. *Kamakura jidai monogatari shūsei*. 8 vols. Tokyo: Kasama shoin, 1988–2001.
- Ichishima Kenkichi, ed. *Heike monogatari Nagato-bon*. Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1906.
- Ihara Saikaku. *Saikaku shū jō*, ed. Asao Isoji, Itasaka Gen, and Tsutsumi Seiji, vol. 47 of *Nihon koten bungaku taikai*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1957.

- . *The Life of An Amorous Man*, trans. Kengi Hamada. Rutland, Vt. and Tokyo: Tuttle, 1964.
- . *Kōshoku nidai otoko, Saikaku shokoku-banashi, Honchō nijū fukō*, ed. Fuji Akio, Inoue Toshiyuki, and Satake Akihiro, vol. 76 of *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikai*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1991.
- Inoue Ai. “Monosugoshi kō,” *Tessen* 585 (2009): 4–5.
- International Research Center for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken). *Renga* Database. <http://tois.nichibun.ac.jp/database/html2/renga/menu.html>. Accessed July 26, 2013.
- . *Waka* Database. <http://tois.nichibun.ac.jp/database/html2/waka/menu.html>. Accessed July 26, 2013.
- Itō Masayoshi, ed. *Yōkyokushū*. 3 vols. (jō, chū, ge). Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1986–88.
- Iwadare Noriyoshi, Kubo Tenzui, and Shaku Seitan, trans. *So Tōba zen shishū*. 6 vols. Tokyo: Kokumin bunko kankōkai, 1928–31; rept. Nihon tosho, 1978.
- Sutōnman, Jakku (Jack Stoneman). “Chūsei waka ni okeru nijū-teki shizen to yasei-teki shizen: Saigyō, Jakunen no ‘yamazato’ zōtōka o chūshin ni,” in Watanabe Kenji, Noda Ken’ichi, Komine Kazuaki, and Haruo Shirane, eds., *Kankyō to iu shiza: Nihon bungaku to ekokurishizumu, Ajia yūgaku* 143 (July, 2011): 53–59.
- Kamei Takashi, ed. *Gogaku shiryō toshite no Chuka jakuboku shishō (keifu)*. Osaka: Seibundō shuppan, 1980.
- Katō, Hilda. “The *Mumyōshō*.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 23:3/4 (1968): 351–430.
- Kobayashi Kenji. “Osoroshi to kowashi: kyōgen daihon ni okeru yōsō.” *Waseda Nihongo kenkyū* 17 (March, 2008): 113–22.
- . “Kowashi no seiritsu to tenkai: chūsei kara kinsei zenki kamigata-go made.” *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 89:10 (October, 2012): 48–63.
- Koten Kenkyūkai, ed. *Engyō-bon Heike monogatari*. 3 vols. Tokyo: Koten kenkyūkai, 1964–65.

- Koyama Hiroshi and Satō Ken'ichirō, eds. *Yōkyokushū I*, vol. 58 of *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1997.
- Morohashi Tetsuji. *Dai kanwa jiten*, vol. 7. Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten, 1989.
- Muromachi Jidaigo Jiten Henshū Inkai, eds. *Jidaibetsu kokugo daijiten, Muromachi jidai hen*. 5 vols. Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1985–2001.
- Nagahara Keiji. *Nairan to minshū no seiki*. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1992.
- Nakamura Yukihiro, Okami Masao, and Sakakura Atsuyoshi, eds. *Kadokawa kogo daijiten*. 5 vols. Tokyo: Kadokawa shoten, 1982–99.
- Nakata Norio, ed. *Shiga jikkai*. 3 vols. Tokyo: Benseisha, 1971.
- Nichiren Shōnin Ropyyakugojū Onki Hōon Kinenkai, eds. *Nichiren shōnin goibun kōgi*, vol. 9. Tokyo: Nichiren Shōnin ibun kenkyūkai, 1958.
- Nihon Daijiten Kankōkai, Dainihan Henshū Inkai, eds. *Nihon kokugo daijiten*, 2nd ed., 13 vols. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 2000–02.
- Nishino Haruo, ed. *Yōkyoku hyakuban*, vol. 57 of *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikai*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1998; rept. 2003.
- Ohara Satoru, ed. *Giya do pekadoru*. Tokyo: Kyōbunkan, 2001.
- Okami Masao and Ōtsuka Mitsunobu, eds. *Mōshishō, Mōgyūshō*, vol. 6 of *Shōmono shiryō shūsei*. Osaka: Seibundō shuppan, 1971.
- Omote Akira and Katō Shūichi, eds. *Zeami, Zenchiku*, vol. 24 of *Nihon shisō taikai*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1974.
- Ōtsuka Mitsunobu, ed. *Kobun shinpō keirinshō, Kobun shinpō genryūshō*, vol. 5 of *Zoku shōmono shiryō shūsei*. Osaka : Seibundō shuppan, 1980.
- , ed. *Sankokushō*, vol. 6 of *Zoku shōmono shiryō shūsei*. Osaka: Seibundō shuppan, 1980.
- , ed. *Toshi zoku suishō*. 3 vols. Vols. 1–3 of *Zoku shōmono shiryō shūsei*. Osaka: Seibundō shuppan, 1980–81.
- , ed. *Chūkō zenrin fūgetsushūshō, Shigaku taiseishō, Chūkō zenrin fūgetsushū, Tsukumono kishō*, vol. 1 of *Shin shōmono shiryō shūsei*. Osaka: Seibundō shuppan, 2000.

- Ōtsuka Mitsunobu, Ozaki Yūjirō, and Asakura Hisashi, eds. *Chūka jakuboku shishō, Yunoyama renku shō*, vol. 53 of *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1995.
- Satake Akihiro, Yamada Hideo, Kudō Rikio, Ōtani Masao, and Yamazaki Yoshiyuki, eds. *Man'yōshū*. 4 vols. Vols. 1–4 of *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1999–2004.
- Shinagawa Michiaki. “Murasaki Shikibu no saku hin ni mirareru iwayuru settōgo no kōsatsu: ‘mono’ o chūshin to shite.” *Yamaguchi kokubun* 8 (1985): 14–33.
- Shiraishi Teizō and Ueno Yōzō, eds. *Bashō shichibu shū*, vol. 70 of *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1990.
- Shirane, Haruo. *Japan and the Culture of the Four Seasons*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Souyri, Pierre François. *The World Turned Upside Down: Medieval Japanese Society*, trans. Käthe Roth. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Takayama Toshihiro, *Kundoku Shibu kassenjō-bon Heike monogatari*. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1995.
- Tanaka Makoto, ed. *Mikan yōkyokushū*, vol. 17. Tokyo: Kōten bunko, 1971.
- Tokuda Kazuo. *Otogi-zōshi kenkyū*. Tokyo: Miyai shoten, 1988.
- Totman, Conrad D. *The Green Archipelago: Forestry in Preindustrial Japan*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1989.
- Umeno Kimiko. *En to sono shūhen: Heian bungaku no biteki goi no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Kasama shoin, 1979.
- Watanabe Kenji, Noda Ken'ichi, Komine Kazuaki, and Haruo Shirane, eds., *Kankyō to iu shiza: Nihon bungaku to ekokuritishizumu. Ajia yūgaku* 143 (July, 2011).
- Watanabe Yasuaki and Kawamura Teruo, eds. *Utawareta fūkei*. Tokyo: Kasama shoin, 2000.
- Yamamoto Toshihide. “Keiyōshi ku-katsuyō, shiku-katsuyō no imijō no sōi ni tsuite.” *Kokugogaku* 23 (December, 1955): 71–75.

Yokomichi Mario and Omote Akira, eds. *Yōkyokushū ge*, vol. 41 of *Nihon koten bungaku taikei*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1963.

Yōmei Bunko, ed. *Chūsei wakashū*. Vol. 6 of *Yōmei sōsho kokusho hen*. Tokyo: Shibunkaku, 1978.