

Naoko GUNJI

Redesigning the Death Rite and Redesignating the Tomb

The Separation of Kami and Buddhist Deities at the Mortuary Site for Emperor Antoku

This article explores the transformation of Emperor Antoku's mortuary temple Amidaji into a new shrine, Akamagū, which took place in the process of *haibutsu kishaku* in the early Meiji period. The focus of this article is on two aspects of this transformation: the change that the rituals in Antoku's death anniversary underwent, and the process that led to the official designation of Akamagū as Antoku's imperial mausoleum. After reviewing the history of Amidaji and the general context of *haibutsu kishaku*, this article investigates the two aspects in the context of the principle of Kokka Shinto, under which the Meiji government redefined the various roles of Shinto shrines, rituals, and imperial mausolea. Among such redefinitions, this article reviews in particular how the government redefined the notion of pollution and sanctity involved in imperial mausolea. It will be revealed that the political goals of the central and local governments largely defined the mode of the transformation of Antoku's mortuary site as well as the design of the new shrine and its rituals, which have survived to this day.

KEYWORDS: *shinbutsu bunri*—*haibutsu kishaku*—Antoku—Amidaji—Akamagū—Akama Jingū—imperial mausoleum

Naoko GUNJI is assistant professor of Art History at Augustana College, Illinois.

AS PART of the Meiji restoration, the newly-formed government sought to reestablish the authority of the emperor, linking that agenda to the promotion of nativist theories and the demotion of foreign influences, including Buddhism. As a crucial step in this process, in 1868 the Meiji government issued a series of decrees ordering the separation of Shinto and Buddhist divinities (*shinbutsu bunri rei* 神仏分離令). The expulsion of Buddhism from syncretic Shinto-Buddhist sanctuaries was frequently accompanied by violent suppression, which included the laicization of priests with Buddhist credentials, the abolition of Buddhist institutions, the confiscation of Buddhist temple land properties, and the removal of Buddhist images, scriptures, implements, and buildings from religious complexes.

Among the temples completely destroyed during this turmoil was Amidaji 阿弥陀寺, the imperial mortuary temple for Emperor Antoku 安徳 (r.1180–1185; 1178–1185). While many other imperial mortuary temples underwent similar changes, the case of Amidaji is unique as it was immediately replaced by the Shinto shrine Akamagū 赤間宮, which is now called Akama Jingū 赤間神宮. Inspired by recent studies of *shinbutsu bunri*,¹ this paper will investigate this transformation of Amidaji into Akamagū. The investigation will provide a case study of the religious and political dynamics at work behind the persecution of Buddhism, and the reestablishment of Shinto as a national ideology in the early Meiji period.

The case of Amidaji and Akamagū has a special significance in the study of these dynamics for the following reasons. First, Antoku was one of the few emperors who, after their fall in political struggles, were recognized to have become vengeful spirits. While such recognition was itself a highly political process, it was considered to be a crucial role of the imperial government, and often was a central concern of the court, to properly appease the vengeful spirits to protect the imperial state from their wrath. Moreover, of all the appeased emperors, Antoku's case stands out in two respects: one is that his mortuary site is the only case in which, despite its transformation into a Shinto shrine, its identity as an imperial mortuary site was retained. This enables us to compare what was

* I would like to express my gratitude to Clark Chilson, Karen Gerhart, Kishida Kōhei, Linda Penkower, and Van Symons for their helpful comments on this article. A grateful acknowledgment also goes to Mizuno Naofusa, the head priest of Akama Jingū, for his invaluable information.

1. For example, recent publications include GRAPARD 1984; TAKEDA 1996; HARDACRE 1989; KETELAAR 1990; ANTONI 1995; THAL 2002; SEKIMORI 2005.

abolished, what was introduced, and what was retained, though perhaps modified, through the transformation, and to study the considerations that defined the mode of this transformation. The other outstanding aspect of Antoku is that he is the only appeased emperor whose place of death and burial site were uncertain. This uncertainty left much more room for political considerations in the process that led to the official designation of Akamagū as Antoku's imperial mausoleum.

To prepare for our investigation of the transformation of Amidaji into Akamagū, this article will first lay out the history of Amidaji up to the beginning of the Meiji period. It will also examine the goal the Meiji government had in transforming Buddhist mortuary sites, including Amidaji, to pure Shinto shrines—namely, the goal of reinforcing the imperial power. The article will then investigate the two aforementioned aspects of Antoku's mortuary site. First, the changes it went through under *shinbutsu bunri* will be examined, and in particular, the rituals performed on the anniversary of Antoku's death. Though Akamagū eliminated most rituals associated with Buddhism, the most important ceremony, conducted on the death anniversary, survived. Still, even with this ceremony, the ritual program was modified: whereas some traditional elements remained unchanged, other new, purportedly Shinto, elements were adapted.

The first of the last two sections of this article will discuss the Meiji government's designation of imperial mausolea. The government conducted a series of research to designate mausolea for emperors whose burial sites were unknown, including Antoku. It will be shown that some political interventions contributed to the designation of Akamagū as Antoku's mausoleum. In relation to this, the final section will explore the process by which imperial mausolea, distancing themselves from Buddhism, came to be regarded as Shinto shrines, and as such, free from pollution and more readily available as institutions to bolster imperial authority.

This article will show that as the Meiji government redefined the various roles of Shinto shrines, rituals, and imperial mausolea under the principle of *Kokka Shinto*, the decision to abolish Amidaji and establish Akamagū, and to transform its rituals, was made in order to ensure its survival and to retain its prestige as a place where the child emperor Antoku's spirit was worshiped. This Shinto transformation of Amidaji and its rituals, as well as its designation as Antoku's mausoleum, greatly enhanced the prestige and importance of Akamagū. The new shrine sustained and even developed a more powerful identity as the institution where rites were performed in perpetuity for Antoku.

Amidaji's History Before the Meiji Period

Amidaji, the predecessor of Akamagū, was located in present-day Shimonoseki City in Yamaguchi Prefecture. According to temple documents, it was originally

established as a site to enshrine a spirit of the Hachiman deity in 859 by the monk Gyōkyō 行教 (act. c.800–860).² The temple became well known after the Battle of Dannoura in 1185. During this fierce battle, the eight-year-old Emperor Antoku and the members of the Taira 平 clan drowned themselves in the sea directly in front of the temple. Antoku's body was said to be buried in the temple complex after it was recovered from the ocean. Since the remains of the young emperor were allegedly deposited and religious rites were performed for his spirit there, Amidaji acquired a new identity as Antoku's mortuary temple at which rituals were maintained for his salvation.

During the early stage of its development as a mortuary temple, nuns acted as the caretakers of Amidaji.³ Temple documents list Nun Meia 命阿 (b.d. unknown; the name can also be read Myōa) as the re-founder of Amidaji. Nun Meia, also known as a daughter of the wet nurse of Kenreimon'in, arrived at Amidaji from Kyoto in 1186. Although no historical document tells us about the scale of the temple when Meia initiated the first rite, the Main Hall (*hondō* 本堂) was likely built as a devotional space to pray to the Amida triad which she had brought with her.⁴

Amidaji's further development was closely related to the spirit pacification (*chinkon* 鎮魂) to placate the vengeful ghost of Antoku.⁵ This was based upon the medieval belief that spirits of those who died under unnatural circumstances were unable to go to the proper resting place and would continue to roam in a liminal state between this world and the next world. Such spirits had the potential to transform into vengeful ones, causing all sorts of evil including natural disasters, misfortunes, and political instability. In the years shortly after the deaths of Antoku and the Taira, various calamities occurred, notably the great earthquake that devastated Kyoto in 1186, followed by Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa's 後白河 (r.1155–1158; 1127–1192) illness in 1187 and 1191.

2. It is said that Gyōkyō deposited a portion of the Hachiman spirit at the site of Amidaji on his way back to Kyoto from Usa Hachiman Shrine in Kyushu in order to establish Iwashimizu Hachiman Shrine. Gyōkyō's journey from Kyushu to Kyoto has been historically verified, but the references about his relation to Amidaji, dating from the fourteenth century onwards, are historically suspect. *Amidaji bettō shidai* (1516, 1765) in AJM, 135–39; *Amidaji bettō Shūeki mōshijōan* dated to 1519 in AJM, 132–34. Although *Chinju Hachimangū engi* is dated to 1282, it is thought that the date was inserted in the fourteenth century, based on its contents. See AJM, 182–84. No historical documentation regarding Amidaji is found before the Genpei War.

3. *Amidaji keidaizu shikigo* (1294), *Amidaji bettō shidai* (1516, 1765), *Amidaji bettō Shūeki mōshijōan* (1519) in AJM, 132–41; *Akamagaseki Amidaji raiyu oboe* in BJY, 382–87.

4. *Amidaji bettō Shūeki mōshijōan* in AJM, 132–34; *Akamagaseki Amidaji raiyu oboe* in BJY, 382–87.

5. My understanding of spirit pacification is based on SHIBATA 1984; YAMADA 2001, 3–63; KURODA 1990, 136–45; also see Allan Grapard's translation of a chapter from KURODA 1996b; and PLUTSCHOW 1990, 203–16.

About three months after the death of Antoku, Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実 (1143–1207), the then Minister of the Right, replied to Go-Shirakawa's concern regarding the tragic death of Antoku in an official document. In the entry of the third day of the seventh month of 1185 in his diary *Gyokuyō* 玉葉, Kanezane records his report to Go-Shirakawa:

Regarding the former emperor

According to the opinions of the secretaries of rites, posthumous names were granted in both Chinese and Japanese precedents.⁶ The only exception is the ex-emperor of Awaji, but even he received a reburial and other rituals later.⁷ *A fortiori* for the former emperor, because, although he followed the rebellious [Taira] clan and escaped from the palace and capital, when we imagine his infantile thoughts, he would not have conspired with them; so there is no objection to giving him sympathy and forgiveness. Even for the adult, adversarial emperor who plotted knavishly, a ceremony of veneration was held to apologize to his vengeful ghost.⁸ For the infant, former emperor who followed his kin, we have to mourn over his tragic death and offer him merciful and benevolent rites; hence granting a posthumous name. As [Nakahara no] Morohisa opines, it is best to order Nagato Province to build a [Buddhist] hall. For the sake of those who died in the battle, from the former emperor down to soldiers in general, perpetual [Buddhist] offerings should be established. This goes along the purport of granting a posthumous name, and moreover constitutes a rite of repenting and eradicating sins. Nonetheless, as the nation is particularly devastated [by the war], if the construction is too much trouble then it is not necessarily an urgent matter, but the work needs completing soon.

(GY 3 [Genryaku 2: 1185.7.2], 88–89)⁹

In the account, Kanezane is concerned about the appropriate rites for the deceased child emperor in reference to precedents. He suggests the possibility that Antoku's soul might become a vengeful ghost, due to the circumstances of his tragic death. Only six days after this account, a severe earthquake devastated Kyoto. Then, the Shingon monk Butsugon 仏巖 (b.d. unknown) saw an oracular dream and told Kanezane about it. In the dream, "a man in a red robe"

6. At this point, Antoku was not yet conferred his posthumous name and he was called the former emperor (*sentei* 先帝 or *kyūshu* 旧主) or the child emperor (*yōshu* 幼主).

7. The Deposed Emperor of Awaji (r.758–764) was exiled to Awaji island in 764 after the Disturbance of Fujiwara no Nakamaro 藤原仲麻呂 (706–764; aka. Emi no Oshikatsu 惠美押勝). He had had no posthumous name and had been simply called the Deposed Emperor of Awaji, but the Meiji government gave him the posthumous name Junnin 淳仁 in 1870 and considered repatriation of his spirit to Kyoto, as we will see below.

8. The adult emperor refers to Emperor Sutoku 崇徳 (r.1123–1142; 1119–1164).

9. All translations are mine, unless indicated.

told Butsugon that, although the earthquake was caused by the wrath of gods against people's sins and the casualty in the Genpei War was due to the victims' sinful karma, yet the fault lay ultimately with the non-virtuous sovereign, Go-Shirakawa, who exercised his political authority as the supreme ruler (*chiten no kimi* 治天の君). The man in red further said that it would take an extreme amount of acts of mercy and benevolence to bring peace to the nation (GY 3 [Genryaku 2: 1185.8.1], 93).¹⁰

Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa was a key figure in initiating the official spirit pacification for the vengeful ghosts of Antoku and the Taira. Prior to the Genpei War, Go-Shirakawa, in order to maintain his own political authority, neglected his grandson Antoku, who had been taken away by the Taira, and arranged for the enthronement of his younger grandson Go-Toba 後鳥羽 (r.1183–1198; 1180–1239) without first securing Antoku's abdication.¹¹ Go-Shirakawa also betrayed the Taira by forming an alliance with the Minamoto, the enemy of the Taira in the Genpei War, to oust the politically and economically powerful Taira clan from the bureaucratic center. It was under these circumstances that Antoku and the Taira members died prematurely. When a series of calamities and misfortunes occurred, as mentioned above, the public suspected that Antoku and the Taira had turned into vengeful ghosts causing fearful incidents.

This national fear of the vengeful ghosts of Antoku and the Taira had a direct and profound impact on the establishment in 1191 of "a hall" (*ichidō* 一堂) in Nagato Province in the place where they died. The Court Council unanimously approved an agenda for memorializing the death of Emperor Antoku; *Gyokuyō* lists the following things that were determined:

1. Building a hall in Nagato Province. Since it is not a shrine [for kami], offerings [from the Department of Divinities (*jingikan* 神祇官)] are not made.
2. Not designating Antoku's death anniversary as an official holiday (*kokki* 国忌), and not including his tomb among the special mausolea (*sanryō* 山陵) of the emperor's close relatives.
3. Not including Antoku's temple among the twenty-two temple-shrine complexes. It does not hold the four festivals nor receive other treatment that the twenty-two temple-shrine complexes regularly receive from the imperial court. Nevertheless, the Department of Divinities should make official offerings (*kanpei* 官幣).

10. Another dream received by Butsugon a few days later showed that Go-Shirakawa's life was prolonged as a result of the rituals performed by Kanezane and the monks, but revealed that calamities would still not cease.

11. This was an unusual case in which two emperors—one in Kyoto and the other in the west—reigned at the same time. As Uwayokote Masataka has argued, this unusual situation was considered one of the causes that brought cosmological and social disorder (UWAYOKOTE 2005, 137–57).

4. Presenting offerings (*heihaku* 幣帛) and the emperor's official prayer (*senmyō* 宣命) at the tomb.

(summary from GY 3 [Kenkyū 2: 1191.intercalary 12.14–29], 768–74)

“A hall” probably refers to the Spirit Hall (*reibyō* 靈廟), which is alternatively called the Portrait Hall (*mieidō* 御影堂), of Amidaji. The rites at the hall were thought to appease the vengeful ghosts and assist the prematurely departed souls to attain salvation. Amidaji, which was named after the salvific Buddha of the Western Paradise and which stood in front of the very site of the battle, assumed major responsibility as a mortuary temple for the placatory and commemorative rituals. Through such rituals, transformation of the malicious ghosts into benign spirits was expected, which would then bring peace to the living and the nation. These rituals played an active role in the protection of the imperial state, and in this sense, spirit pacification was strongly tied to political authority.

Amidaji's placatory rites for Antoku and the Taira were not isolated from other government-sponsored placatory rites designed for different vengeful ghosts who contemporaneously threatened the nation. Daisenbōin 大懺法院,¹² which was intended as the center to placate vengeful ghosts with an emphasis on the rituals to eradicate sins, was built in Kyoto by Jien 慈円 (1155–1225) under imperial patronage.¹³ In a prayer dedicated to Daisenbōin in 1206, for instance, Jien states that the temple was intended to appease wrathful ghosts, especially of those who died in the Hōgen and Genpei Wars. This prayer further states that the placation of the angry spirits and the protection of the imperial state will be realized through the performance of Buddhist rituals at Daisenbōin, where the mutual dependence of the Law of the Sovereign and the Law of the Buddha (*ōbō buppō sōiron* 王法仏法相依論) will be enforced. In order to protect the imperial state, spirit pacification rites for Antoku and the Taira were also conducted in Nara, Mt. Kōya, and Kamakura; yet, Amidaji, located in front of the death site of Antoku and the Taira, was considered the most important site where placatory rites were to be performed in perpetuity for these spirits.

Amidaji sustained its placatory and memorial functions for Antoku and the Taira, and it attracted patrons from Japan's elite—emperors and daimyō—throughout the next six centuries. Its history, however, came to a sudden end when the political situation surrounding imperial rituals underwent a huge change as the emperor restored his authority in the Meiji reformation.

12. For more on Daisenbōin, see AKAMATSU 1957, 267–300; TAGA 1980, 147–69; 296–321.

13. Jien, a younger brother of Kujō Kanezane, had close personal and political connections with the imperial court. He served as *gojisō* 護持僧 (a monk who prayed at the imperial palace for the well-being of the emperor and performed rituals for the imperial family) and the chief abbot of Enryakuji, where many rituals were performed for the protection of the imperial state.

The Meiji Transformation of Buddhist-Shinto Mortuary Sites

In 1868 the newly established Meiji government issued a series of decrees to separate Shinto and Buddhist divinities, officially known as *Shinbutsu hanzen rei* 神仏判然令. The impact of the decrees was immense and threw Buddhist temples into turmoil all over Japan. On the local level, this directive was implemented by suppressing Buddhist temples under the formula *haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈, which literally means abolishing Buddhism and destroying (the teaching of) Shakamuni. The series of the decrees began with the order to defrock *bettō* 別当, as well as *shasō* 社僧, Buddhist priests who performed rituals at shrines (HZ 3 [Meiji 1: 1868.3.28], 77–78). Soon after this first decree, the government banned the usage of Buddhist terms such as *gongen* 権現 (avatar) and *daibosatsu* 大菩薩 (great bodhisattva) to refer to deities, and ordered the removal of all Buddhist images treated as kami bodies, *honjibutsu* 本地仏 (Buddhist origin of kami), bronze bells (*waniguchi* 鰐口 and *bonshō* 梵鐘), and other Buddhist paraphernalia from shrine complexes (HZ 3 [Meiji 1: 1868.4.10], 89–90). Within only two weeks following this decree, the Council of State announced:

It was decreed the other day that if shrines, large and small in all provinces, treat Buddhist images as bodies of kami, display Buddhist images in the shrine fronts on the account of *honji*, or keep bells of different types (*waniguchi* and *bonshō*) and other Buddhist paraphernalia, they should be dislocated from shrine complexes immediately. Nevertheless, since shrine priests and Buddhist monks have long been irreconcilable as if ice and charcoal [oil and water], now that shrine priests have rapidly increased their authority and power, if there is a case in which they speciously claim to be performing the government's will but really are working off their personal grudges, it would not only cause an obstruction to the government, but necessarily result in a public disturbance. Since such an outcome would be truly regrettable, one should consider closely and think tactfully, and, not to mention dealing with things peacefully, one should also take the utmost care to make sure that even Buddhist monks would keep their ways of living and contribute more to the nation. Moreover, as to how to deal with Buddhist images, paraphernalia and the like that have been in shrines, including even those dislocated, one must seek and follow an instruction [from the authorities] regarding each piece. If, from now on, there is violent behavior and the like based on mistaken ideas, they must certainly be punished.

In addition, if an imperially worshiped shrine (*chokusai no jinja* 勅祭之神社) has documents written or tablets dedicated by emperors, it should report them and seek for a decision [by the central government], while other shrines should report details to law courts and local governments.

(*Dajōkan fukokurei* 226 [Keiō 4: 1868.4.10] in HZ 3, 89)

Although the implementation of *haibutsu kishaku* varied depending on each case, this public statement declaring that the removal of Buddhist images and implements should be carried out nonviolently suggests that the government knew *haibutsu kishaku* was accompanied by terrifying “outbursts of violence against Buddhist institutions” (ANTONI 1995, 143).

In 1870, during this turmoil, Amidaji was abolished. In the same year, the government of the newly established Yamaguchi Prefecture ordered that Amidaji be called by the Shinto name, Antoku Tennō-sha 安徳天皇社 (Shrine of Emperor Antoku). As a consequence, the majority of its Buddhist icons and implements were vandalized or ransacked and replaced with Shinto ceremonial ones. All temple buildings except the Spirit Hall and the Hachiman Shrine—the Main Hall, the Goma Hall, the Reception Hall, the living quarters of the monks, the belfry, and the gates—vanished from the complex. Even the Spirit Hall, which was commissioned by an imperial order almost seven centuries before as the most important building in performing rituals for the repose of Antoku’s soul, did not survive long after.¹⁴ When the Spirit Hall was dismantled, the artwork it housed, such as the portraits of Antoku and the Taira members, and the sliding-door paintings depicting Antoku’s life, lost their original place of enshrinement, if not even destroyed. Many surviving pieces were simply moved to storage. Antoku’s wooden statue, which had been venerated in the Spirit Hall at the time of Amidaji, was reinstalled deep within the new shrine’s sanctuary as a kami body (*goshintai* 御神体). Like other places throughout Japan, Amidaji’s Hachiman Daibosatsu (great bodhisattva) was renamed Hachiman shin (kami), as the government prohibited using a Buddhist term to refer to what the government regarded as a Shinto kami.¹⁵

14. It is not documented exactly when the Spirit Hall was dismantled, but it must have been between 1877 and 1882. In 1877, on the one hand, Yamaguchi Prefecture submitted an inquiry to the Home Ministry (*naimushō* 内務省) concerning purchasing land to add to the precincts of Akamagū; to this inquiry was attached a plan of the area containing the precincts, which shows the Spirit Hall. See *Nagato no kuni Akamagū shachi baishū ukagai*, in KR (Meiji 10: 1877.9.?), (Doc. #.2A-010-00-Kō 02064100). On the other hand, a picture of Akamagū’s new complex published in 1882 shows today’s mausoleum of Antoku (its completion ceremony was held in 1883; see page 78 and footnote 42 of this article) at the location where the Spirit Hall had stood.

15. It is obvious that all of the Buddhist works of art and ritual implements were removed from the site in the process of Amidaji’s transformation into Akamagū. For example, *Amidaji jūmotsuchō* 阿弥陀寺什物帳 (Inventory of Amidaji), dated to 1739, lists artwork and ritual implements, as well as ceremonial decorations and furnishings found within each hall. While the 1739 inventory includes many Buddhist statues including Amida, Shakamuni, and bodhisattvas, *Kankoku heisha komonjo hōmotsu mokuroku* 官国弊社古文書宝物目録 (Inventory of official shrines), dated to 1902, does not include any Buddhist items. Both of the inventories are currently preserved in the Yamaguchi Prefectural Archives.

The destruction of Amidaji and the construction of the new shrine were closely related to a larger project that was designed to reinforce and protect the imperial state during the late Edo and early Meiji periods. Chōshū domain, including Nagato Province where Amidaji stood, was a crucial place in the formation of the new Meiji regime. The domain, known as the birthplace of the Meiji restoration, produced many prominent pioneers who actively supported Ōsei Fukko 王政復古 (restoration of imperial rule), a principle that became a core part of the Meiji government. The first Japanese Prime Minister, Itō Hirobumi 伊藤博文 (1841–1909), was among such political elites. Moreover, following an imperial edict to expel all foreign barbarians, Chōshū fired on American, French, and Dutch ships passing through the straits of Shimonoseki into the Inland Sea in 1863. In reprisal, naval forces from four nations (Britain, Holland, France, and America) attacked the port of Shimonoseki in 1864. This bombardment of Shimonoseki, which occurred close to Amidaji, greatly increased the local people's fear of foreign invasions. Around the same time, the Hirata school nativists asserted that divine protection from foreign threats would be assured when kami were worshiped according to the tenets of “pure” Shinto that was not “contaminated” by Buddhism.¹⁶ Approximately forty percent of all Buddhist temples in Yamaguchi Prefecture, into which the Chōshū domain was incorporated, were abolished around the beginning of the Meiji period. In this political climate, people felt compelled to demolish the Buddhist temple of Amidaji and to replace it with a Shinto shrine.¹⁷ Within such a critical time and place, this radical change was justified and a Shinto shrine was considered the most appropriate setting to worship Antoku's soul.

The establishment of Akamagū was incorporated into the milieu in which many shrines were erected under the supervision of the Meiji government. Murakami Shigeyoshi classified the newly established shrines into four categories: 1. shrines dedicated to those who lost their lives in battles leading to the modern imperial state; 2. shrines dedicated to the loyalists of the Southern Court during the Nanbokuchō period; 3. shrines dedicated to emperors and members of the imperial family; and 4. shrines established in Japanese colonies.¹⁸ For this article, the third category, to which Antoku's shrine belongs, will be discussed; in particular, several contemporary shrines dedicated to medieval emperors whose souls were thought to have become vengeful ghosts. Commonalities exist among these emperors who were forced to leave the capital (in most cases, in

16. THAL 2002, 387. I am indebted to Thal's article in which she thoroughly discusses the background and process of separation of Buddha and kami both on national and local levels.

17. I estimated this percentage based on MURATA 1999, 192–99.

18. MURAKAMI 1970, 182, quoted in KURODA 1990, 149–50; KURODA 1996b, 345. I slightly changed Allan Grapard's translation of these categories. Also see OKADA 1966, 4–82.

exile). They died away from the capital, often after failed attempts to reinforce or restore the imperial political power which was threatened or overthrown by the warrior class. Subsequently, when various disasters and misfortunes occurred, it was believed they were caused by the spirits of these emperors, who bore a grudge for their deaths in exile. It was crucial to appease and revere the spirits of these emperors, and even more so when the imperial court was trying to regain political power from the Tokugawa warrior government during the late Edo and early Meiji periods. This was the same goal that was pursued by the medieval emperors who were believed to have become vengeful ghosts.

For example, the defeat of Emperor Sutoku in the Hōgen War (1156) was considered to be the first of key events that triggered the decline of imperial political authority. The process of the military government usurping power from the emperor in the Kamakura period was thought to have originated in the Hōgen War. Emperor Sutoku died in exile in Sanuki Province (present-day Kagawa). Shortly after his death, various calamities occurred and they were attributed to the curse of Sutoku. He was feared as a vengeful spirit around the same period as Emperor Antoku was. Indeed, in 1191, Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa, in the hope of recovering from a grave illness that he was suffering from, ordered that Spirit Halls (Portrait Halls) be built in death places for both Sutoku and Antoku because he feared that their malicious spirits haunted him (GY 3 (Kenkyū 2: 1191.intercalary 12.22), 769–774; *Shiromineji engi* in SGR 19, 276). Similar to Antoku's temple, the Spirit Hall at Sutoku's temple complex Tonshōji 頓証寺 in Sanuki Province was abolished in 1868. In the same year, the construction of Shiraminegū 白峯宮 was completed in Kyoto, and Sutoku's soul was ritually transferred from the Spirit Hall in Sanuki to Shiraminegū in Kyoto.¹⁹ Moreover, the spirits of Emperors Go-Toba, Tsuchimikado 土御門 (r.1198–1210; 1196–1231), and Juntoku 順徳 (r.1210–1221; 1197–1242) were relocated from their places of exile and death (Oki, Awa, and Sado Provinces, respectively) to Minasegū 水無瀬宮 in Osaka.²⁰ These three emperors were exiled after the Jōkyū War in 1221. Go-Toba died in exile in 1239, and his Spirit Hall (Portrait Hall) was constructed in the Minase Villa, which he had originally built. In 1873, the Spirit Hall in the Minase Villa was converted into a Shinto shrine called Minasegū, in which Go-Toba's spirit was re-enshrined along with the spirits of his sons Tsuchimikado

19. For the process of the transfer of Sutoku's soul to Kyoto, see YAMADA 1999, 1–29.

20. OKADA 1966, 59–70. It is interesting to note that the ashes of these three emperors had been transported to the mortuary facilities in Kyoto after their deaths in the early Kamakura period. Go-Toba's ashes were deposited beneath the thirteen-story stupa in Ōhara, Juntoku's ashes were buried in an earthen mound in Ōhara, and Tsuchimikado's ashes were buried in an octagonal-shaped mound in Kanegahara in Kyoto. The Meiji government's decision to transfer the spirits of the three emperors from their mortuary temples rather than from their tombs suggests that their spirits were thought to have remained in their mortuary temples.

and Juntoku. The souls of these emperors, who had died in exile, were ceremonially relocated from Buddhist temples to the new Shinto shrine (YASUMARU 1979, 62–63). Although the Spirit Halls of both Tōnshoji and Minasegū were not destroyed, Buddhist ritual paraphernalia were removed from them.

The case of Emperor Antoku is curiously exceptional and rather radical. In 1873 the Imperial Bureau of Ritual (*shikiburyō* 式部寮) submitted to the Ministry of Religion (*kyōbushō* 教部省) an inquiry regarding the repatriation of imperial spirits and a proposal of repatriating the spirits of Emperors Junnin 淳仁 (aka. the Deposed Emperor of Awaji) and Antoku following the cases of Emperors Go-Toba, Juntoku, and Tsuchimikado.²¹ The proposal was, however, revised so that Antoku's spirit should remain in Shimonoseki and festive rites for him should be performed there since his death in battle was different from other emperors who died in exile, and his burial site was not certain.²² In 1874, the document concerning the transfer of Antoku's spirit was resubmitted to the government from officials dispatched to investigate Antoku's Spirit Hall. It reports:

It requires no discussion that “a hall” in Nagato Province as mentioned in the document cited above [*Gyokuyō*] is today's Spirit Hall (*mieidō* or Portrait Hall) of Amidaji. Even though the document says it is unknown what happened to the former emperor, that he drowned himself is made evident in *Azuma kagami*, *Hyakurenshō*, and the Nagato-version of *Heike monogatari*, and so on.... During the reign of Emperor Go-Toba, to pray for the salvation of the former emperor's soul, he ordered the provincial proprietor to build [the temple]. The fact that the temple's re-founder of that time, Mei-Amida Butsu (Meia), was a daughter of the wet nurse of Kenreimon'in is found in old documents that include imperial edicts and directives from the provincial governors, and other papers since the time of Emperor Tsuchimikado. Nevertheless, even though the temple's account says the Spirit Hall was built above the tomb, it is said that this story does not seem to have a reliable historical source, which is quite right and should be accepted. Since it is obvious in the first place that Amidaji originated as above and is not an imperial mausoleum, I should humbly say that it would truly be an enterprise of the Reformation to now change this Spirit Hall into a shrine and to perform festival rites. I must add my belief regarding the status of the shrine that, following the example of Shiraminegū, it should be given the title *gū* and ranked with *kansha* (official shrine). Meanwhile, the name Shizan Jinja 紫山神社 as proposed in the appeal from the prefectural office appears to be named after the area around Amidaji. Nonetheless, the general public calls the area Akama-ga-seki, and therefore, in order for the

21. The following information on the inquiries is derived in large part from NAKAMURA 2006, 110–16.

22. *Antoku tennō gokansentō no gi ni tsuki ukagai*, in KR (Meiji 7: 1874.1.?), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Kō 1456100).

public to recognize it easily, I humbly implore your further discussion as to whether the shrine should rather be called Akamagū.²³

This report admits that the origin of Amidaji's Spirit Hall is verified by historical documents, but denies that the burial site of Antoku's corpse is confirmed, doubting that his body is interred below the Spirit Hall. In making this comment, the dispatched officials proposed that the Spirit Hall should be converted into a shrine to conduct festive rites, be ranked with official shrines following the case of Emperor Sutoku's Shiraminegū, and be renamed after the area Akamaga-seki where it is located.

In response to the report, Shishido Tamaki 宍戸璣 (1829–1901) in the Ministry of Religion (*kyōbushō* 教部省) put a petition to the Minister of Grand Council, Sanjō Sanetomi 三条実美 (1837–1891):

Regarding the issue of the repatriation, and so on, of Emperor Antoku

As to Emperor Antoku, although his place of death was unclear, it was certain that long ago the imperial court built a hall on the site of Amidaji in Nagato Province to appease the emperor's soul. Also, Yamaguchi Prefecture had made another appeal. These were why we made an inquiry last July as in the first attached document, and then the order was issued as in the red document; later the officials inspecting imperial mausolea returned to the capital and reported as in the second attached document. Nevertheless, whereas the rites of repatriation were made one after another for Emperor Junnin and three other emperors, Emperor Antoku alone is yet to have such a rite made for him, with only a consultation made last year regarding his repatriation. Since I humbly believe this is regrettable, I hope that you immediately order a rite to repatriate him and include him into Shiraminegū, or that if there is a reason this rite cannot be made, you declare the current Spirit Hall (Mieidō) to be *kansha* as suggested by the officials of mausolea. Therefore, attaching the other documents, I inquire about this issue.²⁴

Within a week after the submission of the document above, the Ministry of Religion sent a further inquiry:

Regarding your decision whether to order to make a rite to repatriate the sacred soul of Emperor Antoku and to include him into Shiraminegū, or whether to designate the current Spirit Hall (Mieidō) as *kanpeisha*, we have considered as follows. In his time, the circumstances of the emperor's death already lacked

23. *Antoku tennō gokansentō no gi ni tsuki ukagai*, in KR (Meiji 7: 1874.1?), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Kō 1456100).

24. *Antoku tennō gokansentō no gi ni tsuki ukagai*, in KR (Meiji 7: 1874.2.8), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Kō 1456100).

positive evidence, and it was simply decided that he had drowned himself in the western sea. Upon his sacred consideration, Emperor Go-Toba built a hall in that place and held a memorial service. There should naturally be a huge difference between these circumstances and those for Emperors Junnin and Sutoku and the three emperors of Jōkyū, for whom rites of repatriation were made in order to solace their resentment and anguish for centuries. Since the Ministry of Religion has already failed to settle this issue and sought decision from you, it seems more proper, following the proposal of the inspectors of imperial mausolea at the ministry after all, to give the title of *gū* to the Spirit Hall of former Amidaji, currently the shrine of the emperor, and to grant it with the middle rank of imperial shrine (*kanpei chūsha* 官幣中社), according to the precedent of Shiraminegū. Therefore I inquire for your draft of instruction.²⁵

All of these documents indicate the government officials' attempts to seek precedents that Antoku's special case could then follow. Finally, the Grand Council of State (*dajōkan* 太政官) decided in 1875 that Antoku's shrine should be renamed Akamagū (Shrine of Akama) after the local area where it was erected—and given the middle rank of imperial shrine, and that Antoku's spirit should stay in Shimonoseki, giving two reasons: one, that Antoku's death was different from other emperors who died in exile; and the other, that his burial site was not certain.²⁶ This second point, which will be discussed later, means that the government was not certain that the Amidaji site was Antoku's burial site, even though the government was to officially designate it as Antoku's mausoleum later in 1889. Notwithstanding the exceptional fact that Antoku's spirit was not transferred from Amidaji to Kyoto, the re-enshrinement of his spirit in the Shinto shrine newly built at the site where Amidaji had stood was another example of the state-sponsored enshrinement of spirits.

As KURODA Toshio (1996b, 346) has claimed, the souls enshrined in all of these shrines newly established in the early Meiji period were expected to bring peace to the imperial state. They were new examples of Shinto shrines playing an important political role in the consolidation of the government. From an early age, religion and politics were intimately related, and religious rituals played a vital role in state ideologies. It was crucial for the reigning emperor to exercise his control over both this visible world and the invisible world of spirits through the aid of religion. When Buddhism was introduced to Japan in the sixth century, Buddhist rituals began to dominate the religious part, commonly known as the mutual dependence of the Law of the Sovereign and the

25. *Antoku tennō gokansentō no gi ni tsuki ukagai*, in KR (Meiji 7: 1874.2.25), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Kō 1456100).

26. *Antoku tennō Nagato no kuni Amidaji Akamagū to kaishō kanpei chūsha ni ressu*, in DR 2 (Meiji 8: 1875.10.7), (Doc. #.2A-009-Da 0047100-016).

Law of the Buddha. As already discussed, this emphasis on mutual dependence was reflected in the Buddhist pacification rites for the vengeful ghosts in medieval times. In the Meiji period, however, Shinto rituals replaced Buddhist ones in state ideologies.²⁷ The Meiji regime leaders claimed that the placation of the angry spirits and the protection of the imperial state would be realized through the performance of Shinto rituals at the newly established shrines. The spirits of the medieval emperors, as noted above, were reconstructed both as vengeful ghosts that might harm the imperial state and as benevolent deities that would, it was hoped, protect the nation.²⁸

As in other temples throughout the nation, Amidaji's Buddhist monks were defrocked and forced to enter the shrine priesthood. The last head priest, Zuisen 瑞泉 (b.d. unknown), was compelled to return to lay life and change his name to Ōji Akira 大司明. Although he became the first Shinto head priest of the new shrine, he was dismissed in 1871 shortly after his appointment, and the shrine lacked a head priest from 1871 until 1877, when well-to-do local nativist Shiraiishi Shōchirō 白石正一郎 (1812–1880) was appointed as the second head priest. Shiraiishi was also known as an active supporter of *kiheitai* 奇兵隊, one of the volunteer militias that led to the Meiji Restoration.²⁹ The new priest was expected to accelerate the eradication of the Buddhist presence from within the complex.

Whereas the idea that they could clearly label and sharply separate Buddhist objects from Shinto ones was dubious, the actual process of such labeling was inconsistent at both the local and national levels. Locally, the inconsistency was reflected in how they dealt with the stone mortuary monuments erected on the grounds of Amidaji. For example, Antoku's *gorintō* 五輪塔 (gravestone

27. As Nitta Hitoshi has pointed out by quoting the head priest of Ise Jingū Tanaka Yoritsune's 田中頼庸 (1836–1897) petition to the Ministry of Religion regarding the proximity between state and religion, Shinto was not interpreted in exactly the same way as other religions, namely, Buddhism and Christianity, were (NITTA 2000, 256–57). It is true that Shinto was regarded partly as a religion; it was expected to serve as a political and spiritual force that aided the Meiji government to enhance imperial authority and to unify the Japanese people, in the same way other religions do. Yet it is important to note also that, at the same time, the vast majority of Meiji bureaucrats and Shintoists viewed Shinto as a nonreligion; they emphasized the connection of the state with rituals, rather than with a religion. Against this historical background, the replacement of Buddhist roles with Shinto ones in state ideologies was not a simple shift from one to the other, but it involved the Meiji redefinition of Shinto shaped by state policy.

28. This was stated in many sources by active nativists at that time. Naka Zuiunsai 中瑞雲齋 (1807–1871), for example, asserted that Sutoku's spirit would protect and support the imperial court if his spirit was venerated. He said that in order to gain favourable protection from Sutoku's spirit, which could harm the living and the state, it should be transferred from Sanuki Province to Kyoto (YAMADA 1999, 5–8).

29. *Kiheitai* was first organized in 1863 at Shiraiishi's house, and then soon housed in the temple complex of Amidaji.

monument in the shape of a five-story stupa), above which had been an altar on which Antoku's wooden statue had stood before the Meiji persecution, was buried in an earthen mound; however, many *gorintō*, which had been made originally in the medieval period and collected and erected behind the Taira steles later in the Edo period, were left intact. The treatment of the stone steles of the Taira members and Amidaji's successive head priests was also different from other cases. The surface of each stone stele was chiselled with a Sanskrit seed syllable for a Buddha or a bodhisattva and the name of the deceased; thus the stones obviously functioned as Buddhist mortuary monuments. Nonetheless, the fourteen steles of the Taira members, who all died in the Battle of Dannoura, remained unmoved and unchanged. Later, the government ordered the new shrine to preserve these Taira steles along with the mausoleum of Antoku (MT 7 [Meiji 22: 1889.6.3], 279–80). Incoherently, the stone steles of head priests, similar to those of the Taira, were removed and buried in the ground.³⁰ These decisions over what to and what not to remove or destroy seem to have been made to serve the goals of local people and of authorities, namely, to reestablish Amidaji as a shrine. As will be discussed later, it seems that the new shrine needed to preserve some Buddhist elements, including the stone steles of the Taira, in order to be officially designated as Antoku's mausoleum, proclaiming its prime function as an imperial mortuary site. The Buddhist monuments that had survived were, except for a few, either removed or concealed from view. Through this process, the place where Antoku's spirit had been memorialized and venerated was altered from a Buddhist temple to a Shinto shrine, and the rituals at the new shrine were subsequently entrusted to Shinto priests.

*Changes in the Rituals for the Death Anniversary Ceremony
for Emperor Antoku after the Meiji Restoration*

In Shinto shrines replacing Buddhist temples, Shinto priests performed rituals in accordance with guidelines for rites newly prescribed by the government, and they purged all Buddhist presence from the rituals. The adoption and performance of new Shinto rituals were encouraged by the government through the funding distributed to all national shrines from 1874 (HZ 9 [Meiji 7: 1874.9.3], 97–100). Akamagū, granted the middle rank of imperial shrine in the following year, was among those shrines, and received a fixed amount of financial resources annually to conduct Shinto rites.³¹ All observances that had been held

30. During the construction of the Shunpanrō 春帆楼 Inn, these gravestones of the head priests were unearthed. Today they are erected in the small lot outside the shrine complex.

31. See, for example, *Akamagū keihigaku o sadamu*, in KR (Meiji 8: 1875.12.28), (Doc. #.2A-010-00-Kō 02012100-035). More records of this financial support can be found in Yamaguchi Prefectural Archives.

at Amidaji were abolished except *jōrō sankei* 上臈參詣 (the visit of *jōrō*), one of the most important rituals to commemorate the anniversary of the death of Antoku. To explore why only this ritual continued to be performed among preexisting ones, I will investigate the changes in the form of the rituals on the anniversary of Antoku's death before and after the temple was converted into a Shinto shrine during the Meiji period. Some of the extant aspects of the *jōrō sankei* were maintained, while others were abandoned, and some new aspects were innovated; decisions behind this mixture of continuity and innovation reflected the religious and political roles that the local and central authorities wanted the Shrine to play, so as to serve the former's goal of gaining recognition of the prominence of the new shrine, and the latter's of embedding the shrine into the wider system of Kokka Shinto.

Before the Meiji period, the former temple Amidaji primarily conducted Buddhist rituals at the death anniversary called *sentei-e* 先帝会, which literally means "ceremony for the previous emperor."³² The death anniversary rites for Antoku were first performed under the commission of Emperor Go-Toba, who took the throne immediately after Antoku. During the death anniversary ceremony, various rituals were performed for seventeen consecutive days, starting from the day before the anniversary of Antoku's death. Typical memorial ceremonies, such as *shōgon* 莊嚴 (adornment of the sanctuary), *kuyō* 供養 (offerings of incense, food, flowers, and light to the deceased), and *dokyō* 読経 (recitation of Buddhist sutras) probably took place in the Spirit Hall, which had a room where portraits of Antoku and the Taira clan members were enshrined. Next to this room, the *etoki* 絵解き (picture-explaining) was performed, probably during the death anniversary, of the sliding-door paintings that depicted the life of Antoku as well as scenes from the Genpei War.

Amidaji's monks also conducted *nagare kanjō* 流灌頂 (the flowing water ritual). Esoteric magical spells or the name of Amida Buddha were inscribed on wooden tablets in the shape of *gorintō*, and then these tablets were set afloat on the sea. Because Antoku and the Taira warriors drowned themselves, their souls, unable to attain salvation, were believed to wander in a liminal state between this world and the next. Releasing the wooden tablets to the sea was considered effective in transmitting spiritual merit to the souls of those who died in drowning, which is why this ritual was essential for the souls of Antoku and the Taira to be reborn in the Western Paradise.

The most climactic part of the death anniversary was *jōrō sankei* (the visit of *jōrō*), which is said to have originated late in the twelfth century.³³ The term

32. The following information about the rituals conducted on the death anniversary for Antoku is based upon *Akamagaseki Amidaji raiyu oboe* (1739) in BJK 7, 382–87.

33. The *jōrō sankei*, also called *jōrō kanjo sankei* 上臈官女參詣, is not listed in *Amidaji raiyu oboe*. Information about the *jōrō sankei* is derived from several accounts of travelers in the Edo

jōrō 上臈 referred to the highest ranking ladies-in-waiting who looked after the emperor's daily needs at the imperial court during the Heian period. In memorial rites for a recently deceased emperor, a major role of these court ladies was to serve the deceased sovereign the same way they had when he had been alive. This role was all the more important in the case of the child emperor Antoku because of the ladies' close relationship with him since his birth. Amidaji's identification as a mortuary site in the late twelfth century was indeed associated with women's crucial roles in the death ceremonies. As introduced earlier, a historical reference says that Nun Meia was dispatched from Kyoto to the site of Amidaji in 1186 in order to revive the temple and to perform memorial rites for Antoku. Other documents confirm her and other nuns' active engagement in the ritual and temple management in the early stages of Amidaji's development as a mortuary temple (for example, see *Nagato kokusen* (1238) in AJM, 16–17; *Kantō gechijō* (1238) in AJM, 20–21).

After the Battle of Dannoura, which took place on the sea just in front of Amidaji's site in Akama-ga-seki, many of the Taira court ladies were captured and transported to Kyoto, but tradition says that others stayed in Akama-ga-seki and sold flowers to sailors and travelers who lodged at the port, hinting at the possibility that they turned to prostitution to make a living. These women cleansed themselves and dressed in court robes in order to visit Amidaji, where they offered water, flowers, and incense to the spirits of the dead and prayed for their repose on the death anniversary of Antoku and the Taira warriors. These Taira women started to visit Amidaji in the form of a procession, although it is not certain why and when. The precise number and order of these female processions during Amidaji's existence are unknown due to the lack of documentation.³⁴

The use of the term *jōrō* needs further attention: as explained above, it generally referred to the highest ranking ladies-in-waiting at the imperial court in the Heian and Kamakura periods, when memorial rites for Antoku were initiated; yet later in the Edo period, when the procession seems to have been revived, the term referred to courtesans of a higher rank who normally “would not have offered sex indiscriminately” (GOODWIN 2007, 3). By the Edo period, Akama-ga-seki had become a busy port where great numbers of courtesans conducted their business, and it is said that when the line descending from

period. For example, see *Saiyū zakki* in NSS 2 (Tenmei 3: 1783.4.27), 335; *Shokoku zue nenjū gyōji taisai* (Kyōwa 3: 1803), 221, 226; and *Nihon kyūhō shugyō nikki* in NSS 2 (Bunka 9: 1812.11.10), 47–48.

34. One of the early-nineteenth-century travel journals says that each brothel dispatched ten courtesans in *jōrō* costumes to Antoku's death anniversary rites. Many brothels conducted business in the district of Inari near Amidaji, which suggests that a number of women participated in the ritual procession. For the travel account, see *Satsuyō ōhen kiji* in NSS 2 (Tenpō 3: 1832.4.28), 655.

the Taira ladies became extinct, local courtesans took over the procession at Antoku's death anniversary.³⁵

After the governmental decree of separation of Shinto and Buddhist divinities, the new shrine needed to "purify" the death anniversary ritual from all Buddhist elements even though Buddhism and Shinto had intertwined in complex ways over centuries. To purify religious syncretism, the shrine reintroduced select Shinto elements that had originally been incorporated into Buddhism, and redefined its death anniversary rites. In addition, it included supposedly Shinto rituals. An official report submitted by the head priest of Akamagū to the central government in 1918 includes a brief description of *jōrō sankei* (*Tokushu shinji genkyō hōkoku*). By comparing this document with the list of rituals performed before the Reformation, we can recover how the shrine changed its rituals. The shrine had completely eliminated the Buddhist mortuary rituals such as the recitation of Buddhist sutras and the flowing water ritual. The *etoki* performance was also abandoned, since the building where the sliding-door paintings had been displayed was dismantled.

The shrine, however, decided to carry on the procession of *jōrō*, albeit in a slightly altered fashion. For example, instead of offering incense before the wooden statue of Antoku in the Spirit Hall, the *jōrō* dedicated a sacred twig at the worship hall, toward the statue that was hidden deep in the new main hall. The number and order of female participants in the procession varied after the establishment of Akamagū, although it is uncertain what aspects were inherited or altered from the traditional procession that Amidaji had conducted. As recorded in the shrine report of 1918, twenty-two women formed a procession that made its way from the local brothel district of Inari to the shrine. The procession order was four *keigo* 警固 (guards), five *jōrō*, four *jijo* 侍女 (female attendants), five *kanjo* 官女 (court ladies), and again four *jijo*. The order and number of participants changed when the procession entered the shrine precinct, and the new procession consisted of twenty women: five *kanjo* and five *jōrō*, each of whom was accompanied by *jijo*.³⁶ These women were led by a member of the

35. *Tokushu shinji genkyō hōkoku*. in *Akama Jingū shi*. Yamaguchiken Monjokan (Doc. #.ken-shi hensanjo shiryō 1609); MIZUNO 1985, 46. One may wonder how Amidaji could allow the local courtesans, whose occupation itself might have defiled its sacred ground, to play a major role in the death anniversary. As scholars have argued, however, sexual entertainment was considered as an act of sacrality rather than pollution in premodern Japan. Moreover, the shift from the Taira descendants to the local courtesans in the ritual procession might have been made without difficulty due to the former's possible association with the sex trade, as noted above. Janet Goodwin has closely examined issues of purity and defilement related to the sex trade; see GOODWIN 2007, 84–119.

36. Later, perhaps in the mid-twentieth century, the procession became more elaborate; it consisted of twenty-five, or more precisely, five groups of five females each consisting of a *chigo* 稚兒 (girl), a *keigo*, a *kanjo*, a *kamuro* 禿 (child attendant), and a *jōrō*. *Kanjo*, the most important figure, was positioned in the middle of the procession and protected by the other females. This processional style of twenty-five women is continued by the current shrine.

Nakajima family, whose ancestor Masanobu was said to have recovered Antoku's remains from the sea and buried them in the complex of Amidaji.

On the day after the visit of *jōrō*, moreover, the shrine incorporated other new rituals. Among them was the *gojinkōsai* 御神幸祭, a ritual procession of a sacred palanquin or *mikoshi* 神輿. Following a performance of dance and music (*kagura* 神楽), a sacred palanquin, in which Antoku's soul was temporarily enshrined, was pulled by an ox cart on a round trip from Akamagū to a temporary shrine (*otabisho* 御旅所) built on the site where Antoku's body is said to have been recovered from the ocean. The ox-driven cart was accompanied by priests in archaic ceremonial robes, forming a solemn procession. High-ranking priests rode on horses, while lower-ranked priests and other participants carried offerings, banners, and lanterns. The performance of dance and music, as well as the transportation of sacred palanquins, had not been considered exclusive to Shinto rituals before the edict of the separation of Shinto and Buddhism; ritual specialists in the Meiji government, however, defined these rites as belonging to Shinto. The guidelines for shrine rites prescribed by the government encouraged Akamagū to adopt these, now identified as ancient Shinto-style rituals, for the death anniversary of Antoku.

On a national level, the date of Antoku's death, together with all the successive emperors' death anniversaries, were marked on the imperial ritual calendar during the early Meiji period. By imperial order, local officers were dispatched to the mausoleum on the centennial anniversaries of the death of each emperor from Suizei 綏靖 (r.c.581–c.549 BCE; c.623–c.549 BCE) to Go-Sakuramachi 後桜町 (r.1762–1771; 1740–1813); it is, however, unlikely that Antoku's mausoleum was visited by local officers on his seven hundredth anniversary in 1885 since his mausoleum was not yet designated by the government at this point. At the imperial palace, all ancestral spirits of emperors along with Amaterasu and the legendary kami (kami in the Plain of High Heaven and kami descending from the Plain to the land) received rituals on the vernal and autumnal equinoxes (SAKAMOTO 1968, 235–45). As Takeda Hideaki's research has shown, historical texts indicate that, prior to the Meiji period, Shinto-form rituals were performed mostly for kami but not necessarily for the successive imperial ancestors. After 1870, however, it became a principle under the guidance of the Meiji government that all of the imperial spirit rituals be performed exclusively in a Shinto fashion (TAKEDA 2004, 1–36).

Akamagū generally followed this governmental guidance on rituals; yet the shrine did not eradicate the visit of *jōrō*, despite its absence in the standardized protocols for Shinto rites. Why? There seems to have been three major reasons. First, technically, a procession of *jōrō* was not a Buddhist ritual per se. The way these women made offerings, however, had been in the Buddhist tradition. It was those rituals that were changed. Such minor changes—replacement of the

Buddhist elements by Shinto ones—were not difficult. Secondly, the priests of Akamagū recognized the economic benefits, for the procession of *jōrō* had already acquired the character of a popular festive rite even in pre-Meiji times.³⁷ Such a festive rite was an effective way to collect financial resources directly from the common people. Indeed, this reason was explicitly stated in the official report of 1918 (*Tokushu shinji genkyō hōkoku*). Third, there were political implications behind the continuation of the visit of *jōrō*. The procession was initially sponsored and participated in by the priests of the shrine, as well as by local people. A large number of spectators who came from the local area and from the neighboring districts were also an important component of the procession ritual. Through the ritual, the shrine could propagate the ideology that helped to bolster the legitimacy of the Meiji regime, for the participants and spectators were involved in the national political community by directly or indirectly worshipping the spirit of Antoku, who was among the successive list of emperors that could be traced down to the reigning emperor. The *jōrō* performance may have been designed to link the emperor with the general populace as well as to promote the concept of an unbroken imperial line, which created or reinforced a sense of unity among the Japanese people under the emperor. Responding to economic and political needs, Akamagū sought to continue the visit of *jōrō*, albeit in a modified fashion for its institutional survival.

Designation of Akamagū as Antoku's Mausoleum

Local and central authorities brought back to Antoku's new shrine the religious and political importance that Amidaji had once had, and this was enhanced not only through the shrine's radical break with Buddhism in its institutional, architectural, and ritual settings but also through the restoration of Antoku's tomb by Akamagū, which later led to its official designation by the Meiji government as an imperial mausoleum. The designation was, however, a difficult task since Antoku was among many emperors whose actual tombs cannot be proven with conclusive evidence. Nonetheless, the government officially announced the designation of Amidaji's site as his mausoleum, which promised the survival of Akamagū, where Antoku's spirit was then memorialized. This designation was motivated by political concerns and it raised some issues in relation to the government's perception of imperial mausolea at that time. For example, in order to cope with the long-standing problem of pollution associated with imperial mausolea, the government redefined imperial mausolea as sites suitable for performing rituals for the spirits of the deceased emperors, which would help refashion

37. See Nagasaki kōeki nikki (Meiwa 4: 1767.10.27), in *Nihon kikōbun shūsei* 1, 248; *Shokoku zue nenjū gyōji taisei* (1806), 221, 226.

the emperor as a divine presence free from contamination. The designation of Antoku's mausoleum cannot be considered in isolation from this critical historical moment.

To examine the process of the designation of Antoku's tomb, it is necessary to have a general understanding of the treatment of the imperial mausolea before the Meiji period, for that designation was a continuation of the program of surveys and repairs of the mausolea of both mythical and historical emperors initiated by the *bakufu* in the Edo period. From ancient times, the construction of imperial mausolea was closely linked to the political dimensions of Japanese society. Where, when, how, and with what the deceased rulers should be buried and what ritual activities should be held to commemorate them were carefully determined to assure that the dead would attain felicity in the next world and that the successor who played a central role in ancestral worship would legitimize his authority in this world. Under the *ritsuryō* system, the rituals at, and maintenance of, imperial mausolea were entrusted to the stewardship of the government. Tomb keepers were stationed there and imperial messengers were dispatched to make offerings to the spirits of imperial ancestors at the burial sites. Each emperor's court chose seven emperors and three mothers of emperors as important in ensuring the Tenji line leading to the current emperor, and took special care of their ten mausolea. Nevertheless, by the end of the Heian period, the collapse of the *ritsuryō* system and the emperors' adoption of Buddhist mortuary customs and facilities gradually diminished the importance of rituals at the imperial mausolea. As the imperial funeral rites came to be performed by Buddhist monks and imperial graves came to be constructed within Buddhist complexes, the connection between the imperial court and the imperial mausolea waned. Even the systematized rituals at the ten important mausolea were abolished in the Muromachi period (FUJIKI 1976, 60). This abolition may have been related to the increasing negligence of the duty by *nosaki no tsukai* 荷前使, envoys who offered first harvest to the spirits of the important shrines and tombs (TOIKE 1997, 301–308). As a result, centuries later, ancient imperial mausolea had fallen into a state of disrepair and their occupants had been forgotten.

It was not until the late Edo period that the restoration of rituals at imperial mausolea regained national concern and the immediate identification of the locations of all the imperial tombs was urged. Identifying and restoring the imperial mausolea and placing them in the official imperial genealogy starting with Jinmu, the legendary founder of Japan, were meant to reinforce the notion of an unbroken imperial line. Emphasis focused on the worship of Jinmu, who had seized not only sovereignty but also military command, in part because he could become a symbolic model for a reigning emperor. These projects helped emperors present themselves as being superior to shoguns of the *bakufu* as well as, in the case of Emperor Meiji 明治 (r.1867–1912; 1852–1912), being equal to monarchs

of the great powers in the West. The ancestral worship of the imperial family was restored as the core of a series of rituals conducted at the national level, and the way that the reigning emperor showed filial piety to his ancestors became a model for Japanese people to follow. Such a case is represented in periodic ceremonies at the palace for the spirits of all successive emperors on the vernal and autumnal equinoxes in which the emperor took the role of officiant priest.

As a notable example, Gamō Kunpei 蒲生君平 (1768–1813) from Utsunomiya domain made numerous field trips to survey imperial tombs during the Kansei era (1789–1801).³⁸ His survey report, which examines more than one hundred imperial tombs mostly in the Kansai area, resulted in a publication entitled *Sanryōshi* 山陵志 in 1808. This report later served as the basis for the proposal to restore the mausolea that the domain submitted to the *bakufu* in the Bunkū era (1861–1864). As a result of the *bakufu*'s approval for this proposal, Utsunomiya domain appointed its retainer, Toda Tadayuki 戸田忠至 (1809–1883), as the chief officer of imperial mausolea to conduct the surveys and repairs of imperial tombs. Toda and his colleagues, including Tanimori Yoshiomi 谷森善臣 (1817–1911) and painter Okamoto Tōri 岡本桃里 (1806–1885), surveyed imperial mausolea and submitted two volumes of *Bunkū sanryō zu* 文久山陵図 (Illustration of mausolea of the Bunkū era) to both the *bakufu* and the imperial court in 1867. The volumes comprised illustrations of imperial mausolea before and after the repairs and showed their dramatic changes due to the repairs. In each mausoleum was set up a worship place consisting of a *torii* gateway, a pair of stone lanterns, fences, and raised ground of white pebbles for imperial messengers to perform rituals on. A stele was also erected at each worship place and the designated tomb occupant's name was chiseled into it. At the time of the Bunkū repairs, however, the locations of the tombs of fourteen emperors—including Antoku—remained undetermined (TAKEDA 1996, 162).

Historical references and legends surrounding Antoku's death and the subsequent treatment of his body contradict each other. The earliest account of his death is found in the diary of Kujō Kanezane. An entry, just ten days after the Battle of Dannoura, records that it was not certain what happened to Emperor Antoku (GY 3 [Genryaku 2: 1185.4.4], 72). The Kamakura official chronicle, *Azuma kagami*, describes how Antoku died, but does not mention that his body was recovered from the ocean (*Azuma kagami* [Bunji 1: 1185.3.24], 143).

Among the most popular legends, the one the current shrine adopts says that after Antoku jumped into the sea during the Battle of Dannoura, his body was recovered from the ocean and buried at the site of the former temple complex of Amidaji (*Tokushu shinji genkyō hōkoku*). The tradition that was passed on at

38. For English sources on issues of the surveys and repairs in the late Edo period, see EDWARDS 2000, 377; GILDAY 2000, 284–85.

Amidaji reports that Antoku's body was caught by a net of a local fisherman named Nakajima Shirō-daifu Masanori 中島四郎大夫正則 (whose descendants fill a role in leading the procession of *jōrō* at Antoku's death anniversary), and that he buried the corpse at the foot of Mt. Benishi, where Amidaji stood. It goes on to say that Antoku's remains were interred underneath a *gorintō* above which, as mentioned earlier, the statue of Antoku was to be placed. Another legend tells a different story: Antoku's body was caught in a net of another fisherman and placed in a coffin. The coffin was transported toward Akama-ga-seki, but when it reached a place called Toyora, it suddenly stopped. Although those carrying the coffin tried to move on, it would not move any further, so the body was buried there.³⁹ Other legends say Antoku did not die at the Battle of Dannoura, but that he escaped and died much later somewhere else. According to a recent publication, forty-six sites are said to be associated either with Antoku's burial site or with his refuge.⁴⁰ These purported sites are scattered all over Japan (from Aomori Prefecture in the north to Okinawa Prefecture to the south).⁴¹

Under governmental order, investigations of candidates for Antoku's burial sites, including Amidaji, were conducted several times from 1872 on. As shown in the *Kanpei chūsha Akamagū ryakuzu* 官幣中社赤間宮略図 (Sketch of Akamagū; see FIGURE 1), which is dated to 1882, Akamagū constructed a hemispherical earthen mound in the area where the wooden statue of Antoku had been placed on the altar in the Spirit Hall. This was constructed as Antoku's mausoleum; a fence surrounded it, and an evergreen tree was planted on the mound. In 1883, this construction was completed, and Akamagū held a ceremony to celebrate the completion.⁴²

39. For the legend, see *Antoku tennō goryō to shōshi sōrō jisho hozon no gi ni tsuki ukagai*, in KR (Meiji 16: 1883.3.23), (Doc. #.2A-010-00-Ko 03612100-006). The *Kyōhō nenkan sanryō shi* 1716-1736 (Record of imperial mausolea during the Kyōhō era: 1716-1736) presents the Toyora site as Antoku's mausoleum partly because Edo period scholars relied largely upon local legends in designating the tomb occupants. *Kyōhō nenkan sanryō shi*, Kokkai Toshokan (Doc. #.140-145), 84; MT 7 (Meiji 16: 1883.3.23), 27.

40. ZENKOKU HEIKE KAI 2005. The entire book introduces places associated with Antoku's burial site and refuge.

41. In March of 1883, Tokudaiji Sanetsune 徳大寺実則 (1840-1919), the Chief Administrator of the Imperial Household (*kunaikyō* 宮内卿), submitted an inquiry "Antoku tennō goryō to shōshi sōrō jisho hozon no gi ni tsuki ukagai" (An inquiry concerning the preservation of places alleged to be Emperor Antoku's mausoleum) to the Minister of Grand Council Sanjō Sanetomi. In this inquiry, mentioning that many places had legends holding them to be Antoku's mausolea, but that it was difficult to decide with evidence which of these places was the true mausoleum, Sanetsune requested the government put under his ministry's control the land of three of such places, including the Toyora site, in order to keep it from becoming wasteland or cultivated land, and to prevent legends from becoming lost. Accordingly, in December, the Meiji government purchased the land of these places.

42. This was two years before 1885, the seven hundredth anniversary of Antoku's death; it is likely that Akamagū had planned to complete the construction by this anniversary. Despite



FIGURE 1. *Kanpei chūsha Akamagū ryakuzu*
(Shimonoseki Shiritsu Chōfu Hakubutsukan).

The construction of Antoku's mausoleum and the performance of rituals there were integral to the project of founding Akamagū as a new shrine. As mentioned earlier, Akamagū, as a national shrine, had received from the central government a fixed amount of funds annually since 1874 to pay stipends for shrine priests, to perform ceremonies, and to build and repair shrine structures. The prefectural government of Yamaguchi, in charge of Akamagū, made a request to the Home Ministry in 1878 for additional state funding to construct shrine buildings in Akamagū; and in response, the ministry granted further financial aid to the shrine.⁴³ It is clear that both local and central governments supported the establishment of Akamagū as a new place where Antoku's spirit continued to be venerated. Although Yamaguchi Prefecture's 1878 request does not men-

the completion, no documentation indicates a visit by local officers to Akamagū on the death anniversary of Antoku, although other documents say that they attended the annual festival to celebrate the origin of the shrine (when Antoku's shrine was granted the rank of *kanpei chūsha*).

43. *Yamaguchikenka Akamagū zōei*, in DR 2 (Meiji 11: 1878.12.16), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Da 00661100); *Akamagū shamusho sonota zōei*, in DR 2 (Meiji 12: 1879.5.5), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Da 00661100); *Yamaguchikenka Akamagū honden sonota zōeishi nendo shishutsukata*, in DR 2 (Meiji 14: 1881.1.28), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Da 00661100).

tion the expense for the construction of Antoku's mausoleum, and no document has been found in which the prefecture petitioned the Home Ministry for extra financial support to build his mausoleum, it is highly likely that the prefecture made such a petition at some point. Akamagū's timely reactions to the government's prime concerns of the time, most notably the designation of all imperial mausolea, must have facilitated a favorable outcome in designating the new shrine's site as Antoku's mausoleum.

Moreover, the designation of Amidaji's site as Antoku's mausoleum was accelerated by Itō Hirobumi's assertion that the uncertainty of imperial tomb occupants would discredit Japan's status against the great powers in the West, when Japan was forming a modern state in an effort to revise the unequal treaties with them (MT 7 [Meiji 22: 1889.6.3], 279–80). Designations and repairs of all the mausolea of imperial ancestors and their veneration were crucial in emphasizing the unbroken lineage of emperors from ancient times. The year before, in 1888, Itō drafted the Meiji Constitution, Article I of which declared that "The Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of emperors unbroken for ages eternal."⁴⁴ Also, in his *Commentaries on the Constitution of the Empire of Japan*, Itō explained this article by quoting the legendary decree of Amaterasu that "The Country of Goodly Grain is a State, over which Our descendants shall become Sovereigns: You, Our descendants, come and govern it."⁴⁵ These suggest that Itō thought the unbroken imperial lineage was fundamental to the emperor's sovereignty.⁴⁶ In response to Itō's assertion and intention, the government dispatched officials again in 1889 to the unidentified tombs of imperial family members, ordering them to survey the tombs and submit their reports (MT 7 [Meiji 22: 1889.6.3], 279–80).

Rather than being based upon an archaeological survey, the selection of Akamagū was determined in 1889 by historical accounts—that Akamagū's precedent Amidaji had been established as a mortuary site for Antoku by the imperial court in the late twelfth century, that it had maintained memorial rites for

44. The translation is taken from Itō Miyoji's 伊東巳代治 (1857–1934) translation of Itō 1889, 2.

45. Itō 1889, 3. While the translation by Itō Miyoji ascribes the decree to the first Emperor Jinmu, the original Japanese text follows *Nihon shoki*, which records that the decree was given by Amaterasu. Although the *Commentaries* was eventually published as Itō Hirobumi's work, it was mostly written by Inoue Kowashi 井上毅 (1843–1895), one of Itō's right-hand men with whom he drafted the constitution together (besides Itō Miyoji).

46. Soon after the Reformation, the Meiji government adopted "By grace of heaven, emperor of Japan, seated on the throne of the line unbroken for ages eternal" as the emperor's style used first in diplomatic documents and then in domestic decrees. In 1888, Inoue Kowashi studied the connection between the styles of European monarchs and from what they derive their right to rule. See SHIMA 1994, 119–42. It is likely that Itō was also conscious of the implication of the style's reference to the unbroken imperial lineage that the emperor's sovereignty is derived from the lineage.

Antoku, and that it had preserved many documents issued by emperors and other elite such as shoguns and local warlords. This designation, however, does not necessarily mean that the government regarded Amidaji, in particular the place where Antoku's Spirit Hall had stood, as the actual burial site of Antoku's remains. The site was so designated rather because it was regarded as the most appropriate place for the rituals to be conducted for Antoku's spirit. Right after the designation, Antoku's mausoleum was expanded under the guidance of the central government.⁴⁷

The official designation of Antoku's mausoleum at the Amidaji site was also made in part due to the site's connection with Itō, who was from Yamaguchi Prefecture and visited there several times. Next to Antoku's designated mausoleum, there is an inn Itō often visited. After the destruction of Amidaji's buildings and the confiscation of the temple's land, this inn was built on the site where Amidaji's Reception Hall had been located. It was Itō who named this inn Shunpanrō, and he selected it as the place for himself to conclude the Treaty of Shimonoseki with Chinese ambassador Li Hongzhang 李鴻章 (1823–1901) after the Sino-Japanese War in 1895.⁴⁸ The Chinese delegates were probably aware of Antoku's mausoleum.⁴⁹ The significance of the imperial legacy, which Itō maintained that the designation and restoration of Antoku's mausoleum would help reinforce, was thus reflected in political and diplomatic contexts. Given these circumstances, it is probable that the official designation of Antoku's tomb was politically motivated.

Death Pollution and Veneration of Imperial Spirits

During the Meiji period, when imperial mausolea served as religious and political monuments that would reinforce imperial authority, the government's leaders refashioned them in an appropriate manner for the performance of Shinto-style rituals. As noted earlier, standardized architectural elements such as a worship place were constructed at emperors' tombs during the Bunkū repairs,

47. For a series of correspondence regarding this expansion between the central and prefectural governments, see *Goryōbo ikkenroku* (Meiji 21–23: 1888–90): Yamaguchiken Monjokan (Doc. #.kenchō senzen B 833).

48. The treaty was negotiated around the time of the death anniversary of Emperor Antoku. Indeed, on the date of Antoku's death, Li Hongzhang was attacked and shot by a Japanese youth when he was on his way back to his lodgings near the Shunpanrō Inn. Although this incident may have no relation to the death anniversary of Antoku, it is interesting to note that it happened on this specific day.

49. Even though no mention was made to Antoku's mausoleum itself, Li mentioned during the negotiation how beautiful the area around the inn was. *Kaiken yōroku* (Meiji 28: 1895.3.20) in *Nihon gaikō bunsho* 28: 2, 381–82. This record also shows that Itō's credentials he showed to Li started with Emperor Meiji calling himself “By grace of heaven, emperor of Japan, seated on the throne of the line unbroken for ages eternal” (see footnote 46).

creating sacred space where imperial spirits rest peacefully and rituals are conducted for them. While this transformation enhanced the imperial sacredness, the issue of purity and pollution associated with imperial mausolea became a topic for national debate by the government intellectuals. The final section of this article will discuss the religious and political significance of Antoku's mausoleum within the debate in which imperial mausolea came to be understood as sacred space detached from Buddhism and death pollution. This detachment from taboo seems to have furthered the prestige of Antoku's shrine and of imperial authority in relation to Japanese militarism.

It is often suggested that, in ancient Japan, the imperial palace was relocated from one place to another following the death of an emperor to avoid pollution from his or her death. Although scholars are yet to agree when people's fear of the pollution of death became prominent, they generally consider that the medieval elite such as emperors, aristocrats, and high-ranking warriors feared death pollution and transferred the dying, the dead, and ashes or relics to a secluded space. Contact with the impurity of death was considered to cause a great risk of pollution which might be harmful to the living. Once a permanent capital was established in Heian, the capital was not relocated due to the death of an emperor, but his or her demise in the imperial palace was usually avoided by moving the dying sovereign to other places.

Centuries later in the early Meiji period, as imperial mausolea regained their long-lost political and religious importance, the death pollution associated with them reemerged as a national issue. In the spring of 1868 the Court Council (*byōgi* 廟議) debated on this serious concern. Tanimori Yoshiomi, who was Assistant Inspector of Imperial Tombs at the Bureau of Mausolea (*shoryō-no-suke* 諸陵助) and an advocate of Hirata nativism, asserted that emperors' mausolea were free from death pollution. He explained why they came to be perceived as unclean:

My humble survey of classical texts of the empire leaves no question at all that, because emperors are kami manifested in this world as they were so venerated in ancient times, they are kami even after they move to the next world. From the medieval time on, however, concerned with adroit claims of Buddhists, they did not only come to entrust their important funerals entirely to Buddhist monks, but also to build their imperial tombs solely within Buddhist temple complexes, thereby misleading some people into regarding sacrosanct emperors' mausolea as if they were polluted places, which is extremely deplorable. After all, funerals are of the greatest significance to humanity, which is why I do not believe your majesty should entrust them to Buddhist monks in such a frivolous manner. As this is the time of restoration and reformation, I believe your majesty will reform this corrupt custom as well, and have courtiers of all ranks heartily perform rituals at mausolea, in the same way they served the sovereigns when alive. Also, since mausolea are eternally immutable palaces

for [kami-] spirits, I wish that, to prevent the public from considering them polluted, your majesty will treat them analogously to Ise Jingū of heavenly ancestors, and venerate them in a purified manner. (TOIKE 2000, 60)

The most important claim in Tanimori's remark is that the taboo of burial sites was due to their association with Buddhism rather than death itself. In other words, the problem of impurity could be resolved by eliminating anything related to Buddhism from imperial tombs and implementing Shinto elements. Through such a complete break with the Buddhist past, Tanimori claimed, imperial mausolea should be treated as being analogous to Shinto shrines.⁵⁰

In contrast, Seta Norimi 勢多章甫 (1831–1894), a high-ranking governmental official, cited the Kamakura period source *Nenjū gyōji hishō* 年中行事秘抄 (Secret manual of annual observances) to argue that a mausoleum is a polluted place and cannot be compared to a Shinto shrine. According to the reference, the rituals conducted by imperial messengers (*nosaki no tsukai*), who dedicated offerings to the spirit of the emperor at the tomb, were similar to those dedicated to deities, but since they were related to impurity, *nosaki no tsukai* did not perform other ceremonies for deities, nor were they allowed to attend the imperial court during the month of ritual abstinence, when certain activities had to be refrained from. For this reason, Seta concluded that imperial mausolea cannot be analogous to Shinto shrines.⁵¹ Seta's conclusion was supported by a prominent nativist scholar Yano Harumichi 矢野玄道 (1823–1887), based on his research in a number of ancient and medieval texts on the issue of whether imperial tombs were comparable to Shinto shrines (TOIKE 1997, 321–24).

The Court Council's debate on this issue, however, appears to have been resolved in favor of Tanimori's position. Perhaps as a result of this resolution, in the summer of 1868, Emperor Meiji paid visits in person to the mausolea of

50. In response to the separation of Shinto and Buddhist divinities, the elimination of Buddhist presence from imperial mausolea was also implemented, but was not complete; for example, Sennyūji 泉涌寺 was not destroyed at all, but it assumed more responsibilities for the Buddhist rituals for the imperial family. All of the personal objects of devotion and the memorial tablets of successive emperors were moved from the Buddhist room called *okurodo* in the imperial palace to the Kaiedō and the Reimyōden in Sennyūji respectively after Kōreiden was built in the imperial palace in 1871 (SAKAMOTO 1968, 246–47). It is interesting to note that, as recorded in Kanezane's *Gyokuyō*, the court of 1183 decided to treat the temple for Sutoku in a similar manner to Hachimangū for Emperor Ojin 応神 (r.c.270–c.310) and Kitanogū for Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真 (845–903), based on the distinction between *sha* 社 for venerating kami deities and *byō* 廟 for commemorating deceased human beings. See GY 2 [Juei 2: 1183.8.15], 617; YAMADA 2001, 136–37. Later in 1191 the court decided to treat Antoku's Spirit Hall in the same way as Sutoku's temple, but not as a shrine; see GY 3 [Kenkyū 2: 1191.112.22], 773.

51. TOIKE 2000, 60–61. Several other primary sources also state that imperial tomb keepers and messengers who were dispatched to dedicate offerings to a deceased emperor at a tomb were considered taboo officials who were not allowed to attend the court during certain times.

Emperors Tenji 天智 (r.668–672; 626–672) and Kōmei 孝明 (r.1846–1867; 1831–1867), the first and last in the Tenji imperial genealogy before the Meiji period (MT 1 [Meiji 1: 1868.18.29], 815–16). These visits were marked events that would help to remove the notion of mausolea as polluted (TAKEDA 2001, 79). In reality, however, people's fear of death pollution from imperial tombs and their negative conception of *nosaki no tsukai* still remained. Their reflection can be seen, for example, in a proposal submitted to the Department of Divinities. It argues that the distinction would be lost between purity and impurity, resulting in a fierce disorder, if officials who deal with purity and those who deal with impurity were put together to work in the same department. Given this aspect, it proposes that the section in charge of imperial mausolea should be separated from the one in charge of kami matters (TOIKE 2000, 70–71). This testifies to the concern of individuals that imperial tombs were still sources of impurity. Due to this type of issue, the Bureau of Mausolea (*shoryōryō* 諸陵寮), which had been restored in 1869, was restructured several times in the early Meiji period (TOIKE 2000, 71).

Finally, in 1883, a proposal submitted to the Court Council by Adachi Masana 足立正聲 (1841–1907), Assistant Inspector of Imperial Tombs at the Bureau of Mausolea, brought an end to the intense dispute over the death pollution caused by mausolea. Stressing the significance of ancestor veneration and the fact that it is the bureau's most important duty to perform rites for the spirits of deceased emperors, Adachi argues that the reverence for imperial ancestors is absolutely not a taboo, because it is a kami-related ritual (*shinji* 神事) conducted by those who practiced austere abstinence (*saikai* 齋戒) (TOIKE 2000, 72). Adachi's proposal further considers mausolea to be sanctuaries free from death pollution by redefining them as ritual spaces where imperial spirits are venerated rather than where emperors' corpses are interred. This redefinition became standard in the management of imperial tombs, as can be seen in the current Imperial Household Agency's position on its identifications of tomb occupants with which modern scholars disagree: it insists that, even when an imperial ancestor is not actually buried in the tomb of the agency's designation, his or her spirit has been relocated to the designated tomb after the long years of receiving rituals (EDWARDS 2000, 391). Adachi's argument also assumes that the spirit and the body of the deceased—the former is more important than the latter—can be separated from each other. It is this separation of the spirit from the body that helped form the conception of a burial site as a purified place free from being defiled.

These views justified the designation of Amidaji's site as Antoku's mausoleum. Whether his actual remains were buried there was not a primary concern of the official designation. By going with the government trend in a timely manner, Antoku's new shrine was reaffirmed as a site free from the taboo of death associated with Buddhism. This is how the concept of purification was implemented on the site where religious rites would be maintained for Antoku's spirit.

Due to their political and religious importance, the sacralized shrine and mausoleum of Antoku were visited by the crown prince in 1900 as part of his inspection tour of the Chugoku, Shikoku, and Kyushu regions, which comprised mostly prominent Shinto shrines and places associated with wars (for example, military headquarters, shipyards for military vessels, and artillery batteries). The itinerary also lists Shunpanrō Inn, where the Treaty of Shimonoseki to end the Sino-Japanese War was concluded (MT 10 [Meiji 33: 1900.10.31], 906). Two years later, Emperor Meiji dispatched an imperial messenger to Akamagū to make offerings to the spirit of Antoku. Following this visit of Akamagū, the messenger visited Sakurayama Shōkon Jinja 桜山招魂神社, the first of the shrines dedicated to those who lost their lives during the battles that led to the restoration of the Meiji imperial authority.⁵² Sakurayama Shōkon Jinja enshrines many spirits, including those of Yoshida Shōin 吉田松陰 (1830–1859), the leading ideologist in terminating the Tokugawa Shogunate; Takasugi Shinsaku 高杉晋作 (1839–1867), the head of the Kiheitai militia; Yamagata Aritomo 山縣有朋 (1838–1922), the prime minister also known as the father of Japanese militarism; and Shiraishi Shōichirō, the second Shinto head priest of Akamagū.

A few years before these imperial visits, in 1895, the Treaty of Shimonoseki declared that the Liaodong Peninsula in Manchuria was ceded by China to Japan; immediately after the treaty, however, Japan was forced to relinquish its claim over the peninsula due to the pressure imposed by the Triple Intervention (Russia, Germany, and France). This caused an increasing tension between the two colonial powers, Japan and Russia, over the control of Manchuria and Korea, which resulted in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5. Imperial visits to such selected sites as Akamagū, Antoku's mausoleum, and Shunpanrō Inn, along with other important shrines and military facilities, were evidence of the growth of militarism and the positioning of the emperor as the supreme commander of the imperial army and navy. Strengthening the connection between emperor and shrines, which were dedicated to kami, imperial ancestral spirits, and those who lost their lives for emperors, especially during the years of 1894 to 1905 when Japan was involved in military conflicts with China and Russia, was meant to fortify national solidarity under the ideology of Kokka Shinto. Prayers at such shrines were expected to receive favor from spirits who would bring military victory and security to the imperial state. Under these historical circumstances, Akamagū came to acquire further political significance by promoting the Emperor Meiji's legitimacy and Kokka Shinto.

52. MT 10 (Meiji 35: 1902.11.16), 323. This shrine belongs to the first of the four categories mentioned above of shrines newly established to bring peace to the imperial state.

Conclusion

All those redefinitions by the Meiji government of the roles of Shinto shrines, rituals, and imperial mausolea which we examined affected the religious and political significance of Antoku's new shrine that replaced his former mortuary temple. After the destruction of the Buddhist temple, the new Shinto shrine was designated as the place where the death of Antoku would be memorialized. At that time, both the Meiji government and local officials asserted that it was an essential part of the formation of modern Japan to purge all foreign or Buddhist contamination from the rituals conducted at the shrine and to restore the emperor's power by legitimizing the deification of the imperial line. To meet this demand, the priests of Akamagū proclaimed the Meiji imperial legitimacy by refashioning the shrine's most important ritual, the death anniversary, and restoring the tomb of Emperor Antoku. These tactics were what enabled the new shrine to survive the strife of this period, and later to be made a *kanpei taisha* 官幣大社 (great imperial shrine), the highest rank in the new hierarchical system of Shinto shrines. The central government, in turn, supported the transformation of Antoku's temple into his new shrine, free from Buddhism and death pollution, which was designed to illuminate the divine aura of Emperor Meiji, an element necessary for the implementation of the Meiji governmental policies. The new shrine's connection with the imperial family, which was most starkly highlighted during the eras of the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars, made the shrine more politically significant under the principle of Kokka Shinto. The creation and designation of the tomb of Antoku and the modification of the ritual at his shrine played a vital role not only in the emergence of Akamagū as a significant institution, but also in the legitimization of the new Meiji regime. The shrine's role in the new Japanese state went far beyond the simple commemoration of the death of the child emperor Antoku.

Today, more than three hundred thousand people are reported to visit Akama Jingū during Japan's Golden Week for Antoku's death anniversary, and to witness the ritual procession, *jōrō sankei* (the visit of *jōrō*), every year. This procession was designated by Shimonoseki City as an intangible cultural asset in 1970 and has attracted numerous spectators from all over Japan. The majority of the audience, however, have no awareness that the rituals at the ceremony for Antoku's death anniversary were reconstructed to reflect the religious and political roles that the local and central governments wanted Antoku's new shrine to play as part of the larger national project of enhancing imperial authority in the Meiji period. Although only the cultural importance of this ceremony is emphasized today, we must keep in mind the multilayered political and religious meanings that could be elicited through such a ritual.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

- AJM *Jūyō bunkazai Akama Jingū monjo* 重要文化財赤間神宮文書. Akama Jingū 赤間神宮. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1990.
- BJY *Bōchō jisha yurai* 防長寺社由来. Yamaguchiken Monjokan 山口県文書館. Vol. 7. Yamaguchi: Yamaguchiken Monjokan, 1986.
- DR *Dajō ruiten 2* 太政類典 2. Kokkai Kōbunshokan 国会公文書館. 1878–1881.
- GY *Gyokuyō* 玉葉. Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実. 3 vols. Tokyo: Meicho Kankōkai, 1993.
- KR *Kōbunroku* 公文録. Kokkai Kōbunshokan 国会公文書館.
- KT *Kokushi taikai* 国史大系. Ed. Kuroita Katsumi 黑板勝美. 60 vols. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1897–2000.
- HZ *Hōrei zensho* 法令全書. Vol. 3. Tokyo: Naikaku Kanpōkyoku, 1887.
- MT *Meiji tennō ki* 明治天皇記. Vols. 1, 3, 7. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1972.
- NSS *Nihon shomin seikatsu shiryō shūsei* 日本庶民生活史料集成. Ed. Miyamoto Tsuneichi 宮本常一. 30 vols. Tokyo: San'ichi Shobō, 1968–1984.

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Akamagaseki Amidaji raiyu oboe* 赤間関阿弥陀寺来由覚 (1739). In BJV 7, 382–87.
- Akamagū kanpei chūsha ni resseraru gosaiten shikkō no gi Yamaguchiken e aitasshisōrō mune jōshin* 赤間宮官幣中社ニ被列御祭典執行ノ儀山口県へ相達候旨上申. In KR (Meiji 8: 1885.10), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Kō 01639100-007).
- Akamagū keihigaku o sadamu* 赤間宮經費額ヲ定ム. In KR (Meiji 8: 1875.12.28), (Doc. #.2A-010-00-Kō 02012100-035).
- Akamagū shamusho sonota zōei* 赤間宮社務所其他造營. In DR 2 (Meiji 12: 1879.5.5), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Da 00661100).
- Amidaji bettō shidai* 阿弥陀寺別当次第 (1516, 1765). In AJM, 136–39.
- Amidaji bettō Shūeki mōshijōan* 阿弥陀寺別当秀益申状案 (1519). In AJM, 132–35.
- Antoku tennō gokansentō no gi ni tsuki ukagai* 安徳天皇御還遷等ノ儀二付伺 (1874). In KR (Meiji 8: 1885.8), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Kō 1456100-004).
- Antoku tennō goryō to shōshi sōrō jisho hozon no gi ni tsuki ukagai* 安徳天皇御陵ト称シ候地所保存ノ儀二付伺. In KR (Meiji 16: 1883.3.23), (Doc. #.2A-010-00-Kō 03612100-006).
- Antoku tennō Nagato-no-kuni Amidaji Akamagū to kaishō kanpei chūsha ni ressu* 安徳天皇長門国阿弥陀寺赤間宮ト改称官幣中社ニ列ス (Meiji 8: 1875.10.7). In DR 2 (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Da 0049100-016).
- Azuma kagami* 吾妻鏡 (late Kamakura period). In KT 32. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1964.

- Chinju Hachimangū engi* 鎮守八幡宮縁起 (1282?). In *AJM*, 182, 184–87.
- Dajōkan fukokurei* 太政官布告令 226 (Keiō 4: 1868.4.10). In *HZ* 3 (Tokyo: Naikaku Kanpōkyoku, 1887), 89.
- Goryōbo ikkenroku* 御陵墓一件録 (Meiji 21–23: 1888–90). Yamaguchiken Monjokan (Doc. #.kenchō senzen B 833).
- Gyokuyō* 玉葉. By Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149–1207). 3 vols. Tokyo: Meicho Kankōkai, 1993.
- Hōrei zensho* 法令全書. Tokyo: Naikaku Kanpōkyoku, 1868–1871.
- Junnin tennō Antoku tennō o Gotoba tennō hajime santei dōyō kansen kore aritaki gi ukagai* 淳仁天皇安德天皇ヲ後鳥羽天皇始三帝同様還遷有之度儀伺. In *KR* (Meiji 6: 1873.10.?), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Kō 00752100).
- Kaiken yōroku* 会見要録 (1895). In *Nihon gaikō bunsho* 日本外交文書 Vol. 28: 2. Third ed. Tokyo: Gaimushō, 1998.
- Kankoku heisha komonjo hōmotsu mokuroku* 官国弊社古文書宝物目録. In *Shingonshū shōjin meisai* 真言宗諸寺院明細書, *Toyorahan kyūki* 豊浦藩旧記 104, Yamaguchiken Monjokan 山口県文書館 (Doc. #.toyorahan kyūki 104).
- Kantō gechijō* 関東下地状 (1238). In *AJM*, 20–21.
- Koharu kikō* 小春紀行, Ōta Nanpo 太田南畝 (1749–1823). *Ōta Nanpo zenshū* 9 太田南畝全集 9. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1987.
- Kyōhō nenkan sanryō shi* 享保年間山陵誌 (1716–1736). Kokkai Toshokan 国会図書館 (Doc. #.140–145).
- Meiji tennō ki* 1, 3, and 7 明治天皇紀 1, 3, 7. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1972.
- Nagasaki kōeki nikki* 長崎行役日記. Nagakubo Sekisui 長久保赤水 (1717–1801).
- Nagato kokusen* 長門国宣 (1238). In *AJM*, 16–17.
- Nagato no kuni Akamagū shachi baishū ukagai* 長門国赤間宮社地買取伺. In *KR* (Meiji 10: 1877.9.?), (Doc. #.2A-010-00-Kō 02064100).
- Nihon kikōbun shūsei* 1 日本紀行文集成 1. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1979.
- Nihon Kyūhō shugyō nikki* 日本九峰修行日記. Noda Shigesuke 野田成亮 (1756–1835). *NSS* 2, 3–262.
- Saiyū zakki* 西遊雜記. Furukawa Koshōken 古河古松軒 (1726–1807). *NSS* 2, 329–96.
- Satsuyō ōhen kiji* 薩陽往返記事. Takagi Zensuke 高木善助 (d.1854). *NSS* 2, 609–704.
- Shiromineji engi* 白峯寺縁起 (1406). *SGR* 19. Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 1977.
- Shokoku zue nenjū gyōji taisei* 諸国国会年中行事大成 (1806). By Hayami Shungyōsai 速水春暁齋 (1767–1823). Tokyo: Ōfūsha, 1978.
- Tokushu shinji genkyō hōkoku* 特殊神事現況報告. In *Akama Jingū shi* 赤間神宮誌 (1918). Yamaguchiken Monjokan 山口県文書館 (Doc. #.kenshi hensanjo shiryō 1609).
- Yamaguchikenka Akamagū honden sonota zōeihi nendo shishutsukata* 山口県

下赤間宮本殿其他造営費年度支出方. In DR 2 (Meiji 14: 1881.1.28), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Da 00661100).

Yamaguchikenka Akamagū zōei 山口県下赤間宮造営. In DR 2 (Meiji 11: 1878.12.16), (Doc. #.2A-009-00-Da 00661100).

SECONDARY SOURCES

AKAMA JINGŪ 赤間神宮

- 1985 *Akama Jingū: Shimonoseki, genpei shiseki to bunkazai* 赤間神宮—下関・源平史跡と文化財. Shimonoseki: Kyōdo no Bunka o Mamoru Kai.
- 1990 *Jūyō bunkazai Akama Jingū monjo* 重要文化財赤間神宮文書. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- 1997 *Akama Jingū genpei kassen zuroku* 赤間神宮源平合戦図録. Shimonoseki: Akama Jingū.

AKAMATSU Toshihide 赤松俊秀

- 1957 *Kamakura bukkyō no kenkyū* 鎌倉仏教の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

ANTONI, Klaus

- 1995 The “separation of gods and buddhas” at Ōmiwa Jinja in Meiji Japan. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22: 139–59.

BREEN, John

- 2000 Ideologues, bureaucrats and priests: On “Shinto” and “Buddhism” in early Meiji Japan. In *Shinto in History: Ways of the Kami*, ed. John Breen and Mark Teeuwen, 230–51. Richmond: Curzon.

EDWARDS, Walter

- 2000 Contested access: The imperial tombs in the postwar period. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 26: 371–92.

FUJIKI Kunihiko 藤木邦彦

- 1976 *Heian jidai ni okeru kinryō, kinbo no hisōsha ni tsuite* 平安時代における近陵・近墓の被葬者について. *Kokushikan daigaku bungakubu jinbungaku kiyō* 8: 46–61.

FUJITANI Takashi

- 1996 *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan*. Berkeley, CA, and London: University of California Press.

GILDAY, Edmund

- 2000 Bodies of evidence: Imperial funeral rites and the Meiji Restoration. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 27: 273–96.

GOODWIN, Janet

- 2007 *Selling Songs and Smiles: The Sex Trade in Heian and Kamakura Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

GRAPARD, Allan

- 1984 Japan’s ignored cultural revolution: The separation of Shinto and Buddhist

divinities in Meiji (*shimbutsu bunri*) and a case study: Tōnomine. *History of Religions* 23: 240–65.

HARDACRE, Helen

1989 *Shinto and the State, 1868–1988*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

HORI Yutaka 堀 裕

1998 *Tennō no shi no rekishi teki ichi: "Nyozaï no gi" o chūshin ni* 天皇の死の歴史的位置—「如在之儀」を中心に. *Shirin* 81: 38–69.

ITŌ Hirobumi 伊藤博文

1889 *Commentaries on the Constitution of the Empire of Japan*. Trans. Itō Miyoji. Tokyo: Igarisu Hōritsu Gakkō.

KETELAAR, James Edward

1990 *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and its Persecution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

KURODA Toshio 黒田俊男

1990 *Nihon chūsei no shakai to shūkyō* 日本中世の社会と宗教. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

1996a The Imperial law and the Buddhist law. Trans. Jacqueline Stone. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, 271–85.

1996b The world of spirit pacification: Issues of state and religion. Trans. Allan Grapard. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23: 321–51.

MIZUNO Naofusa 水野直房

1985 Senteisai 先帝祭. In *Akama Jingū: Shimonoseki, Genpei shiseki to bunkazai* 赤間神宮—下関・源平史跡の文化財, ed. Akama Jingū 赤間神宮, 46–48. Shimonoseki: Kyōdo no Bunkazai o Mamorukai.

MURAKAMI Shigeyoshi 村上重良

1970 *Kokka Shintō* 国家神道. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

MURATA Yasuo 村田安穂

1999 *Shinbutsu bunri no chihōteki tenkai* 神仏分離の地方的展開. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

NAKAMURA Akira 中村 聡

2006 Akamagū sōken oyobi Antoku tennō goryō no chitei ni itaru kei ni tsuite 赤間宮創建および安徳天皇御陵の治定にいたる経緯について. *Shintō bunka* 18: 106–24.

NITTA, Hitoshi

2000 Shinto as a “non-religion”: The origin and development of an idea. In *Shinto in History: Ways of Kami*, ed. John Breen and Mark Teeuwen, 256–57. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

OKADA Yoneo 岡田米夫

1966 Jingū, jinja sōkenshi 神宮・神社創建史. In *Meiji ishin Shintō hyakunenshi*

- 2 明治維新神道百年史 2, ed. Shintō Bunkakai 神道文化会, 4–82. Tokyo: Shintō Bunkakai.
- PLUTSCHOW, Herbert E.
1990 *Chaos and Cosmos: Ritual in Early and Medieval Japanese Literature*. Leiden and New York: E. J. Brill.
- SAKAMOTO Ken'ichi 阪本健一
1968 *Kōshitsu ni okeru shinbutsu bunri* 皇室における神仏分離. In *Meiji ishin Shintō hyakunenshi 2* 明治維新神道百年史 2, ed. Shintō Bunkakai 神道文化会, 194–254. Tokyo: Shintō Bunkakai.
- SAKAMOTO Koremaru 阪本是丸
1994 *Kokka Shintō keisei katei no kenkyū* 国家神道形成過程の研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- SEKIMORI, Gaynor
2005 The separation of kami and buddha worship in Haguro Shugendō, 1869–1875. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 32: 197–234.
- SHIBATA Minoru 柴田 実, ed.
1984 *Goryō shinkō* 御霊信仰. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.
- SHIMA Yoshitaka 島 善高
1994 *Kindai Nihon ni okeru “tenyū” to Gottesgnadentum* 近代日本における「天祐」と Gottesgnadentum. *Waseda shakai kagaku kenkyū* 45: 119–42.
- SHIMAZONO Susumu 島 蘭 進
2001 *Kokka Shintō to kindai Nihon no shukyō kōzō* 国家神道と近代日本の宗教構造. *Shūkyō kenkyū* 329 (75): 319–44.
- SHIMONOSEKI SHISHI HENSHŪ IINKAI 下関市史編集委員会
1973 *Shimonosekishi Shishi: Genshi, Chūsei hen* 下関市市史—原始・中世編. Shimonoseki: Shimonosekishi Shishi Henshū Iinkai.
1993–2001 *Shimonosekishi shi: Shiryōhen* 下関市史—資料編. Shimonoseki: Shimonosekishi Shishi Henshū Iinkai.
- TAGA Munehaya 多賀宗隼
1980 *Jien no kenkyū* 慈円の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- TAKEDA Hideaki 武田秀章
1996 *Ishinki tennō saishi no kenkyū* 維新时期天皇祭祀の研究. Tokyo: Taimeidō.
2001 *Kindai no kokka saishi to ryōbo* 近代の国家の祭祀と陵墓. *Bessatsu rekishi dokuhon* 別冊歴史読本78: 78–82.
2004 *Meiji jingikan to shoki kōrei saishi* 明治神祇官の初期皇霊祭祀. *Shintō shūkyō* 193: 1–36.
- THAL, Sarah
2002 Redefining the gods: Politics and survival in the creation of modern kami. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 29: 371–404.

2005 *Rearranging the Landscape of the Gods: The Politics of a Pilgrimage Site in Japan, 1573–1912*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

TOIKE Noboru 外池 昇

1997 *Bakumatsu, Meiji ki no ryōbo* 幕末・明治期の陵墓. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

2000 *Tennōryō no kindaiishi* 天皇陵の近代史. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

UWAYOKOTE Masataka 上横手雅敬

2005 Antoku tennō to Go-Toba tennō 安徳天皇と後鳥羽天皇. In *Kaiōgyū* 海王宮, ed. Matsuo Ashie 松尾葦江, 137–57. Tokyo: Miyai Shoten.

YAMADA Yūji 山田雄司

1999 Sutoku tennō shinrei no kanshen 崇徳天皇神霊の還遷. In *Kindai Nihon no rekishiteki isō: Kokka, minzoku, bunka* 近代日本の歴史的位相: 国家・民族・文化, ed. Ōhama Tetsuya 大濱徹也, 1–29. Tokyo: Tōsui Shobō.

2001 *Sutokuin onryō no kenkyū* 崇徳院怨霊の研究. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan.

YAMAGUCHIKEN Monjokan 山口県文書館, ed.

1986 *Bōchō jisha yurai* 防長寺社由来. Vol. 7. Yamaguchi: Yamaguchiken Monjokan.

YASUMARU Yoshio 安丸良夫

1979 *Kamigami no Meiji ishin: Shinbutsu bunri to haibutsu kishaku* 神々の明治維新一神仏分離と廃仏毀釈. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

ZENKOKU HEIKE KAI 全国平家会

2005 *Heike denshōchi sōran* 平家伝承地総覧. Tokyo: Shinjinbutsu Ōraisha.