

**From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library,
Princeton, NJ**

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyright law. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material in our collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff. For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information on the Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.

<https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines>. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. <https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us>

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026

East Asian Studies

2018

Narrating Vengeful Spirits and Genealogies in Premodern Japanese Literature

Hayashi, Kaoru

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

<http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp0108612r306>

U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. <https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf>

**NARRATING VENGEFUL SPIRITS AND GENEALOGIES
IN PREMODERN JAPANESE LITERATURE**

Kaoru Hayashi

A DISSERTATION
PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY
OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE BY
THE DEPARTMENT OF
EAST ASIAN STUDIES

Adviser: Brian R. Steininger

September 2018

© Copyright by Kaoru Hayashi, 2018. All rights reserved.

*To my parents,
Masayuki and Masako Hayashi
And in memory of Hideki Richard Okada*

Abstract

Narrating Vengeful Spirits and Genealogies in Premodern Japanese Literature

Kaoru Hayashi

This dissertation explores the invocation of the angry dead as both a social practice of genealogical imagination repeatedly thematized within Heian literary texts and as itself a narrative act whose structure generated a particular voice integral to the development of classical Japanese fiction. I argue that in the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries, the process of becoming a powerful vengeful spirit, or even suffering as a victim of such a spirit, provided political, religious, and familial legitimacy in elite aristocratic culture. By closely investigating narrative techniques in a wide range of texts—from canonical literature, such as *The Tale of Genji* and *Tale of Hōgen*, to official historical chronicles, poems, and religious treatises—I trace a larger literary practice of invoking vengeful spirits as rhetorical devices in order to narrate the unspeakable, challenge stable meanings, and provide powerful genealogical links to the past, present, and future.

Chapter One delves into one of the most famous of all premodern narratives, *The Tale of Genji*. By closely examining the multiple roles of female narrators, I argue that women not only mediate the voices of vengeful spirits but that the emergence of these vengeful spirits facilitates the development of the narrative itself. Chapter Two continues to explore *The Tale of Genji* by illustrating the significance of kinship in the process of becoming a vengeful spirit and how connections to such spirits reinforce genealogical legitimacy. Chapter Three evaluates the

writings of Jien, an archbishop from premodern Japan's most powerful aristocratic family, the Fujiwara, further examining the interdependency between genealogical legitimacy, Buddhist rhetoric, and vengeful spirits by focusing on Jien's written prayers and his historical account, *Gukanshō*. Chapter Four reconsiders writings related to one of the most feared vengeful spirits in Japanese history, Retired Emperor Sutoku, who publicly declared his intention to become a vengeful spirit and cursed his own descendants. In total, this dissertation constitutes the first comprehensive literary and historical analysis of vengeful spirits in premodern Japan and argues for understanding these spirits through the intertwined relationship between narration and genealogies.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	vi
Abbreviations and Conventions	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 Narrating <i>Mononoke</i> in <i>The Tale of Genji</i> Part One: <i>Monogatari</i> Haunted	32
Chapter 2 Narrating <i>Mononoke</i> in <i>The Tale of Genji</i> Part Two: Specters of Genealogy	75
Chapter 3 Speaking in Reasons: The Seen, the Unseen, and the Between in Jien's Writing	118
Chapter 4 Becoming the Fiercest <i>Mononoke</i> : Retired Emperor Sutoku's Genealogy Unnarrated	157
Epilogue	224
Bibliography	229

Abbreviations and Conventions

I have relied on the modified Hepburn system for romanizing Japanese terms. I applied macrons for terms and place names except for those that most commonly appear in English works, such as Tokyo, Kyoto, and Osaka. Japanese names are provided in their original order—family name followed by given name—but I have tended to remove the “no” that often appears between family names and first names dating from the early and medieval periods. For dates, I have given the year as the corresponding Gregorian year but have left the month and day according to the historical Japanese lunar calendar. All translations are mine unless indicated otherwise.

I have used the following abbreviations for frequently cited source collections.

NKBT	<i>Nihon koten bungaku taikei</i>
NKBZ	<i>Nihon koten bungaku zenshū</i>
SNKBT	<i>Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei</i>
SNKBZ	<i>Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū</i>
SZKT	<i>Shintei zōho kokushi taikei</i>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Life, death, reading, and writing, these are a few of the fundamental elements of life that spur my feelings of joy, passion, and questioning the unknowable—forces that gave birth to this project. All of these were seeded, nurtured, and developed by my parents Masayuki and Masako Hayashi and my late advisor, Hideki Richard Okada. It is both a great honor and a sadness to say that I am Okada sensei's last advisee. This dissertation began as the first seminar paper I wrote for him, and his memories, and hopefully his legacies, are engraved throughout this project. My first, fathomless debt of gratitude is owed to these three individuals, and it is my privilege to dedicate this work to my parents and Okada sensei.

I am equally fortunate to have Brian Steininger as my advisor, and I am grateful for his generosity and, especially, his patience. His sincere advice and support kept me going during every step of the long second-half of my PhD program. Reginald Jackson has been the most gracious mentor after Okada sensei's passing, and his intellectual stimuli and encouragement made my survival of graduate school possible. My sincere gratitude goes to my other committee members. Jacqueline Stone has always provided me invaluable feedback and untiring compassion for my intellectual and personal development. She has also become a valued friend and mentor. Federico Marcon who shares my passions for the monstrous gave me new inspiration and energy to continue my project. I am very grateful for his kind willingness to serve both as an examiner and reader.

Throughout my academic career, I have received tremendous support from a great number of people without whose help this project could never have been brought to fruition. At Smith College, Thomas Rohlich rekindled my passion for classical Japanese literature and provided unbounded help and encouragement to apply for graduate programs. Other faculty at

Smith, Maki Hubbard, Jamie Hubbard, Marnie Anderson, and Sujane Wu gave me an important foundation for solidifying my academic career in the field of East Asian studies. While at Smith, I was also unexpectedly fortunate to have opportunities to work with Amy Franks, Samuel Morse, and Jonathan Lipman. I would like to thank my Chinese language teachers in the summer language program at Middlebury College for indispensable language training at an early stage of my academic career.

My academic career would not even have begun without the dedicated teachers at LaGuardia Community College, where I first started my higher education as a student in the English as Second Language Program. George Sussman, Louis Lucca, and Barbara Comins believed in my potential and encouraged me to pursue a bachelor's degree. At Vassar College's Exploring Transfer Program, the enthusiasm of Andrew "Andy" Bush and John Henry Davis for critical reading, thinking, as well as learning and teaching, and their unbounded support for their students have inspired me to pursue my own goal to become a teacher like them.

I cannot overstate my gratitude to many faculty members at Princeton whose indispensable advice and support inside and outside of the classroom are an integral part of my project and my graduate student life. Martin Colclutt, Atsuko Ueda, Keiko Ono, Tomoko Shibata and Albert Raboteau all provided generous support and encouragement for my academic as well as professional growth. Special thanks are due to Steven Chung and Thomas Conlan who kindly served on my prospectus committee and made sure my project was off to a good start. Setsuko Noguchi also deserves my deep gratitude for not only providing me resources critical to my studies, but also creating a safe space where I could talk with her whenever I needed. I am very grateful to have had a chance to work with Haruko Wakabayashi, with whom I could share curiosity and enthusiasm regarding strange phenomenon. David Leheny will forever have my

endless thanks for ensuring my growth as a teacher, setting a brilliant pedagogical example for teaching and mentoring, and for helping my search for employment.

This project could not have been completed without the intellectual support of many other institutions and scholars beyond Princeton as well. I cannot thank enough Hyōdō Hiromi 兵藤裕己. It is not an exaggeration to say that encountering his works on war-tales and *monogatari* as an undergraduate student was a turning point in my academic career in pursuing *mononoke* and *monogatari* as my primary research interest. Hyōdō sensei kindly took me into his seminar at Gakushūin University while I was conducting research in Japan and graciously presented me invaluable materials and topics, as well as challenging questions that have deepened my thought and arguments reflected in this dissertation.

Zhong Yijian offered generous aid and oversaw my work as a visiting fellow at the Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia at Tokyo University on two separate occasions over the course of seventeen months, providing me various opportunities to present my work. I am very grateful to Ido Misato for her attentiveness, warm friendship, and great inspiration.

I wish to express my appreciation to Japanese scholars at Monoken (Monogatari kenkyūkai). Rigorous discussion with Takagi Makoto, Kimura Saeko, Fujii Sadakazu, and Mutō Nagako, in particular, made me reconsider methodology and reading about *monogatari* and helped me formulate my own ideas on narratives inscribed in this work. I owe Yamada Yūji a great debt of gratitude for being the frontier of *onryō* studies and his generosity to share a great amount of resources with me and his warm encouragement to pursue issues related to vengeful spirits.

Paul Atkins generously read an early draft of a chapter and his sincere encouragement for my success saved me on many occasions. Charlotte Eubanks patiently and kindly listened to my

rambling on about Jien and *onryō* when the chapter was still in a nascent form and gave me thoughtful feedback that strengthened my project. Azusa Nishimoto has made sure that Okada sensei's legacies continue. Her immeasurable bravery and compassion will never be forgotten.

As an exchange scholar at the University of Chicago, I was extremely fortunate to have had an opportunity to work with vigorous scholars such as Michael Bourdaghs, Susan Burns, Nobuko Toyosawa, and Ashton Lazarus, as well as members of the Kuzushi-ji benkyōkai, who welcomed me into their classroom and offered helpful advice and training much needed for conducting research.

I have greatly benefitted from the resources that Princeton University has provided, including the McGraw Center for Teaching and Learning and the Writing Boot Camp, which not only supported my professional and academic development but also gave me wonderful opportunities to meet my peers outside of my department. The Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies and the East Asian Studies Program gave me the financial means to conduct summer research that laid the foundation for the dissertation. In addition to financial aid, the academic and moral support provided by the Center for the Study of Religion and my Religion and Culture Fellows colleagues were the highlight of my final year at Princeton. My last year at Princeton was also generously funded by the Japanese American Association of New York (JAA)-Honjō Scholarship.

Materials from this dissertation have been presented at the Mid-Atlantic Region Association for Asian Studies in 2017 in a presentation entitled “Mononoke at the Sickbed: Redefining Kinship from the Past and into the Future.” I benefitted greatly from feedback given by participants at the conference, including Linda Chance who offered me resourceful

comments. Alex Bates generously served as a discussant on the panel I organized and offered me wonderfully useful feedback and questions to help me recraft my own perspectives.

No graduate students in our program can survive without the industrious aid provided by the East Asian Studies Department and Program staff. Hue Kim Su welcomed me when I first arrived on campus as a candidate, and Margo Orlando made sure my final year of the PhD program was a smooth one. My special thanks go to Amber Min-Lee for her untiring support for students and her warm friendship. I am grateful to Richard Chafey for his generous assistance and his sense of humor that lit up my daily trip from Jones Hall to Gest library.

I am beyond words to express my deep sense of my gratitude to my many friends and colleagues at Princeton and beyond. I am especially grateful to my *senpai* for their intellectual inspiration during untiring discussions dealing with premodern literature and theory in Okada sensei's classroom. Good spirited and caring, Eno Compton has been a simply wonderful *senpai* that any *kōhai* could hope for. He showed me how to read interwoven concepts of genealogies in Heian literature. I also thank Erin Brightwell for being supportive and a great role model as a disciplined scholar.

Countless inspiring discussions and laughter I shared with Mimi Chusid were truly the highlight of my graduate student life. Special thanks to Elijah Greenstein, Kay Duffy, and David Boyd for their unfailing camaraderie and friendship. David Boyd especially has always had my back and generously read through my whole dissertation and provided me valuable suggestions when he was also preparing for his own FPO.

I feel incredibly lucky and honored to have wonderful colleagues and friends who profoundly affected my professional and personal life. I wish to thank many of my *senpai*

beyond the field of premodern Japanese literature, Bryan Lowe, Yulia Frumer, Maren Ehlers, April Hughes, William H. Bridges IV, Seiji Shirane, Christopher Mayo, Zuo Ya, Sang-ho Ro, Juergen Melzer, Sare Aricanli, and Michael Hunter, always lent me a hand and showed me a path to follow. Daniel Burton-Rose, Meghan Fidler, Kjell Ericson, Paul Kreitmen, Dung Thanh, Xinxian Zheng, Yangyang Xu, Miyabi Goto, Timothy Benedict, Eun Jeong Choi, Clare Kaup, Takashi Miura, Reut Harari, Brent Lee, Ron Wilson, Qinyuan Lei, Mercedes Valmisa, Dror Weil, Mårten Söderblom-Saarela, Songyeol Han, Kyle Bond, Bingyu Zheng, Mai Yamaguchi, Yiyi Luo, Jinsong Guo, Clair Cooper, Bernard Shee, Yuanxin Chen, Kwi Jeong Lee, Jessica Zu, Kentarō Ido, Megan Gilbert, Chris Lau, and many others provided intellectual inspiration, support and friendship inside and outside of the classroom and our sweet-home of Gest library. I also wish to thank my CSR (the Center for the Study of Religion) fellows. I am particularly indebted to Orlando Reade who made invaluable comments on early drafts of my chapters. I also wish to thank my colleagues at the University of Chicago. Brian White, Alex Murphy, and Yiren Zheng, who welcomed me to their classroom and shared keen insights with me.

Outside of Princeton, my special thanks are due to Irimoto Yūichi. Without his self-sacrifice and good-natured spirit, my transition to Princeton would not be possible. Eva Hageman, Judy Wang, Susan Burdelski, Teresa Gonzales, and many other courageous Smithies friends have always been my inspiration, and I am honored to count them as friends. My long-overdue deepest gratitude to the bravest and the kindest late Yamamoto Asako for her never-fading friendship.

This journey would have not been possible without the continued and unwavering support and help of my family in the U.S. and in Japan. I would like to thank the Young family

for much needed emotional support. My parents-in-law, Bill Otōsan and Judy Okāsan, always cheered me on and provided me wise counsel; I am incredibly lucky to be your *musume*.

In Japan, my sister, Midori never failed to impress me with her charismatic unflappability, vitality, and sense of humor. I thank her for all the great energy and encouragement she naturally emanates. I am grateful to the Isogai family. My nephews, Kūga and Korekio, who patiently (?) waited for me on other side of the table to play with them whenever I was “working.” Truth be told, it was I who waited for their interruption more than I would like to admit, and it was such a luxury to share joys and wonders with them.

My husband, William Evan Young shared every precious moment of my graduate student life. I am ever grateful for his ability to appreciate and laugh at the fortunate situations and the occasional disasters I encountered. His selfless time, never-failing sympathy, and optimistic faith in me were very often all that kept me going. His encouragement saw this project through from the beginning to the end, and it was a delight to share the entire process with him. Through all of the years it took to complete this dissertation, I have realized how much this kind of academic endeavor is truly a family matter.

Introduction

Everybody dies, but only some turn into ghosts and vengeful spirits. In Japan's ancient and early medieval periods, unseen spirits, such as *onryō* 怨霊 and *mononoke* 物怪/物の怪, played a crucial role in everyday life. They were often blamed for causing extraordinary and unpredictable occurrences such as natural disasters, social and political upheavals, and illnesses. Rites of pacification intended to appease vengeful souls were performed regularly in both private and public spheres and occasionally sponsored by the imperial court. According to texts from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries, these spirits were angered by their own ignominious deaths, often amid political strife, and provoked disasters to exact revenge.

There are several recurring famous historical figures whose names are perpetuated as the fiercest vengeful spirits in history. These figures include Princess Ikami/Inoe (Ikami/Inoe naishinnō 井上内親王, 717–75), Prince Sawara (Sawara shinnō 早良親王, 750–85, posthumously titled as Emperor Sudō or Sudō Tennō 崇道天皇), Tachibana Hayanari 橘逸勢 (?–842), Sugawara Michizane 菅原道真 (845–903), Taira Masakado 平将門 (?–940), and Retired Emperor Sutoku (Sutoku Jōkō 崇徳上皇 or Sutoku-in 崇徳院, 1119–64).¹ That these historical figures were considered to have become vengeful spirits, or *onryō*, is certain, but many important questions still remain: how did these figures transform into *onryō* and what made them eligible for such status? Who did they haunt and for what reasons? Why did these dead “return” to speak, what did they say, and on whose behalf?

¹ In this dissertation, I use the term “emperor” for the Japanese *tennō* or *mikado*. The translation of *tennō* has been a matter of debate among scholars, but for the sake of consistency, I will cautiously use the terms “emperor” and “imperial family.”

This dissertation explores vengeful spirits by focusing on the rhetorical significance of *mononoke* as they were used to signal unnarrated voices, political intrigue, and complex family relationships in the context of aristocratic culture. While I explore historical accounts, official court records, courtier diaries, and religious texts from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, my main focus is on narrative tales (*monogatari* 物語), especially *The Tale of Genji* (*Genji monogatari* 源氏物語) and *The Tale of Hōgen* (*Hōgen monogatari* 保元物語). These tales abound with such spirits, some entirely fictional such as the famous Rokujō no miyasudokoro 六条御息所 in *The Tale of Genji*, and some based on historical figures, such as the Retired Emperor Sutoku in *Hōgen monogatari*. These narrative tales offer unique opportunities to explore both the creation of such spirits and the various roles they played in premodern texts. Reading both narrative tales and historical records together allows us to unveil the narrative functions *onryō* and *mononoke* played in the premodern literary realm.

I have thus far used the terms *onryō* and *mononoke* interchangeably, but it is worth taking a moment to discuss the difference between these two words. *Mononoke* is a broad term that can be written in various ways, most commonly 物怪, 物の怪, and 物恠.² The term, *mono*, roughly translated as “thing,” is not only multivalent and ambiguous but also suggests meanings that may

² There is an interesting point of contention among scholars over the possible etymological and genealogical relationship between the words *monogatari* 物語 and *mononoke* 物の怪, which share the same morpheme *mono* 物 or “thing.” Until recently, the most influential and accepted theory about *mono* and its relationship with *monogatari* was one posited by Orikuchi Shinobu. His famous, aesthetically enticing shamanistic theory is that the *mono* of *monogatari* signifies “soul/spirits (*tama* 霊)” and *monogatari* is so called as a result of a being from the spiritual realm who speaks (*kataru*) through the human mouth. Scholars such as Furuhashi Nobutaka, Takahashi Tōru, and Hyōdō Hiromi, while criticizing Orikuchi’s naiveté and narrow definition, agree with the suggestion of the incantatory in the term “*mono*” in the early formation of *monogatari*. For further discussion and criticism of Orikuchi, see Fujii Sadakazu, *Monogatari no kigen: Furukotoron* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1997); Hyōdō Hiromi, “Heike monogatari no ‘kataru’ no kōzō: Haseironteki ni,” in *Katarimono Josetsu: ‘Heike’ gatari no hassei to hyōgen* (Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1985), 51–74; and Orikuchi Shinobu, “Reikon no hanashi,” *Minzokugaku* 1, no. 3 (September 1923): 153–66.

be contradictory, including any of the following: (1) a prefix that softens or obscures the sense or meaning of a word; (2) things or unspecified subjects; (3) food, clothing, furniture, or musical instruments that are understood in a given context; (4) thoughts or words that should not be uttered; (5) a human or an animal; (6) something “supernatural,” beyond human power, and frightening, such as *mononoke*, vengeful spirits (*onryō*), and fierce gods (*kishin* 鬼神 or *oni* 鬼).³ Here we find that *mono* can indicate both a concrete substance (a thing, human, animal, or object) and an abstract invisible concept or being (word, evil spirit, or god).⁴ During the early and medieval periods, the *ke* of *mononoke* was usually written with the Chinese characters 気 (air, spirit, breath, atmosphere) or 怪 (mystery, wonder).⁵ In the broadest sense, *mononoke* 物の怪 are typically *unidentified* spirits that provoke natural disasters, possess human beings, and cause illnesses or other troubles.

What defines an *onryō* within this broad category of spirits is that it has been identified. Once a *mononoke* is identified, it is usually no longer called *mononoke*: it is called *mono* (もの/物/霊), *mitama/goryō* (御霊), *onryō* (怨霊), or addressed by its living name.⁶ Among identified spirits, *onryō* maintain a special place. Few people could become *onryō*. As a general rule, both *onryō* and their victims had to be involved with the highest level of court politics, related to or involved with the imperial line, and highly literate. These *onryō* were the spirits considered

³ In *Man'yōshū*, *Nihon ryōiki*, and *Konjaku monogatari shū*, the character *oni* 鬼 (demon) is occasionally seen with the *kana* reading “*mono*.”

⁴ *Kogo jiten*, 10th ed. (Tokyo: Ōbunsha, 2008).

⁵ Yamauchi Hisashi, *Mononoke*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppankyoku, 2004), 47. The specifics of the characters chosen to render *mononoke* in different types of events and texts in different time periods requires further study. See Fujimoto Katsuyoshi, *Genji monogatari no “mononoke”*: *Bungaku to kiroku no hazama* (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1994), 31–33.

⁶ Yamauchi, *Mononoke*, 47; and Fujimoto, *Genji monogatari no “mononoke,”* 31–33.

responsible for state-wide disasters and haunting members of the imperial house and the aristocracy.

I argue that *mononoke* (and to large extent *onryō*) are ambiguous by nature and therefore always escape total comprehension. Given that *mono* can also mean “a word used when one wishes to avoid saying something directly,” *mono* is something that holds a potentially anxiety-producing ambiguity and requires mediation to understand.⁷ *Onryō*, even though they have been identified, likewise tend to inflict confusion and panic over how best to placate them. A key to understanding the phenomenon of vengeful spirits in premodern Japanese literature and society is the act of mediation. In the case of vengeful spirits, mediation is the process by which incomprehensible phenomena and the voices of the dead are transformed into comprehensible accounts and stories. In other words, *mononoke* and *onryō* necessitate interpretation, and their discursive function in texts is often to signify or speak for more than just themselves.

This dissertation is organized into four main chapters that roughly follow a chronological order. Both Chapters One and Two deal with *Genji monogatari*. Chapter One examines the undecidable nature of *mononoke* and challenges common understandings of the identities of these spirits, such as Rokujō no miyasudokoro. Chapter Two focuses on the significance of kinship in relation to vengeful spirits and how connections to such spirits reinforce genealogical legitimacy. Chapter Three evaluates the writings of Jien, a chief abbot of the Tendai sect, further examining the interdependency between genealogical legitimacy, Buddhist rhetoric, and *onryō*. Chapter Four considers various historical records and literature related to one of the most feared

⁷ Roland Barthes states, “any system, which consists of a large number of signifieds for a restricted number of signifiers, generates anxiety... On the contrary, any inverse system (with a large number of signifiers and reduced number of signifieds) is a system which makes for euphoria.” See his *Fashion System* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), 287. The ambiguous word, *mono*, which itself has a large number of signifieds, may appropriately suggest the uncertainty and uneasiness of the being, *mononoke*, it signifies.

vengeful spirits in Japanese history, the Retired Emperor Sutoku, to investigate the formation of *onryō*. Although I focus on narrative tales, or *monogatari* 物語, especially *Genji monogatari* 源氏物語 (1001–?) and *Hōgen monogatari* 保元物語 (13th century); my methodology is not confined to one particular genre of primary texts and includes official chronicles, such as *Rikkokushi* 六国史 (720–901); courtier diaries, such as *Teishinkōki* 貞信公記 (907–48) and *Kikki* 吉記 (1142–1200); genealogical texts, such as *Tōshi kaden* 藤氏家伝 (760); and Buddhist prayers dating from the ninth to the fourteenth centuries.

In examining vengeful spirits as a social practice as well as a rhetorical tool in premodern literature, this dissertation presents the first comprehensive English-language study of vengeful spirits in Japan between the eleventh and early fourteenth centuries. This project not only contributes to literary studies but to social and cultural history as well, by demonstrating the significant roles played by vengeful spirits in defining genealogies and producing literature. I argue that in premodern Japan, vengeful spirits provided the imperial family and elite aristocrats, especially the Fujiwara family, political and genealogical legitimacy. In other words, for the highest elites, it was crucial to either become a vengeful spirit or to be haunted by one to gain authority as a rightful member of a powerful family. These spirits were equally important in the literary realm as rhetorical devices that signal to readers to look for what is not explicitly narrated in the text, especially in the context of family and genealogy. *Mononoke* serve as mediators between texts and readers, as well as between past, present, and future.

The Emergence of *Onryō* in History

Dealing with extraordinary and unpredictable occurrences, including natural disasters and strange illnesses, was a crucial part of life in premodern Japan. Numerous texts recorded such incidents involving *mononoke*, *onryō*, and *goryō* 御霊 (august spirits), including official chronicles, courtier diaries, commentaries, and narrative tales. The word *mononoke* is used in official chronicles to describe these unusual occurrences as early as the ninth century in *Shoku Nihon kōki* 続日本後紀 (869).⁸ Fujimoto Katsuyoshi argues that in the early- to mid-Heian period, the Chinese characters 物恠 were used to describe natural disasters and mysterious phenomena rather than individual cases of sickness and spirit possession. Later, the characters *mononoke* 物の怪 and the word *mononoke* largely came to indicate an *unidentified* malicious and uncanny spirit—usually that of a person who died in indignation.⁹

One of the earliest recorded *identified* spirits (a nascent form of *onryō*), was that of Prince Nagaya 長屋 (684–729), a son of Prince Takechi 高市 (654–96) and grandson of Emperor Tenmu 天武 (?–686). Prince Nagaya was forced to commit suicide as a result of political conflicts with four sons of Fujiwara Fuhito 藤原不比等 (659–720)—Muchimaro 武智麻呂 (680–737), Fusasaki 房前 (681–737), Umakai 宇合 (694–737) and Maro 麻呂 (695–737)—during the reign of Emperor Shōmu 聖武 (701–65). The political machinations of these four sons are collectively known as “Shinshi Jiken” 辛巳事件. *Shoku Nihongi* 続日本紀 (797) records in detail the events of the tenth day of the second month in 729, on which the Fujiwara arrested

⁸ The meaning of the ambiguous and all-inclusive word, *mono* apparently signified things that were beyond human power and possibly frightening. See Fujimoto, *Genji monogatari no “mononoke,”* 30–33.

⁹ See Fujimoto, *Genji monogatari no mononoke*, 30–33; and Yamauchi, *Mononoke*, 47.

Prince Nagaya for plotting to overthrow the state.¹⁰ The Prince died just two days later by his own hand.

The emergence of Prince Nagaya's wrathful spirit following his death can be found in *Nihon ryōiki* 日本靈異記 (822?). According to this Buddhist *setsuwa* (didactic tales) collection, after Nagaya committed suicide, his body was burned, crushed, and then thrown into the river while his bones were buried in Tosa province, all by imperial order.¹¹ Soon after, residents in Tosa became afraid when many people were said to have died because of his evil spirit, and they made an appeal to the court. The truth of the matter is difficult to discern, since *Shoku Nihongi* states that his bones and corpse were placed in a grave with his wife, Princess Kibi, at Mt. Ikoma just a couple of days after his death.¹² While we cannot determine the exact date that the episode was told or recorded, it is clear that the spirit of Prince Nagaya was believed to have caused mass death and was greatly feared. Furthermore, in 735 and 739, an epidemic (likely smallpox) spread over the archipelago, killing the four Fujiwara brothers who were involved in Nagaya's death.¹³ As scholars have already noted, Prince Nagaya's spirit was believed to have been the cause of this epidemic. In addition to literary works, official accounts such as *Shoku Nihongi* also attest to how in the midst of this pestilence, Nagaya's accusers had made "false accusations," hinting that

¹⁰ 二月辛未。左京人從七位下漆部造君足。無位中臣宮處連東人等告密。称、左大臣正二位長屋王私学左道。欲傾国家。其夜。遣使固守三閤。因遣式部卿從三位藤原朝臣宇合。衛門佐從五位下佐味朝臣虫麻呂。左衛士佐外從五位下津嶋朝臣家道。右衛士佐外從五位下紀朝臣佐比物等。將六衛兵。圍長屋王宅。 *Shoku Nihongi*, in *Shintei zōho kokushi taiki* (hereafter *SZKT*), vol. 2 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2007), 115.

¹¹ Keikai, *Nihon(koku) genhōzenaku ryōiki*, ed. Nakada Norio, in *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* (hereafter *SNKBZ*), vol. 10 (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1995), 120.

¹² *Shoku Nihongi*, *SZKT*, 2: 115.

¹³ Between the eighth month of Tenpyō 7 and Spring of Tenpyō 9, there were four large waves of this epidemic. Fujiwara Muchimaro, Fusasaki, Maro, and Umakai all died in Tenpyō 9 (737). See *Shoku Nihongi*, *SZKT*, 2: 139–49.

Nagaya's death was the result of a wrongful doing.¹⁴ Eventually, Prince Nagaya's sons and daughters were restored to their original ranks or even promoted in order to pacify his spirit.¹⁵

Although the text does not use the term “*onryō*” just yet, this incident involving Prince Nagaya exemplifies an early prototype of the process of an *onryō* figure's birth, influence, and pacification. First, the *onryō* was a member of high nobility who lost a political conflict and died in indignation. Part of becoming an *onryō* seems to also typically involve false rumors, such as the stories recorded in *Shoku Nihongi* and *Nihon ryōiki*. Epidemics and death are some of the most common and fatal elements of retribution/vengeance (*tatari* 祟り) caused by such spirits.¹⁶ Finally, to pacify such *onryō*, it was necessary to clear the false charges and bestow a higher rank upon the individual who had been wronged, as well as his/her family. Moreover, I argue that *onryō* are strongly associated with both the imperial family and the Fujiwara family. Prince Nagaya is a perfect example since he was both a member of the imperial family as well as related to the Fujiwara by marriage. One of his wives was Fujiwara Fuhito's own daughter, Nagako 長娥子, whose brothers plotted the Prince's death.

Prince Nagaya's episode also serves as a helpful prelude to examine the relationship between the capital and *onryō*. At the time of Nagaya's death, Heijō-kyō 平城京 had already enjoyed a relatively long history as a political capital for seventy years. Many people gathered and lived in the carefully planned city. Interestingly, the episode of Prince Nagaya claims that

¹⁴ 天平十年（七三八）七月丙子【十】》○丙子。左兵庫少属従八位下大伴宿禰子虫。以刀斫殺右兵庫頭外従五位下中臣宮処連東人。初子虫、事長屋王、頗蒙恩遇。至是、適与東人任於比竊。政事之隙、相共囿碁。語及長屋王。憤發而罵。遂引劍斫而殺之。東人、即誣告長屋王事之人也。 *Shoku Nihongi*, SZKT, 2: 152.

¹⁵ Yamada Yūji, *Sutoku-in onryō no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2001), 13.

¹⁶ In early Japan, the term *tatari* 祟り had been mostly used to describe divine punishment by non-human gods. For more on how the dead came to be deified and worshipped, see Satō Hiroo, *Hitogami shinkō no keifu* (Tokyo: Iwata Shoten, 2012).

because of the Tosa people's appeal, the court relocated Nagaya's corpse from Tosa to a location near the capital (皇都に近づけむが為に) in the province of Kii.¹⁷ While the *Nihon ryōiki* episode conflicts with other information regarding the actual gravesite of Prince Nagaya, this narrative demonstrates an intriguing relationship between the capital, authority, and *onryō*, hinting that the spirit of an *onryō* needs to rest at a proper place, preferably in or near the capital. This pattern that begins with Prince Nagaya—a wronged political figure, ensuing disaster, and reconciliation on the part of the court and high-ranking aristocrats—is one that was repeated throughout the Heian period and beyond.

While moving *onryō* nearer to the capital was an important element of pacification, even more crucial was identifying and naming them.¹⁸ Typically, authorized officials from the Department of Divinities (*jingi-kan* 神祇官) who were able to perform augury were appointed to identify the *onryō*.¹⁹ We can find extant records of the codes and regulations for *jingi-kan* as early as 833, when the first commentary on Ritsuryō codes (*Ryōnogige* 令義解) were compiled.²⁰ From the late eighth century onward, according to Ōe Atsushi, as *onmyōdō* became popular, *onmyō* masters (*onmyōshi* 陰陽師) began to officially perform divinations alongside *jingi-kan*.²¹

¹⁷ *Nihon ryōiki*, SNKBZ, 10: 120.

¹⁸ Ōe Atsushi, *Nihon kodai no kami to rei* (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 2007), 15–43.

¹⁹ *Shoku Nihongi* describes great concern about rumors regarding a vengeful spirit, likely that of Tachibana no Naramaro, who was arrested for plotting against Fujiwara no Nakamaro and died after being tortured during the Tenpyō era (729–49). According to the text, a statement was issued warning that anyone who circulated false rumors, regardless of the degree of offence, would be punished. On the seventh month of 757, the entry reads 民間或有仮託亡魂。浮言紛紜。擾乱郷邑者。不論輕重。皆与同罪。普告遐邇、宜絶妖源。 *Shoku Nihongi*, SZKT, 2: 237.

²⁰ *Ryōnogige*, in *Shinten*, ed. Ōkura Seishin Bunka Kenkyūjo (Yokohama: Ōkura Seishin Bunka Kenkyūjo, 1987), 979.

²¹ *Onmyōdō* was institutionalized as a *ryō* 寮 (in line with the *ritsuryō* system) as an official division of the Department of Nakatsukasasho in the *Yorōritsuryō* code 757. See Ōe, *Nihon kodai no kami to rei*, 93–100.

Another turning point for understanding the concept of *onryō* was when Prince Sawara was officially recognized as *onryō* and recorded as such in the late eighth century. In 785, Fujiwara no Tanetsugu 藤原種継 (737–85), a grandson of Fujiwara no Umakai, the founder of the Shiki branch of the Fujiwara, was murdered. Fujiwara Tanetsugu was responsible for planning the capital prior to Heian-kyō, Nagaoka-kyō. Since Emperor Kanmu's 桓武 (737–806) brother and the first heir to the throne, Prince Sawara, was opposed to Tanetsugu's plan to move the capital, Prince Sawara became a suspect in Tanetsugu's murder. According to *Nihon kiryaku* 日本紀略 (c. late eleventh century), on the twenty-third day of the ninth month of 785, Tanetsugu was shot and killed; five days later, Prince Sawara was disinherited and expelled from the capital to Awaji 淡路 province.²² Prince Sawara starved himself for more than ten days and died en route.²³ Although Prince Sawara's involvement in the assassination of Tanetsugu remained unclear, his restless soul became one of most famous *onryō* in early Japan.

In 792, the court officially recognized Prince Sawara's vengeful spirit, using the specific term *onryō* for the first time in extant records. When the new Crown Prince after Sawara, Ate 安殿 (later Emperor Heizei 平城, 774–824), fell seriously ill, a *jingi-kan* pronounced the cause of disease to be retribution by the deceased Prince Sawara (皇太子久病、卜之崇道天皇為祟、遣諸陵頭調使主等淡路国、奉謝其靈).²⁴ As some scholars agree, Emperor Kanmu's decision to move the capital to Heian-kyō 平安京 may have been in part to escape from Sawara's *onryō*.²⁵

²² *Nihon kiryaku*, SZKT, 10: 260.

²³ *Nihon kiryaku*, SZKT, 10: 260.

²⁴ The text addresses Prince Sawara as Sudō Tennō although his posthumous name was not given until 800: 延暦十九年廿三巳未 詔曰。云々。宜故皇太子早良親王追稱崇道天皇。This portion of *Nihon kiryaku* was likely written or edited at a later time. *Nihon kiryaku*, SZKT, 10: 275.

²⁵ The word *onryō* first appears in the official chronicle in 804: 延暦廿四年四月庚申。謝怨靈也。*Nihon kiryaku*, SZKT, 10: 282.

Prince Sawara's incident demonstrates that identification itself is a gesture of pacification as well as domestication. In Sawara's case, after he was identified, Prince Sawara was promoted to emperor and given the posthumous name Sudō 崇道. In other words, such a spirit was expected to have a new identity and be reincorporated into the imperial family structure.²⁶ As historian Kobayashi Shigefumi points out, this can also be seen as a shift in that vengeful spirits or *onryō*, such as of Prince Sawara, came to be something controllable by the imperial family with proper pacification and rituals.²⁷

While naming and pacification formed a major method to domesticate vengeful spirits, this was also an opportunity for the imperial family to publicly display their power to control *onryō*.²⁸ As often pointed out, the term *goryō* was recorded for the first time in *Nihon Sandai jitsuroku* 日本三代実録 (901), when a *goryō-e* ritual was held at the imperial palace compound in the city of Heian-kyō.²⁹ On the twentieth day of the fifth month of 863, a large, court-sponsored ritual to repose the souls of the dead—known as *goryō-e* 御霊会—was held at Shinsen-en 神泉苑 in the capital during Emperor Saga's 嵯峨 (786–842) reign. Prior to the ritual festival, according to *Nihon Sandai jitsuroku*, heavy rains flooded the capital, and an epidemic decimated the peasants. Many believed that the spirits of political victims were responsible, and in order to rectify the situation, the imperial court held this momentous purification ritual to appease these spirits and to deify them as gods (*goryō* 御霊).³⁰ The court enshrined the vengeful spirits of political victims including Sudō Tenno (d. 785), Iyo Shino (d. 807), Fujiwara Bunin

²⁶ *Nihon kiryaku*, SZKT, 10: 275.

²⁷ Kobayashi Shigefumi, "Sawara shinnō onryō gensetsu no hatsumei," *Shigaku* 79, no. 3 (July 2010): 211–44.

²⁸ Herman Ooms, *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650–800* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), 228.

²⁹ *Nihon Sandai jitsuroku*, in SZKT, 4: 112–13.

³⁰ *Nihon Sandai jitsuroku*, SZKT, 4: 112–13.

(Yoshiko) (d. 807), Kansatsushi (Fujiwara no Nakanari) (d. 810), Tachibana no Hayanari (d. 847), and Bunya no Miyatamaro (d. 843). Almost all of these figures were feared to have become vengeful spirits after being killed during political turmoil or exiled for “crimes for which they were falsely accused” (並坐事被誅。冤魂成厲).³¹

We can see how the pacification ritual (*goryō-e* 御靈会) included characteristics of syncretism of Buddhism, Shintō, and various other beliefs. The *Nihon Sandai jitsuroku* entry explains that it was led by Fujiwara no Mototsune 藤原基經 (836–91), an adopted son of Yoshifusa, and Fujiwara Tsuneyuki 藤原常行 (836–75). The Master of Discipline, Etatsu 慧達 (796–878) from the Hossō 法相 School, gave lectures, and the court arranged for *gagaku* 雅樂 and *sangaku* 猿樂 performances. Four gates of the garden were opened to the public and many commoners attended. As Kadoya Atsushi explains, reciting six volumes of the Heart Sutra aloud for the pacification rituals demonstrates an expectation of incantatory effects of sutras for pacification and the incorporation of Buddhism into *kami* rituals.³²

While such rituals were not exclusively held in the capital, the court attempted to impart their own rituals with special meaning. *Nihon Sandai jitsuroku* records that there had been various *goryō* rituals held outside of the capital among commoners, which included the recitation

³¹ 日壬午。於神泉苑修御靈会。勅遣左近衛中将從四位下藤原朝臣基經。右近衛權中将從四位下兼行內藏頭藤原朝臣常行等。監会事。王公卿士趣集共觀。靈座六前設施几筵。盛陳花果。恭敬薰修。延律師慧達為講師。演說金光明經一部。般若心經六卷。命雅樂寮伶人作樂。以帝近侍兒童及良家稚子為舞人。大唐高麗更出而舞。雜伎散樂競尽其能。此日宣旨。開苑四門。聽都邑人出入縱觀。所謂御靈者。崇道天皇。伊予親王。藤原夫人。及觀察使。橘逸勢。文室宮田麻呂等是也。並坐事被誅。冤魂成厲。近代以來。疫病繁發。死亡甚衆。天下以為。此災。御靈之所生也。始自京畿。爰及外国。每至夏天秋節。修御靈会。往々不斷。或礼仏說經。或歌且舞。令童貫之子觀粧馳射。膂力之士袒裼相撲。騎射呈藝。走馬爭勝。倡優嫵戲。遞相誇競。聚而觀者莫不填咽。遐邇因循。漸成風俗。今茲春初咳逆成疫。百姓多斃。朝廷為祈。至是乃修此会。以賽宿禱也。 *Nihon Sandai jitsuroku*, SZKT, vol. 4, 112–13.

³² Kadoya Atsushi, “Goryō-e to Shinbutsu shūgō,” *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō* 63, no. 3 (March 1998): 138–45.

of sutras, dance and music performances, sumo, bow shooting, and horse riding competitions. These rituals were apparently regular occurrences due to massive numbers of peasant deaths from epidemics. As Komine Kazuaki suggests, although there were rumors and hypotheses regarding the cause of the epidemics, it is likely that the rituals outside the capital did not specify any particular individual *goryō* as the responsible party.³³ Therefore, the imperial court's *goryō-e* is significant in two major ways. First, it officially pronounced a link between the epidemic and six specific *onryō*; and second, the court specified previously unnamed *onryō* and domesticated them by bringing them into the *goryō* system and thereby into the imperial family within the capital. Many scholars, including Neil McMullin, Kuroda Toshio, and Herman Ooms, have already pointed out that rituals of purification and pacification legitimated imperial rule.³⁴ Here I wish to emphasize that *onryō* management became a part of privileged politics for the imperial family and the Fujiwara from the eighth and ninth centuries onward.

The belief that natural disasters were caused by wrathful *kami*, or gods in general, as a type of divine punishment was common throughout East Asia at this time. Such notions were in part based on a theory of correlation between heaven and humans (*tenjin sōkan setsu* 天人相関説) and theories regarding natural disasters and strange phenomena (*saii setsu* 災異説) often attributed to Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (179–104 BCE). Such theories were interpreted by Japanese intellectuals and officials and applied to Japanese customs and legal codes.³⁵ A

³³ Komine Kazuaki, “Goryō Shinkōron” in *Kyōgi no shisō e*, ed. Akasaka Norio (Tokyo: Shin’yōsha, 1992), 142–43.

³⁴ See Kuroda Toshio, “Kenmitsu Bukkyō to chinkon,” in his *Kuroda Toshio chosakushū*, vol. 3 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1995), 131–84; Neil McMullin, “On Placating the Gods and Pacifying the Populace: The Case of the Gion “Goryō” Cult,” *History of Religions* 27, no. 3 (1988): 270–93; and Herman Ooms, *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650–800* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009).

³⁵ Kure Asao, “Kodai shiryō (shisho, hōten) to kaii,” in *Kaiigaku nyūmon* (Tokyo: Iwata Shoten), 50–63.

comprehensive study of Japan's adopted *ritsuryō* system and legal codes in relation to Chinese thought and political systems is beyond the scope of this dissertation; however, it is significant that in premodern Japan, rather than attributing natural disasters to a ruler's failing, individual *onryō* were often blamed for such calamities.

Although some emperors conceded that *onryō* emerged under their rulership, thereby indirectly admitting a degree of their or their predecessors' misrule, imperial authority was rarely threatened. Not only did emperors and the court tend to escape blame for causing such disasters, in fact they demonstrated their authority in subduing the rage of vengeful spirits in various ways, such as granting pardons, reducing taxes, and exercising pacification rituals in and outside of the capital. The court further cemented their special ability to pacify spirits on the fourteenth day of the sixth month of 865, when they issued an order to prohibit the populace from assembling and conducting public pacification rituals without the court's permission.³⁶ Without being challenged in their right to rule, Japanese emperors and the court could amplify their political authority and present themselves as legitimate rulers, even virtuous and kind ones, by demonstrating control over *onryō*.³⁷

These early sources created a persistent *onryō* rhetoric and a sort of "life-cycle" of *onryō*, which laid down certain rules about who could become *onryō*, who could appease them,

³⁶ McMullin, "On Placating the Gods and Pacifying the Populace."

³⁷ Some scholars have argued that *Goryō shinkō* in fact exemplifies popular beliefs and even represents a kind of resistance toward authoritative institutions. Post-World War II scholarship on *Goryō shinkō* was imbedded in post-war mass social movements, *minshū undo*, led by scholars including Takatori Masao, Shibata Minoru, and Murayama Shūichi. Influenced by such early ethnologists and anthropologists as Yanagita Kunio, they tended to assess belief in *goryō* and *goryō-e* as emerging from folk beliefs and developing into a form of resistance by commoners against authority, who in turn felt regretful for causing the emergence of vengeful spirits and thus sponsored public pacification rituals, especially the Jōgan *goryō-e*. While most studies tend to focus on the official Jōgan *goryō-e*, it is important to acknowledge that *Goryō shinkō* involved multiple groups/classes of people with differing motivations. See Murayama Shūichi, *Tenjin shinkō* (Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1990); Takatori Masao, *Minkan shinkōshi no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1982); and Shibata Minoru, *Goryō shinkō*. (Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1984).

and how they could be temporarily placated but never entirely pacified. Despite efforts to pacify *onryō* by the imperial court, the vengeful spirits seemed to constantly return. In the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries, we find these revenant spirits joined by newly created *mononoke* and *onryō* in all manner of written works, and this is where my study begins.

Frameworks: Mediation, *Monogatari*, and Genealogy

There are three central themes that I intend to pursue through the study of *mononoke* and *onryō*. First, the term “mediation” suggests reconstructing and rearticulating the voices of the deceased in a mediumistic sense. The question posed by scholars such as Edward Said and Richard Okada—Who speaks? For what and for whom?—is highly relevant here.³⁸ Second is the question of what narrative tales, or *monogatari*, are in premodern contexts. What do *monogatari* do? How do they differ, if indeed they do, from other forms of texts, such as official chronicles, in terms of telling the stories of *mononoke*? Third is the notion of genealogies, which I use in two senses: (1) the genealogy (*keizu/kakeizu* 系図/家系図) of the imperial line and other important aristocratic families in Japanese history that played roles in the birth and continuation of *mononoke* and *onryō* phenomena, and (2) the genealogical interdependency between *monogatari*, *mononoke*, and sovereignty, especially within the imperial family and Fujiwara governance. What is the connection between aristocrat family lines, *onryō*, and politics, and what does it mean to have well-known *mononoke* in the family?

³⁸ Edward Said, “Representing the Colonized: Anthropology’s Interlocutors,” *Critical Inquiry* 15, no 2 (Winter 1989): 212; and Richard H. Okada, “Speaking For: Surrogates and *The Tale of Genji*,” in *Crossing the Bridge: Comparative Essays on Medieval European and Heian Japanese Women Writers*, ed. Barbara Stevenson and Cynthia O. Ho (New York: Palgrave, 2000), 5–27.

Mediating the Voices of the Dead

Questions surrounding “mediation” and “who speaks for whom,” are crucial ones. In the same manner in which all communication can be considered to be an act of translation, reading the utterances of the dead in *monogatari*, needless to say, can never be entirely transparent communication.³⁹ It is always an act of translation that involves several agencies. *Mononoke* commonly speak through a medium (*yorimashi* 憑坐), often a woman or child, whereupon *onmyō* masters (*onmyōji* 陰陽師) and/or Buddhist priests then interpret the utterance. The Department of Divinities (*jingikan* 神祇官) was frequently involved in the process of mediation, performing augury to interpret the medium’s utterances.⁴⁰ Within the realm of written and spoken narratives, this chain of mediation can be much longer: the voices of the dead are retold by the narrator(s) often through the act of overhearing, recorded by the writer(s), often read aloud by primary readers, later copied by copyists, commented upon by annotators, transcribed and translated into print versions, and read by contemporary readers.

Although I will constrain my focus to emphasize socio/religio-political forces and their agency as the primary mediums of the deceased’s voice, it is important to keep in mind this longer chain of mediation, a chain in which I too am participating. For I am also admittedly

³⁹ My discussion of non-transparent communication and issues of translation here is inspired by Naoki Sakai’s argument of uncommunicability within homolingual communities. See Naoki Sakai, “Introduction: Writing for Multiple Audiences and the Heterolingual Address,” in his *Translation and Subjectivity: On “Japan” and Cultural Nationalism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 1–17.

⁴⁰ Yamada Yūji, “Onryō no shiso,” in *Nihon shisōshi kōza*, vol. 1, ed. Karube Tadashi, Kurozumi Makoto, and Satō Hiroo (Tokyo: Perikansha, 2012), 254. Yamada discusses how outside of the court or capital, religious practitioners such as *yamabushi* 山伏 (male Shugendō mountain ascetics) and *arukimiko* 歩き巫女 (female spirit mediums) served the local populace to perform pacification rituals instead of high-ranking Buddhists priests. For further reading on *miko*, see Lori Meeks, “The Disappearing Medium: Reassessing the Place of Miko in the Religious Landscape of Premodern Japan,” *History of Religions* 50, no. 3 (2011): 208–60.

speaking for *mononoke* in my own scholarship. As a female Japanese graduate student in the United States, I speak for premodern Japanese texts and the *mononoke* depicted within, mediating them into English academic discourse.

In doing so, however, I wish to avoid merely trying to demystify or disenchant premodern Japan. In particular, I hope to avoid historicizing extraordinary phenomena and spiritual beings into what Dipesh Chakrabarty and Bliss Cua Lim have described as modern capitalist homogeneous time⁴¹ and distance myself from worldviews that characterize belief in “supernatural agency” as primitive and irrational.⁴² I aim to avoid any potentially misleading division between the so-called “natural” and “supernatural.” There is always a risk when analyzing premodern discourse to domesticate it through language and concepts suitable for the modern world, effacing the latent otherness.

As Dipesh Chakrabarty argues, the realm of “the religious, the supernatural, the divine, and the ghostly” presents a problem of translation with regard to modern academic language and homogeneous time. In other words, gods and spirits challenge the disenchanted languages of history and social science whose discourses are based on the impulse for “structure of generality,” naturalization, and categorization. “Supernatural” events defy this impulse by way of

⁴¹ I borrow the concept of “homogeneous time” from Bliss Cua Lim, who integrates Henri Bergson’s analysis of temporal heterogeneity into her discussion of the fantastic cinema in postcolonial discourse. Lim describes homogeneous time as a constructed modern historical linear time, epitomized by the evolutionary view and ideology of progress, serving as a temporal justification for imperialist expansion. Bliss Cua Lim, *Translating Time: Cinema, the Fantastic, and Temporal Critique* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009), 12–13.

⁴² My discussion and ideas of untranslatability and supernatural agency in homogeneous and heterogeneous communities are inspired by Bliss Cua Lim, Dipesh Chakrabarty, and Henri Bergson. See Lim, *Translating Time*; Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Chakrabarty, “The Time of History and the Times of Gods,” in *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital*, ed. Lisa Lowe and David Lloyd (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 35–60; and Henri Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, trans. Arthur Mitchell (New York: Holt and Company, 1911).

their contingency, singularity, and “radical untranslatability.”⁴³ Chakrabarty’s analysis is particularly important to remind us that multi-layered mediation and translation is always at work when investigating premodern (or what he calls nonmodern) “supernaturalism,” which may in essence be untranslatable and “unassimilable” to modern times.⁴⁴

Admittedly, Chakrabarty is more narrowly focused on the problems faced by European historians in their confrontation with the “supernatural” and the issues of presentation of the history of the Other. In the study of premodern Japanese literature, one of the challenges that scholars face is what Richard Okada has described as the “naturalization” and/or “domestication” of literature.⁴⁵ Okada’s analysis echoes Chakrabarty’s problematization of assimilating the untranslatable into modern scholarly discourse. For the sake of accessibility and comprehension of the literature of the Other, and by using tools to analyze literature in the western academic discourse (i.e., close reading, narratology, and other literary modes of analysis), we tend to lend ourselves to the project of domesticating the other/the object of our studies. Thus, there is a need not simply for translation but for conscious mediation. As Richard Okada asserts, awareness that one is “speaking for” someone or something should not be confused with an attempt to provide the other with a true voice, but to recognize that “there is only ever speaking for.”⁴⁶ I hope to continue this discussion by making my work dealing with *mononoke* in premodern Japan a moment of critical intervention, a place to question the consequences of mediating the untranslatable and nonmodern into present-day scholarly language and to challenge conventional readings of iconic texts.

⁴³ Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 82–83.

⁴⁴ See Bliss Cua Lim’s discussion in *Translating Time*, 19.

⁴⁵ See Okada’s review of Norma Fields’s *Splendor of Longing in The Tale of Genji* and Haruo Shirane’s *The Bridge of Dreams: A Poetics of the Tale of Genji* in “Domesticating the *Tale of Genji*,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 110, no. 1 (1990): 60–70.

⁴⁶ Okada, “Speaking for,” 9.

Monogatari

What makes *monogatari* different from other literary forms? A great number of writers, annotators, and scholars have devoted themselves to tracing the development of *monogatari*. A core debate over *monogatari* and its distinguishing characteristics can be found within the text of *Genji monogatari* itself, a canonical work that has long been considered a locus of the debate, not only for its wealth of literary qualities but also its confirmation of other precedents, such as *Katano no shōshō* 交野少将 (no longer extant), the late-ninth-century *Taketori monogatari* 竹取物語, and the late-tenth-century *Utsuho monogatari* 宇津保物語.⁴⁷ One episode in particular has elicited much scholarly attention: the famous “defense of narrative” (*monogatari ron* 物語論) between Genji and Tamakazura in the “Fireflies” (*Hotaru* 蛍) chapter. Many scholars believe this passage reflects the author’s intention to defend fiction with respect to history or official chronicles.⁴⁸ They claim that Genji valorizes the narrative form by stating that official records represent only a limited perspective, whereas *monogatari* reveal the real details of life and

⁴⁷ It is well known that *Genji monogatari* names *Taketori monogatari* as the origin, or “parent,” of *monogatari* (*monogatari no idekihajime no oya* 物語のいできはじめの親). See *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, in *SNKBZ*, vol. 21 (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1995), 380.

⁴⁸ *Nihongi* here means a general umbrella term for the state’s historical records, including *Rikkokushi* 六国史. See *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, *SNKBZ*, 22: 210–16.

people, often neglected by official records.⁴⁹ Though I tend to disagree with this reading, it remains the starting point for how we talk about the relationship between history and literature.⁵⁰

My approach to the question of the differences and similarities between *monogatari* and history is to examine how the rhetorical voices of *mononoke* have the power to mediate stories, histories, and even the unnarrated.⁵¹ I will explore questions of mediation and the problematic of “speaking for” beyond the binary notion of fiction versus history. Admittedly, as seen in *Genji monogatari*, just from the fact that *monogatari* had to “defend” itself against historical records, fiction often seems to have occupied a “surrogate position” relative to the “reality” depicted in official chronicles and other texts written in classical Chinese.⁵² In challenging this binary, the conclusion should not simply be the easy rhetorical catch-all that “all histories are constructed and thus fiction,” but rather to continually ask whether—or, more importantly, how—*monogatari* speaks for history and vice versa. By so doing, rather than define what is *monogatari*

⁴⁹ One strand of this line of thought can be traced to one of the leading scholars of the eighteenth century, Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801), who analyzed this same passage and claimed the authorial intention in *monogatari ron* placed privilege on *monogatari* over historical records. Many established *Genji* scholars, including Akiyama Ken, Yamanaka Yutaka, and Yoshioka Hiroshi frequently refer to Norinaga’s argument, and one of the central discussions in the field has focused on the dynamics of *monogatari* and historical records, in which many scholars look for correspondence and/or precedents (*junkyo* 準拠 and/or *tenkyo* 典拠) between fictitious events/figures and historical events/figures. In his discussion, Motoori Norinaga, a nativist, also emphasizes the significant role of *kana* and *kanbun* writing for the definition of *monogatari*, criticizing Chinese style of writing. In addition, he develops the relationship between *mono no aware* and *monogatari* in the same section. See Motoori Norinaga, “*Genji monogatari tama no ogushi*” in *Motoori Norinaga zenshū*, vol. 4 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969), 187–200. For further discussion of Motoori Norinaga on *Genji monogatari*, see Tomiko Yoda, *Gender and National Literature: Heian Texts in the Constructions of Japanese Modernity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).

⁵⁰ I am not the first to disagree with this interpretation for two main reasons. First, it is difficult if not impossible or meaningless to assert the author’s intentions. Second, *Genji* is interacting in a highly flirtatious manner and may not be revealing his inner most thoughts on literary forms.

⁵¹ Fujii Sadakazu asserts that the essence and critical method of *monogatari* lies in the realm that is “not narrated” in the text, and the narrative written in text is merely a glimpse of the larger world behind. See Fujii Sadakazu, “Kyōdo tōgi: Higuchi Ichiyō no sakuhin o yomu,” in *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū* 29, no. 13 (October 1984): 94. For further discussion of the development of *monogatari* and Fujii’s theory, see his *Monogatari bungaku seiritsushi: Furukoto, katari, monogatari* (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1987).

⁵² Okada, “Speaking for,” 23.

and/or history as well as other genre of writings, my study will show how the discourse of *mononoke/onryō* can be found beyond today's so-called genres and disciplines, and how *mononoke*, *monogatari*, and history are interdependent. For this exploration, I propose to examine the rhetorical voice of *mononoke* as narrator and character in both literary and historical texts.

The narrator in *monogatari* is someone or something who mediates plots, characters' voices, gazes, and innermost thoughts to audiences, and whose position is frequently unstable, opinionated, and protean. Although scholars dispute the concept and function of *monogatari*, they tend to agree that the very word “*monogatari*” literally “telling stories,” contains the verb “*kataru*” 語る and requires a narrator or *katarite* 語り手, in addition to a listener or *kikite* 聞き手.⁵³ In most of the literature produced in my target period, it is easy to find a strong sense of the narrators' presence in the texts as well as their supposed listeners in and outside of the texts. Furuhashi Nobutaka and Hyōdō Hiromi, among others, have suggested that the prefix *mono* in *monogatari* may imply a relationship between spirits and sacred words, with *monogatari* emerging from an oral tradition, especially since the term *gatari/katari* 語り literally means to “speak” and/or “tell.”⁵⁴

This dissertation explores the rich topic of *mononoke* and *onryō* as narrators in addition to their role as characters. One of the most notable narrative techniques in *Genji monogatari* is what

⁵³ It is important to keep in mind that in many pieces of literature in premodern Japanese there are plural voices, several types of narrators, and shifting perspectives. Additionally, very often *monogatari* contain “the writer,” or more precisely, the scribe, as a character, which is again different from the author. The borders between the narrator (*katarite*), the writer (*kakite*), and the author are also unstable. See also Mitani Kuniaki, *Monogatari bungaku no hōhō*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1989), 113–22.

⁵⁴ Hyōdō Hiromi, *Ōken to monogatari* (Tokyo: Seikyūsha, 1989), 45–51. See also Furuhashi Nobuyoshi, *Monogatari bungaku no tanjō: Man'yōshū kara no bungakushi* (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 2000).

Mitani Kuniaki calls *jiyū kansetsu gensetsu*, or what could be termed “free indirect speech.”

Mitani analyzes the narrative of *Genji monogatari* with the technique of *jiyū kansetsu gensetsu* in which the lack of quotation marks allows a merging of the narrator’s voice (*sōshi ji* 草子地) or the descriptive narration (*ji no bun* 地の文) and the character’s voice or character’s innermost thoughts.⁵⁵ As Takahashi Tōru points out, the omniscient, elusive, and shifting narrator’s perspective may even be most analogous to that of *mononoke*.⁵⁶ In the discussion of *monogatari* in my dissertation, I extend this idea of a *mononoke-like* narrator, and I argue that *mononoke* can speak for what is unsaid or unwritten in texts. Their voices, often relayed through strange phenomena, human mediums, or dreams, represent various perspectives on the event that brought about the corporeal death of the now vengeful spirit and can often suggest what might not be explicitly said or written. In other words, the living speak for the dead, and, in turn, the dead are able to say what the living cannot. This characteristic of *mononoke* as narrator can be found in both *monogatari* and official chronicles, and in both cases allows for the violation of social or cultural boundaries.

The narratives of *mononoke* and strange occurrences do not just appear within the genre of narrative fiction. *Mononoke* and *onryō* are ubiquitous beyond so-called genre, appearing as putative narrator, speaker, witness, and character, including victim and victimizer, and monster and guardian deity. The earliest use of the word *onryō* in extant sources can be found in *Nihon*

⁵⁵ Mitani Kuniaki, *Genji monogatari no gensetsu* (Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2002), 62–66.

⁵⁶ Takahashi often uses *mononoke-like* author and narrator alternatively. He is aware of the multi-voiced natures of subjectivities in texts, including that of narrators (*katarite*) and authors (*sakusha*). He acknowledges that there is a continuity of telling and writing *monogatari* by the narrator and the author, as well as the problem of using the word “author” to describe the subjectivities of *monogatari* instead of “narrator (*katarite*).” See Takahashi Tōru, “*Genji monogatari* no ‘mononoke’ to shinteki enkinhō,” in *Nihon ni okeru Shūkyō to bungaku*, ed. Kokusai Nihon Bunka Kenkyū Sentā (Kyoto: Kokusai Nihon Bunka Kenkyū Sentā, 1999): 151–68.

kōki 日本後紀 (840), which records that on the fifth day of the fourth month of 805 the court issued an order to pacify Prince Sawara's vengeful spirit, or *onryō* 怨霊.⁵⁷ As for the word *mononoke*, in addition to its appearance in fiction, such as *Genji monogatari*, *Sagoromo monogatari* 狭衣物語 (c. 1100), and multiple other *monogatari* and *setsuwa*, the characters 物恠, 物怪, and 物氣 are seen in many official chronicles, including *Rikkokushi* 六国史 (720–901) and *Honchō seiki* 本朝世紀 (1150–59). Other courtier diaries such as *Teishin kōki* 貞信公記 (907–48) and *Kikki* 吉記 (1163–93) also frequently record *mononoke* related incidents. *Mononoke* float between literary fiction, courtier diaries, official histories, poems, and picture scrolls, highlighting the “porosity” of story and history, mediums, genre, and time.⁵⁸ By situating *mononoke*'s voices and presences/absences as reminders that stories are narrated through mediation in any type of literature, we can pose and question the possibility of multilayered mediation and open up new readings of a wide range of texts.

Genealogy

Genealogy may at first seem straightforward, but it is full of complexity and intrigue and comprises nothing less than an important genre of literature. Although reading and decoding complex webs of genealogy is beyond the scope of this dissertation, we cannot underestimate the role that genealogy plays in the discourses of *mononoke* or *vice versa*. While there are variations across these broad categories, *onryō* and *mononoke* constitute a particular group of spirits who

⁵⁷ *Nihon kiriyaku*, SZKT, 10: 282; and *Nihon kōki*, SZKT, 3: 41.

⁵⁸ I am borrowing this idea partially from Bliss Cua Lim's argument in response to Todorovian views of the fantastic as a genre and their textual analysis. She points to inadequacy of Tzvetan Todorov's structuralist theory of the fantastic and claims it does not serve well in examining the narrative of Aswang, a folkloristic flesh-eating monster that appeared in the postcolonial Philippines. See Lim, *Translating Time*, 99.

had been wronged in life and died in misfortune, often in exile. The examples of *onryō* figures that I mentioned above were members of imperial lines and the other high-ranking aristocratic families. While they frequently caused country-wide or capital-wide disasters, their individual targets were usually the members and/or descendants of the families of political rivals who brought about their wrongful death. Kinship relationships in the imperial court were elaborate, vast, and convoluted. I am particularly interested in investigating the significance of genealogy in *onryō* and *mononoke* discourse, focusing on the imperial line, and other aristocrat families, especially the Fujiwara.

In my project, I consider Japan's imperial family as a symbolic family line that intermingled with several different bloodlines. What we conventionally consider to be family lines, for example, "the imperial family," "the Northern Fujiwara," "the Southern Fujiwara," "the Tachibana," and "the Sugawara," were in fact far from stable. As a result of intermarriage, adoption, and the imperial practice of princes being removed from the line of succession and taking surnames like Minamoto, Ariwara, and Taira, decoding blood relationships requires careful use of several different genealogical sources. Instead of deciphering historical genealogies, I aim to explore the significant role played by *mononoke* in constructing and strengthening the concept of genealogy and kinship among imagined members of family. In other words, I will examine how *mononoke* facilitate the continued growth and formation of family and legitimize the genealogical relationships between families, often of the imperial family and the Fujiwara, from the past, the present, and into the future.

Rather than directly challenge the imperial house, powerful families sought to legitimize themselves by establishing genealogical connections with the imperial family, as seen in the *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 (720) and *Kojiki* 古事記 (712). In doing so, powerful families also in

effect legitimated the power of the imperial house. Many families' ancestries were documented with anecdotes describing how they were related to the imperial family. These sources are a prime place to trace the genealogy of *mononoke* and *onryō* and a similar discourse that seeks association with the imperial family, often with the rhetoric of both *onryō* (identified) and *mononoke* (typically unidentified) spirits repeatedly seen in later texts. Paying close attention to genealogies brings to light family relationships, especially rivalries and power struggles, which might account for why particular figures came to be represented as *onryō*. In tracing the political rivalry and kinship between families, we find that *mononoke* play an important role, often elucidating hidden family narratives.

Previous Scholarship

My approach is interdisciplinary, integrating religion, history, and literature, and thus will need to respond to prior research across various fields and disciplines. One of the leading book-length pieces of scholarship on *mononoke* in the field of literature is Doris Bargaen's *A Woman's Weapon: Spirit Possession in the Tale of Genji*, focusing on the famous *mononoke* of Rokujō no miyasudokoro, or Lady Rokujō, from a feminist point of view. Bargaen criticizes male-centric views of spirit possession that locate the cause of spirit possession solely within the relationship between Genji and his jealous mistress, radically arguing instead that the possessing spirit empowers the possessed women to say what they could not say in ordinary speech. Both male-centric scholarship and Bargaen's arguments primarily focus on *mononoke* in relation to women's oppression in a polygamous and patriarchal society.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ Doris Bargaen, *A Woman's Weapon: Spirit Possession in the Tale of Genji* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press), 121.

However, *Genji monogatari* does not confine itself to issues of the women's world and female victimization. It also allows us to read about men's private lives and struggles during the period of the northern Fujiwara domination. As Asao Hiroyoshi's work shows, during the Heian period, appearances of *mononoke* were inseparable from scrambles for political power. Overemphasizing the novelty of spirit possession by an individual woman and the putative author's female gender might ironically obscure the significance of other marginal figures and reduce the possibilities of exploring the unnarrated.

For instance, Rokujō no miyasudokoro, one of Hikaru Genji's lovers, is generally considered to be responsible for many spirit possession incidents in the tale, haunting and even killing several other female characters, mostly Genji's other love interests. And yet, there is more at stake here than a tale of feminine empowerment and revenge. Richard Okada, Eno Compton, and several Japanese scholars, such as Asao Hiroyoshi, discuss political aspects of Rokujō no miyasudokoro's spirit possession.⁶⁰ Asano, Okada, and Compton recognize the genealogical significance of Rokujō no miyasudokoro's relation to her husband, the late Crown Prince, whose name and cause of death are not given, and to her late father whose political ambitions for his family may be primarily responsible for Rokujō no miyasudokoro's becoming *mononoke*. My project further traces the genealogical relationship between the families involved in *mononoke* episodes in *Genji monogatari*, closely examining political motivations that the appearance of

⁶⁰ In 2009, I wrote a seminar paper for my late advisor, Richard Okada, dealing with political motives related to the late Crown Prince and Rokujō no miyasudokoro's late father and their genealogical relationship that may empower Rokujō no miyasudokoro's spirit possession. In his "Introduction," Okada acknowledges that his discussion of this issue is partially borrowed from this seminar paper. See his, "Introduction" in *The Tale of Genji: Japanese Literature in English*, vol.1 (New York: Routledge, 2011), 21. See also Asao Hiroyoshi, "Rokujō miyasudokoro to sentei: Mononoke o shiza to shita Genji monogatari no kōzō," *Chūko bungaku*, vol. 35 (May 1985): 19–28; and Eno Compton, "A Genealogy of an Erotic Figure: Reading 'Chinese Influence' of Heian Literature" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2013).

mononoke can mediate for us. By extending the political ramifications of *mononoke* possession episodes throughout the tale, my project is able to show that *mononoke* appearances, disappearances, and even absences are connected by complicated interrelationships between politics and genealogy.

Compared to the large volume and variety of primary documents available dealing with *mononoke*, English-language scholarship has only recently begun to give this subject the serious academic attention it deserves beyond the canonical *Genji monogatari*. Two recent monographs focused on *setsuwa* are particularly noteworthy and relevant to my project: Charlotte Eubanks's *Miracles of Book and Body: Buddhist Textual Culture and Medieval Japan* and Michelle Li's *Ambiguous Bodies: Reading the Grotesque in Japanese Setsuwa Tales*.⁶¹ Eubanks primarily investigates miraculous events and religious experiences, linking human bodies to sacred texts by focusing on Buddhism and social contexts. Drawing from a large number of primary sources in Japanese, classical Chinese, and *kanbun*, Eubanks asks how Buddhist rhetoric, as materialized on the written page, works on human bodies. My own work includes miraculous events in *monogatari*, focusing on the question of "mediation" and how unseen spirits are conveyed and materialized in written texts.

Li's work examines mysterious creatures depicted in *setsuwa* tied closely to Heian and early Kamakura politics. She analyzes several examples of the "grotesque"—borrowing the terminology of Mikhail Bakhtin—including detached body parts, ghosts, and demons (*oni*), arguing that their ambiguous existence both undermined and sustained authority, especially that of the northern branch Fujiwara. Due to her theoretical framework, which focuses on

⁶¹ Michelle Li, *Ambiguous Bodies: Reading the Grotesque in Japanese Setsuwa Tales* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009); and Charlotte D. Eubanks, *Miracles of Book and Body: Buddhist Textual Culture and Medieval Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

characteristics of mysterious or strange creatures and phenomena as “grotesque,” Li’s reading does not extend to other significant roles that such phenomena may play in terms of narration and genealogy. Li’s treatment of the northern branch Fujiwara as a fixed and stable family can also be further complicated and enriched by investigating the nuances of the concept of the Fujiwara family, which was always constantly in-making.

In addition to literary studies, my work also builds on prior scholarship in the fields of history and religion, which have tended to focus on one particular deity or spirit or religious practice, such as Robert Borgen’s and Murayama Shūichi’s studies of the worship of Sugawara no Michizane as the deity Tenjin, and work on Goryō shinkō by Shibata Minoru.⁶² Rather than examine the biographical background of a single spirit or one particular religious practice, I will explore a larger literary practice. Yamada Yūji, one of the most prominent scholars of the history of *onryō*, offers comprehensive and extensive studies of the development of *onryō* in his *Sutoku—in onryō no kenkyū* and *Onryō, kائي, Ise jingū*.⁶³ His work draws upon a vast array of primary sources, such as official chronicles, courtier diaries, sutras, and temples documents, from the eighth through fifteenth centuries, the time period when *onryō* discourse peaked. My own research complements much of Yamada’s by pursuing questions of literary analysis he leaves unanswered; in particular I will examine the question of narration and representation of *onryō* in literary work in addition to the vast range of sources he introduces.⁶⁴

⁶² For example, see Robert Borgen, *Sugawara no Michizane and the Early Heian Court* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1994); Shibata Minoru, *Goryō shinkō* (Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1984); and Murayama Shūichi, *Tenjin goryō shinkō* (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1996).

⁶³ Yamada Yūji, *Sutoku—in onryō no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2001); and Yamada Yūji, *Onryō, kائي, Ise Jingū* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2014).

⁶⁴ For more on *kami* worship, the nascent form of *onryō*, and writing, in preceding periods, see Herman Ooms, *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650–800* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009); Michael Como, *Weaving and Binding: Immigrant Gods and Female Immortals in Ancient Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2010); and David Lurie, *Realms of*

Interdisciplinary projects, such as Haruko Wakabayashi's *Seven Tengu Scrolls: Evil and Rhetoric of Legitimacy in Medieval Japanese Buddhism* and David Bialock's *Eccentric Spaces, Hidden Histories: Narrative, Ritual, and Royal Authority from the Chronicles of Japan to the Tale of the Heike* explore not only the textural mediation of mystical creatures and vengeful spirits but also their representation in visual material and/or ritualistic performance during the late Heian and Kamakura periods.⁶⁵ As his title suggests, Bialock also traces the "hidden" story of the imperial family, which was empowered by Daoist and yin-yang thought in the Nara period, practices to avoid defilement (*kegare*) in the Heian period, and Buddhist doctrine in the medieval period.⁶⁶ I hope to expand his genealogical studies on the relationship between imperial authority and "hidden" religious ideas and practices by focusing on *mononoke* and *onryō*.

I see my project as complementing the above threads of scholarship in both Japanese and English. Through an interdisciplinary approach combining literature, history, and religious studies, my examination of *mononoke* as narrators and key figures in family formation opens new lines of inquiry in reading premodern Japanese texts. In particular I hope to complicate the concept of "mediation" as a larger question about representing and narrating the voices of the deceased and demonstrate how such revenant forces can also "mediate" unnarrated stories.

Literacy: Early Japan and the History of Writing (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2011).

⁶⁵ Wakabayashi's focus on *tengu* as a heuristic device used by Buddhist institutions echoes my argument regarding *onryō*'s mutually dependent relationship with imperial power. See Haruko Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls: Evil and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy in Medieval Japanese Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2012).

⁶⁶ David Bialock, *Eccentric Spaces, Hidden Histories: Narrative, Ritual, and Royal Authority from the Chronicles of Japan to the Tale of the Heike* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007).

Chapter Outline

My first two chapters consider the unnarrated stories buried in the political landscape and genealogies within *Genji monogatari*. Chapter One explores complex relationships between *mononoke* and *monogatari*, focusing on the role of *mononoke* as narrators of the unnarrated. Drawing on Derrida's concepts of the *revenant* and hauntology, my own reading of *mononoke* complements previous political approaches but is not limited to well-studied marriage politics and female victimization, instead challenging the general consensus of *mononoke* identities and motives. Examining the narrative techniques in *Genji monogatari* reveals that *mononoke* are “in essence” undecidable entities, a quality that they share with the nature of *monogatari*. *Mononoke* and *monogatari* help to engender each other, constantly challenging our comprehension and opening up new and multiple readings. This chapter establishes the methodology used throughout the dissertation, which considers *mononoke* as rhetorical tools to read the unnarrated.

Chapter Two turns to analyze the relationship between *mononoke*, genealogy, and family. This chapter goes beyond the simplistic assumption that *mononoke* only exact revenge by haunting a rival's family members and causing trouble. Just as the concept of *mononoke* is ambiguous, kinship in premodern Japan was fluid and unstable. *Mononoke* episodes surrounding characters' sickbeds, deathbeds, as well as birth scenes, reveal *mononoke* roles in incorporating the dead into new family configurations and legitimating family bonds. *Mononoke* and kinship are mutually dependent entities, defining each other from the past and into the future.

Chapter Three further explores *mononoke* and their roles in defining and legitimizing kinship by analyzing Buddhist prayers (*ganmon* 願文) and historical accounts, especially *Gukanshō* 愚管抄 (1220), written by Jien 慈円 (1155–1225), an Archbishop of the Tendai 天台 Buddhist sect. Jien's use of the rhetoric of *dōri* 道理 (reason) and *onryō* 怨霊 demonstrate his efforts

to mediate between this world—the seen world (*kenkai* 顕界)—and the other world—the unseen world (*meikai* 冥界). At the same time, as a member of the powerful Fujiwara family himself, his rhetoric of *mononoke*, *dōri*, and kinship facilitate to authorize religious and political ideologies and elevate his own genealogical status.

Finally, Chapter Four turns to one of the most feared *onryō*, Sutoku-in. Here I trace the process of Sutoku-in's becoming an *onryō* in historical accounts and literature, especially *Hōgen monogatari* 保元物語 (thirteenth century), during a time of social and political upheaval that witnessed the transition from imperial rule to an aristocratic military government. In the process of making Sutoku-in's *onryō*, as well as attempts to pacify him, various texts emphasize the concept of genealogy, familial relationships, and complex succession disputes, all of which are also important motifs in *Hōgen monogatari*. Focusing on themes of exile/displacement and genealogical relationships, as well as the roles of narration in *Hōgen monogatari*, I explain how Sutoku-in's *onryō* both exemplifies and deviates from the archetypal *onryō*—ultimately making him the fiercest *onryō*, shaking the foundation of the imperial family and their realm.

In total, my dissertation constitutes the first comprehensive literary and historical analysis of vengeful spirits in premodern Japan, exploring these spirits in terms of religious, political, and ideological contexts through the complex relationships that emerged between the literary forms of *monogatari* and genealogical focused historical records. Exploring *mononoke* in premodern Japan in an attempt to recover the voices of the dead—literally and metaphorically—requires conscious mediation. It is my sincere hope that the theme of *mononoke* can cross disciplinary boundaries and time periods and offer new insights and discoveries to that which has hitherto remained unnarrated.

Chapter One

Narrating *Mononoke* in *The Tale of Genji* Part One: *Monogatari* Haunted

...a specter is always a revenant. One cannot control its comings and goings because it begins by coming back.

—Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx*¹

There is no *Dasein* [being there] of the specter, but there is no *Dasein* without the uncanniness, without the strange familiarity (*Unheimlichkeit*) of some specter. What is a specter? What is its history and what is its time? The specter, as its name indicates, is the frequency of a certain visibility. But the visibility of the invisible. And visibility, by its essence, is not seen, which is why it remains *epekeina tes ousias*, beyond the phenomenon or beyond being.

—Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx*²

Haunting is a particular way of knowing what has happened and/or is happening.

—Avery Gordon, *Ghostly Matters*³

Introduction

In this chapter, I focus on one of the most haunted and haunting works of premodern Japanese literature, Murasaki Shikibu's *The Tale of Genji* (*Genji monogatari* 源氏物語, c. 1008). *Genji* is customarily considered to be a cultural touchstone, standing at the pinnacle of Heian literature and serving as a symbol of Japanese cultural identity.⁴ I will consider the

¹ Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (New York: Routledge, 1994), 10.

² Derrida, 125.

³ Avery Gordon, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 8.

⁴ The date of completion of *Genji monogatari* is controversial, if such date can actually be determined. Here, I follow scholarship that places *Genji*'s completion around 1008 C.E.

significance of the multivalent and polysemous nature of *mononoke* もののけ in *Genji monogatari* by closely investigating a multiplicity of narrative perspectives and voices. I argue that *mononoke* are inherently mediated and performative traces of “the absence of a presence, an always-already absent present.”⁵ *Mononoke* constantly resist being reduced to singular beings (or non-beings), continually displacing the material dead and/or living that speak and speak for. *Mononoke* in premodern Japanese texts are *in essence* irreducible traces, refusing to be identified, suggesting a dialectic generated between spectral absences and mediated presences.⁶

Episodes of *mononoke* in *Genji monogatari* may be some of the most studied occurrences of spirit possession in all of Japanese literature. Yet most scholars have tended to attribute the identities of *mononoke* and the reasons for their appearances to a narrow set of possibilities. For instance, the *mononoke* that cause the illness and death of Hikaru Genji’s 光源氏 wives and lovers are often seen as primarily stemming from the rejected Rokujō no miyasudokoro 六条御息所 or Lady Rokujō. Focusing on Rokujō no miyasudokoro as a primary *mononoke* figure in the text, scholars have approached these episodes through an emphasis on marriage politics, especially the Fujiwara 藤原 and the imperial family’s attempts to strengthen their rule and the consequent victimization of women. Haruo Shirane argues that the *mononoke* in *Genji monogatari* are “a dramatic means of expressing a woman’s repressed unconscious emotions, particularly jealousy and resentment caused by polygamy.”⁷ Doris Bergen criticizes Shirane’s

⁵ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Translator’s Preface,” in Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1976), xvii.

⁶ For more discussion of the problems, risks, and productivities of “essentialism” in feminist theory, phenomenology, and deconstruction, see Diana Fuss, *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference* (New York: Routledge, 1989). Here, I am also inspired by Athena Athanasiou and Judith Butler’s discussion of ontological ghosts and haunting; see their *Dispossession: The Performative in the Political: Conversations with Athena Athanasiou* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013), 14–19.

⁷ Haruo Shirane, *The Bridge of Dreams: A Poetics of the Tale of Genji* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987), 114.

male-centric views of spirit possession and argues that the possessing spirit empowers the possessed women to speak. Despite this key difference, both arguments primarily focus on the causal relationship between *mononoke* and women's oppression in a "polygamous and patriarchal society."⁸ Needless to say, Murasaki Shikibu captures the domain of the "private" and certainly writes about woman's suffering, which had not typically been recorded in official documents written by aristocratic men. However, *Genji monogatari* is not confined to issues of the woman's world and victimization. The text allows us to read about men's private lives and struggles during a period of hegemony by a particularly strong branch of the Fujiwara family.

Mononoke can be both the victimized and victimizer, both male and female. Focusing only on female victimization as the sole object of oppression misrepresents and generalizes privilege and power that not all men in society enjoyed at the time. I do not mean to justify the cruel political power that some individual men exercised, especially within the Northern branch of the Fujiwara (Fujiwara-Hokke 藤原北家) and the imperial line. However, these apparent oppressors can be oppressed in certain ways, as signaled by *mononoke* phenomena. Oppression and suffering in *Genji monogatari* is by no means limited to women—the text captures various intricate male victimizations, as well. More importantly, the claim that only women can gain voices through voluntary possession by or becoming *mononoke* presumes that women of the time

⁸ Doris G. Borgen, *A Woman's Weapon: Spirit Possession in the Tale of Genji* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997), 121. In her latest book, *Mapping Courtship and Kinship in Classical Japan: The Tale of Genji and Its Predecessors* (University of Hawai'i Press, 2015), Borgen continues to highlight the possibility of female agency in spirit possession, although the book's primary focus is on kinship rather than spirit possession. Borgen opines that possessed women were "actively seeking to take on the charismatic persona of another in order to communicate her distress, anguish, or hostility obliquely to those who witness the possession—the notion of the self-becoming other in order to express emotions otherwise inexpressible." See Borgen, *Mapping Courtship and Kinship*, 62.

were fundamentally voiceless. Instead of empowering women, this argument ironically reduces individual women to a silenced and underprivileged status.

More recent scholarship on *mononoke*, produced mainly by Japanese scholars, investigates alternative possibilities for the identities of *mononoke* besides Rokujō no miyasudokoro. Some Japanese scholars, including Fujimoto Katsuyoshi, Kojima Naoko, and Asao Hiroyoshi, argue that the *mononoke* who kills Yūgao 夕顔, one of Genji's lovers, at an abandoned house is not Rokujō no miyasudokoro but another spirit, possibly her late husband, Zenbō 前坊 (with or without the help of Rokujō no miyasudokoro's late father), and/or floating spirits and earthbound spirits that reside within the house.⁹ For the other *mononoke* incidents, Royall Tyler contends that Emperor Suzaku 朱雀 haunts characters, especially in the last ten Uji chapters (Uji jūjō 宇治十帖).¹⁰

While these studies have opened up alternative readings of *mononoke* identities, overemphasizing their identities and motivations might preclude narrative significances of the phenomenon. I therefore explore *mononoke* in *Genji monogatari* without limiting the significances, causes, or effects to any individual identities. I aim to deconstruct the identification of hauntings as mere extensions of antipathies derived from the realm of romance and politics.

My usage of the term “haunting” here recalls Jacques Derrida's intervention into critical thinking, *hauntology*. This multi-layered term “hauntology” merges ontology with the act of

⁹ See Fujimoto Katsuyoshi, *Genji monogatari no “mononoke”: Bungaku to kiroku no hazama* (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1994); Asao Hiroyoshi, “Rokujō no miyasudokoro to sentei: Mononoke o shiza to shita *Genji monogatari* no kōzō,” *Chūko Bungaku* 35 (May 1985): 19–28; Kojima Naoko, “*Rokujōin to mononoke: ‘Rokujō no furumiya’ no ‘chi’ to ‘ie,’*” *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kanshō* 71, no. 5 (May 2006): 71–79.

¹⁰ Royall Tyler, “Genji and Suzaku (2): The Possibility of Ukifune,” in *The Disaster of the Third Princess: Essays on The Tale of Genji* (Acton, ACT: ANU E Press, 2009), 97–130.

haunting to explore the logic of ghosts and non-beings that haunt space and time (as hauntology (*hantologie*) and ontology (*ontologie*) sound the same in French). First coined in his *Specters of Marx* published in French in 1993, hauntology addresses an unstable and indefinable ontology that rattles the very foundation of existence and underscores the uncertainties of the specter itself, which in turn challenges the idea of the knowable. Derrida emphasizes that the ghost is “always a revenant”—it begins by coming back and its comings and goings cannot be fully controlled by humans.¹¹ These characteristics of ghosts resemble *mononoke* in *Genji monogatari*; *mononoke* are always there, waiting to (re)appear.¹² While Derrida’s exploration of ghosts focuses on political and ideological implications of collective memories and temporality, especially of Marxist ideologies, the concepts of haunting and hauntology enable us to leverage the notion of ghosts and spirits as a methodology to understand texts in new ways. Spirits require constant investigation and reconsideration since, in essence, any singular definition a ghost must fail. A ghost is:

something that one does not know, precisely, and one does not know if precisely it is, if it exists... One does not know: not out of ignorance, but because this non-object, this non-present present, this being-there of an absent or departed one no longer belongs to knowledge. At least no longer to what which one thinks one knows by the name of knowledge.¹³

Similarly, the identities of *mononoke* are not static. By their nature *mononoke* defy traditional, and thus comfortable, definitions of being; they confound what is accepted as knowledge.¹⁴

¹¹ Derrida, *Specters of Marx*, 10.

¹² My reading of Derrida’s hauntology, ghosts, and their operation in literature is partially inspired by Benjamin D. Powell and Tracy Stephenson Shaffer’s works on hauntology in performance studies. See Benjamin D. Powell and Tracy Stephenson Shaffer, “On the Haunting of Performance Studies,” *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* 5, no. 1 (April 2009): 1–19.

¹³ Derrida, *Specters of Marx*, 5.

¹⁴ Powell and Shaffer, “On the Haunting of Performance Studies,” 13.

Even when hauntings and possessions appear to be over, spirits are never entirely expelled from the text. They remain, constantly haunting us and our inquiry, reminding readers of the continual displacement of ontology, genealogy, and materiality in written texts. In this chapter, I will demonstrate the *mononoke* in *Genji monogatari* as revenant spirits that not only (re)appear as various characters (with or without flesh) but also manifest themselves through narrative voices, spaces and times, as well as their conspicuous absences.

Genji monogatari invites readers to experience and investigate these hauntings through the specific use of language by which the undecidable and unknowable can paradoxically “speak.”¹⁵ Hence, I find the deconstructive concept of haunting useful to resituate the question: “What is *monogatari*?” The specter, which exists between life and death, neither alive nor dead, questions the limits of definition, playing on the very question of interpretation and identification and challenges experiential knowledge that cannot predict the specter’s revenant timing. In reading *Genji monogatari*, this chapter will set aside the impulse to demystify the *mononoke*. I will instead draw out the signs of specters of *monogatari* and the haunting nature of the text. By so doing, I hope to show how reading texts in the light (or shadow) of *mononoke* can open up new readings that *monogatari* offer.

Monogatari are also inherently unstable and undefinable entities. When we speak of *Genji monogatari*, we commonly conceptualize a canonical piece of Japanese literature that was written in the early eleventh century by the author(s) known as Murasaki Shikibu 紫式部. However, none of the original handwritten manuscripts are extant today, if there ever was any “original” text in the contemporary sense. *Genji monogatari*, like many other early Japanese

¹⁵ Elisabeth Loevlie, “Faith in the Ghosts of Literature: Poetic Hauntology in Derrida, Blanchot, and Morrison’s *Beloved*,” *Religions* 4, no. 3 (2013): 336–50.

texts, has never been a single stable object. There are further controversies regarding the author's identity (or identities) and gender. Moreover, the text(s) have circulated under different titles: from *Genji no monogatari* 源氏の物語 to *Murasaki no monogatari* 紫の物語, or even just *Monogatari* 物語.¹⁶ As Richard Okada correctly states, *Genji monogatari* stands as “a metonym for its many variants.” This text is in fact still evolving through our imagination, mediation, and what Michael Emmerich calls *replacement*.¹⁷ The order of the fifty-four chapters that we currently have are also undeterminable, if indeed Heian readers approached the chapters in any given order. The texts were probably composed and copied piecemeal as aristocratic readers circulated hand-written versions in social and familial circles, copied them, and read communally.¹⁸ The copying process naturally led to missing words, sentences, and typos. These changes could also reflect a reader's intentional reformulation of the story. Most modern editions of *Genji monogatari* have erased the textuality of writing and often generalize differences among variants in favor of accessibility for modern readers. What we have in *Genji* is merely a specter—a collection of memories, imaginations, and productions that materialize as the *Genji monogatari* we know today. We need to be aware that we are dealing with such haunted texts

¹⁶ See Katō Masayoshi, “Genji monogatari no sakusha ha Murasaki shikibu da to ieru ka,” in *Heian Bungaku o ika ni yominaosu ka*, ed. Tani Tomoko and Tabuchi Kumiko (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2012), 312–47; and Nakagawa Terumasa, “*Genji Monogatari*” to iu gensō (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2014).

¹⁷ See H. Richard Okada, *Figures of Resistance: Language, Poetry, and Narrating in The Tale of Genji and other Mid-Heian Texts* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991), 20; Michael Emmerich, *The Tale of Genji: Translation, Canonization, and World Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013).

¹⁸ These activities are suggested in diaries such as *Murasaki Shikibu nikki* and *Sarashina nikki*. In *Murasaki Shikibu nikki* for example, Murasaki Shikibu laments that Fujiwara Michinaga took some manuscripts that she was hiding and gave them away to his daughter, Kenshi, without Murasaki Shikibu's permission. She continues to write that she had lost some other versions that she was revising and worries about whether the one that Michinaga took from her is good enough to be circulated. See *Murasaki Shikibu nikki*, SNKBZ, 26: 168. For studies regarding how *Genji monogatari* was read aloud, see Tamagami Takuya, *Genji Monogatari ondokuron* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2003).

and must surrender our expectations of total comprehension and the desire for finding comfort in *Genji* as stable classic of the Japanese literary canon.

Textual *monogatari* share surprising similarities with the polysemous and indefinable qualities of *mononoke*. These tales are also mediated by narrators and told through multiple perspectives, including characters' gazes, audible voices, and silent innermost thoughts. *Monogatari* like *mononoke*, constantly displace what has been narrated and unnarrated, as well as who speaks for and to whom. In this chapter, I will explore how *mononoke* and *monogatari* are intertwined and how the one helps to engender the other. Studying *mononoke* and *monogatari* together destabilizes our comprehension of meanings and our certainty of existence (presence/absence), time (past/presence/future), and identity. I will explore both the haunted and haunting nature of *monogatari* by paying close attention to the roles of ghostly narrators, revenant events and characters, and the indeterminable and multifaceted narrative voices and perspectives that mediators of the text share. Within *Genji monogatari*, *mononoke* are ubiquitous, haunting supposed certainties of identity, challenging stable meanings and readings, and weaving threads of discomfort and undecidability into the text.

Voices from the Past: Revenant Beginnings of *Monogatari*

What does the notion of *monogatari* being *haunted* imply, then? *Monogatari* etymologically derives from oral tradition as *gatari/katari* 語り, literally to “speak” and/or “tell.” It is in this telling that *monogatari* are haunted by voices and textual traces from the past. Many early *monogatari* begin by stating that the story took place in the past. For example, *Ise monogatari* 伊勢物語 begins with “Once there was a man...” (*Mukashi otoko arikeri* 昔男ありけり) and *Taketori monogatari* 竹取物語 with “Now it is a long time ago” (*Ima wa mukashi* 今

は昔). Although these stories have been told in different ways, the opening phrase nearly always remains the same, reminding readers or listeners that the story is revenant: the story begins by coming back.

Genji monogatari, likewise begins with indeterminacy in time as well as language:

In which emperor's [whose] reign might it be? Among many senior consorts (*nyōgo*) and junior-rank consorts (*kōi*), there was one who was not exactly born to the highest ranks but stood high in [the emperor's] favor.

いづれの御時おほむときにか、女御、更衣あまたさぶらひたまひける中に、いとやむごとなき際にはあらぬが、すぐれて時めきたまふありけり。¹⁹

The famous opening phrase, *Izure no ontoki ni ka* いづれの御時にか, is generally translated as “which emperor's/whose reign was it (we are not quite sure)?”²⁰ Following this reading, we are first presented with an undecidable time and period. Unlike the other earlier *monogatari*, such as *Taketori monogatari* or *Ise monogatari*, which begin with sentences using the word “long ago” *mukashi* 昔 thereby affirming the time of the story as in the past,²¹ the narrator of the opening phrases of *Genji monogatari* refuses to locate the story in a specific time or period. While *mukashi* admittedly fails to give a specific time, it does place the story in the distant past. In contrast, the narrator in *Genji* implies an ambiguous setting that may point to either the distant past or the recent past. *Ontoki* 御時 is customarily used to mark a period of an emperor's reign.

¹⁹ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 17.

²⁰ While this opening is unusual, similar openings are used in the *Ise shū* variants, such as the phrase “*Izure no on toki nika ariken*,” as well as in *Shikashū* and other aristocrats' diaries. See Hijikata Yōichi, “Katarite ga kataranakatta koto,” *Nihon Bungaku*, no. 37 (January 1988): 10–19.

²¹ There are debates regarding the “*Ima wa mukashi*” opening as well. This sentence does not necessarily separate the present and past, and thus many scholars consider it to imply a continuation from the past to the present. However, unlike the opening in *Genji*, which leaves the timeline ambiguous, the “*Ima wa mukashi*” represents a definitive affirmation that the story takes place in the past.

The word, *izure* indicates options that the reader may choose, which could include historical references and the continuation of time, connecting the past and present.

This temporal ambiguity is accompanied by spatial uncertainty. *Ontoki* does not only point to a time of a reign but can also allude to the space in which a particular emperor resided.²² The proceeding phrase, *nyōgo, kōi amata saburahi tamahi keru naka ni* 女御、更衣あまたさぶらひたまひける中に, immediately reminds readers of an unidentifiable yet familiar scene of the emperor's consorts and the inner palace. *Naka* 中—roughly meaning during, among, or in—is a polysemous word that can be used to indicate a particular time, space, or situation. *Naka* provides readers with an even broader and equally ambiguous context that includes this group of consorts, the Inner Palace, and certain period of time in which they were all situated.

Further complicating this indeterminate beginning, the phrase, “many senior and junior rank consorts present” in the court, in fact reveals the “absence” of one of the most important figures in the inner court, the empress consort (*chūgū* 中宮). Ever since the regency of the Fujiwara family (especially the Fujiwara-Hokke), who held strong matrimonial relationships with the Emperor, the identity of the empress was of great political concern. Although the readers do not yet know the reason why the empress consort is absent in the opening lines, this vacancy strongly suggests political instability and anxiety, casting a shadow of a conspicuous “absent being” for the story that follows. In this opening phrase, the narrator presents us with a narrative technique and rhetoric that set the “rules” for reading *Genji monogatari* and alert the reader that the text is not simply about presence and the narrated but also absence of the unnarrated.

²² See Kawazoe Fusae, “Genji monogatari no jikū ishiki: Kiritsubo kan o kiten to shite,” in *Genji monogatari jikūron* (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppan, 2005), 32; and Imanishi Yūichirō, “Ontoki no monogatari,” in *Genji monogatari oboegaki* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1998).

The study of narrative technique in *Genji* has a long history. One of the most traditional and valuable methodologies practiced since the twelfth century has been to seek historical and textual references (*junkyo* 準拠).²³ Commentaries on the text, such as *Genji shaku* 源氏釈 and *Shimeishō* 紫明抄, have long proposed historical figures and events as models of characters and time periods that the phrase *izure no ontoki* may signal, thereby attempting to provide credibility for the narrative. However, the grammatical structure of the phrase can nullify any such historical investigations. In particular, for the famous opening “*izure no ontoki ni ka*,” in opposition to the often cited translation of “In a certain reign, there was a lady...” as seen in Edward Seidensticker’s work or “In a certain reign (whose can it have been?)” in Royall Tyler’s translation, the postpositional word, *ka*, can also be read not only as a straight forward question (as seen in Tyler’s translation), but also as a rhetorical question that produces multiple undeterminable readings. As Richard Okada proposes, the phrase can just as easily be read as “it doesn’t matter whose reign it was or it matters and we all know whose reign it was.”²⁴ While there are many variants (*ihon* 異本) of *Genji* texts with different constructions, the majority of extant manuscripts belonging to *Kawachi bon* 河内本 and Fujiwara Teika’s *Aobyōshi bon* 青表紙本 share the exact same opening sentence.²⁵ Thus, it is not unreasonable for us to assume that most readers throughout history begin reading *Genji monogatari* with this indeterminate

²³ For further *junkyo* studies, see Asao Hiroyoshi, *Genji monogatari no junkyo to keifu* (Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2004); Hinata Kazumasa, *Genji monogatari no junkyo to wakei* (Tokyo: Shibundō, 1999); and Yamanaka Yutaka, *Rekishi no naka no Genji monogatari* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2011).

²⁴ Okada, *Figures of Resistance*, 183.

²⁵ Only the Yōmei bunko hon 陽明本 ends with the honorific *tokimeki tamau owashikeri* instead of *tokimeki tamau arikeri*. See Ii Haruki, “Kiritsubo kan no honbun to kōshaku no hōhō,” in *Genji monogatari no shihatsu: Kiritubo kan ronshū*, ed. Hinata Kazumasa and Nihei Michiaki (Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2006), 557.

literal/rhetorical question.²⁶ One can read the passage as saying that it was no one's reign, and the story being narrated may not have actually occurred, or that the story indeed occurred but we cannot determine when, or that readers are assumed to know when the story happened.

This uncertainty of time in *Genji*'s opening lines resembles what Derrida sees in the ability of hauntology to destabilize the linear progression of time. The present is simultaneously haunted by the past and the future, which Derrida calls the "persistence of a present past."²⁷ In contrast to the standard opening of earlier *monogatari*: "*Ima wa mukashi keru*," meaning "now it is a long time ago...there was..." indicating past experience or hearsay, and in which the specter of the story begins by coming back from the distant past, in *Genji* we do not know from where or when the story is coming back. *Genji monogatari* starts with indeterminacy between the literal and the rhetorical, between presence and absence. This initial ambiguity thus establishes from its very beginning a narrative style that discloses more than what literal language can narrate and signals that the story currently narrated is haunted by an undecidable past and future.

Narrators, Ladies-in-Waiting, and *Mononoke* Voices

In this section, I will examine the narrators in *monogatari* whose presence/absence contributes to the text's ontology [hauntology]. Generally, the narrator in *monogatari* is someone or something who mediates the plots, characters' voices, gazes, and innermost thoughts to the audience. Their position is frequently unstable, opinionated, and protean. Although scholars

²⁶ We cannot determine whether Heian readers strictly followed the chapter order when they read *Genji*. We do know, however, there are certain examples in which they started with the first Kiritsubo chapter, as seen in *Sarashina nikki*: 心も得ず心もとなく思う源氏を一の巻よりして、人もまじらず、几帳の内にうち臥して、引きいでつつ見るこち、後の位もなんにかはせん。See *Sarashina nikki*, SNKBZ, 26: 298.

²⁷ Derrida, *Specters of Marx*, 101.

dispute the concept and function of *monogatari*, they tend to agree that the word *monogatari*, literally “telling stories,” contains the verb, “*kataru* 語る,” and requires a narrator or *katari-te* 語り手, in addition to a listener.²⁸ In most *monogatari* produced in the Heian period, it is easy to detect a strong sense of the narrators’ presence in the texts and extrapolate their imagined listeners.

As is well-known, there are multiple narrators in *Genji monogatari* who often clearly state their status as an anonymous lady-in-waiting or *nyōbō* 女房. The narrators occasionally insert their frank opinions and do not hesitate to suggest their alliances to a particular faction, as can be seen in comments in the Hahakigi 帚木 chapter and the opening of the Takekawa 竹河 chapter. Mitani Kuniaki contends that there may be at least three or four different narrators in the extant text.²⁹

Although the narrator does not explicitly reveal her identity, the use of honorific words toward other characters intimates her social standpoint and possible perspective. Returning to the opening phrase above, for example, the narrator uses the honorific prefix *on* 御 in reference to the emperor’s reign, time, and space that he ruled. The narrator then uses *tamahikeru* たまひける to express respect for *nyōgo* 女御 and *kōi* 更衣. But the narrator does not use the honorific for the consort who “was not exactly born to the highest ranks, but stood high in the emperor’s favor,” and opts for the simple verb *ari* あり. Because of the relatively consistent usage of

²⁸ It is important to keep in mind that premodern Japanese literature often makes use of many voices, several types of narrators, and shifting perspectives. Additionally, *monogatari* often contain “the writer,” or more precisely, the scribe, as a character, who differs from the author. The borders between the narrator (*katari-te*), the writer (*kaki-te*), and the author are unstable and fluid. See Mitani Kuniaki, *Monogatari bungaku no hōhō*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1989), 113–22; and Yoshioka Hiroshi, *Monogatari no katarite: Naihatsuteki bungakushi no kokoromi* (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1996).

²⁹ Mitani Kuniaki, “Genji monogatari ni okeru ‘katari’ no kōzō: ‘Washa’ to ‘katarite’ arui wa ‘sōshiji’ hihanron no tame no joshō,” *Nihon bungaku* vol. 27, no. 11 (November 1978): 46.

honorific words throughout the tale, the reader can in fact assume that characters are being narrated through particular perspectives. The narrators use honorific words for senior consorts higher than the third rank but not for junior consorts of the fourth rank or lower. This usage of honorifics indicates the narrators' distance from the assumed author Murasaki Shikibu herself, since her father, Fujiwara Tametoki 藤原為時 (949?–1029?), and her husband, Fujiwara Nobutaka 藤原宣孝 (?–1001), held fifth rank (正五位).³⁰ Paying close attention to the narrators reveals an even more complicated perspective beyond the attributed author and/or status of the narrators as ladies-in-waiting. We can also see there is no such transparent mediation for the stories being narrated.

The following sentence after the opening phrase further unveils the filter that the narrator possesses:

Those other ladies, who assumed they were favored [by the Emperor] from the beginning of their appointment at court, despise her [the lady who received special favor from the Emperor] with feelings of resentment, while those of lesser or equal rank to her are even more restless. As she serves him every morning and night, she only stirs up the other women's hearts. Perhaps because of these women's resentment toward her, her health deteriorates...

はじめより我はと思ひあがりたまへる御方々めざましきものにおとしめそねみたまふ。同じほど、それより下臈の更衣たちはましてやすからず。朝夕の宮仕につけても、人の心のみ動かし、恨みをおふつものにやありけん。いとあつしくなりゆき。³¹

The court during this unidentifiable period of time is filled with whisperings, rumors, and hushed expressions of resentment. Yet, as Mitani Kuniaki also points out, such gossip and voices reach the readers through the narrators' overhearing and observation, a narrator who clearly

³⁰ Mitani Kuniaki, "Genji monogatari no gensetsu bunseki: Katarite no jittaika to sōshiji aruiha miotsukushi kan no Akashi no kimi no ichininshō teki gensetsu o megutte," in *Genji monogatari*, ed. Matsui Kenji (Tokyo: Wakakusa Shobō, 1998), 11.

³¹ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 17.

differentiates these consorts' voices and feelings depending on their ranks.³² Although this opening may not exactly embody *sōshiji* 草子地 or *jiyūkansetsu* 自由間接 discourse that distinctly expresses the narrator's opinion, the widespread voices and feelings among the women in the Inner Palace are filtrated through the narrator. Thus, the narrator here receives and mediates all resentful complaints and bitter feelings of the other consorts. The opening narrator's voice, however subtle or neutral it may seem, belies chaotic gossip and accumulated grudges. *Genji monogatari*, therefore, consists of a plurality of perspectives and voices that inevitably challenge the absolute truth or singular interpretation of what is narrated and written. Through the multiple perspectives of narrators that mediate the events, characters, and the audiences, *Genji* produces and openly invites ambiguity and relativity that is rooted in the concept of *monogatari*.

The opening that we have just seen also reminds us, if not explicitly, of the multiple narrators' statuses as ladies-in-waiting and their fluid presences that contribute to the "hauntedness" of *Genji monogatari*. In the Heian court, ladies-in-waiting were generally from middle-class aristocratic families, often from the *zuryō* provincial governor's class (受領). They were more than nurses or maids to a mistress, playing pivotal roles as intermediaries and facilitating the smooth functioning of the Imperial Palace and family networks (including their own by seeking better connections at court). They also mediated between the outside world and the Palace and/or their master/mistress's mansions, serving as messengers as well as matchmakers. In many ways, casting a lady-in-waiting as the narrator, who speaks for the author and also speaks for the characters, is a natural fit. They were certainly some of the most

³² Mitani Kuniaki, "Genji monogatari no 'katari' to 'gensetsu': 'Kaimami' no bungakushi aruiwa konton o zōshoku suru gensetsu bunseki no kanōsei," in *Genji monogatari no "katari" to "gensetsu"* (Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1994), 10–11.

ubiquitous figures in the court and closest attendants to the characters, and thus they would be in position to witness the daily activities of their masters and mistresses. Although their “presence” is not always mentioned in the text, they are not entirely absent from the text either; they are always there and expected to (re)appear anytime.

Having ladies-in-waiting as narrators would seem to impose certain spatio-temporal limitations. Technically, the narrated scenes in *Genji monogatari* occur in one place at a time. There is no parallel editing or cross cutting techniques common in modern novels or film since the narrator as a witness can only exist at one place at one time.³³ This limitation explains the necessity for several narrators in the text. The same narrator cannot narrate totally different spaces since it is highly unlikely that a high-status narrator, such as Naishi no suke 典侍 (approximately of junior fourth rank) who is considered one of the narrators in the Kiritsubo chapter, would also be familiar with events and locations far away from the palace, such as events depicted in the Yūgao chapters.³⁴

While the narrators are neither omnipresent nor omniscient, they are able to enter the minds of the characters they are narrating. That is, they narrate not only events that might have been overheard or witnessed but also what unfolds silently in the characters’ thoughts. As mentioned, one of the most notable narrative techniques in *Genji monogatari* is what Mitani Kuniaki and others called *jiyūkansetsu gensetsu*, inspired by various Japanese annotators since late Heian, including Fujiwara Koreyuki 藤原伊行 (1139?–75?), Ichijō Kanera 一条兼良 (1402–81), and Mikhail Bakhtin’s narrative analysis. Mitani analyzes the narrative of *Genji monogatari* with the technique of *jiyū kansetsu gensetsu* in which the lack of quotation marks

³³ In some sections of the text, the scenes change rather quickly and shift back and forth, but this does not necessarily entail that *Genji* employs a parallel structure.

³⁴ Mitani, “Genji monogatari no ‘katari’ to ‘gensetsu,’” 10–11.

allows for a merging of the narrator's voice (*sōshiji* 草子地) or the descriptive narration (*ji no bun* 地の文) with the character's voice or innermost thoughts.³⁵ As Takahashi Tōru points out, the omniscient, elusive, and shifting narrator's perspective may even be analogous to that of "mononoke."³⁶

While I agree with Takahashi's characterization of narrators/ladies-in-waiting's perspectives as *mononoke*-like, I would like to expand the concept of this *mononoke*-like perspective (*mononoke no shiten* もののけの視点). The commonality between *mononoke* and ladies-in-waiting/narrators is not only their perspective but their presence and absence as well as their ability to merge into the characters so that no distinction can be made between narrators and characters—as if the characters are inhabited by *mononoke*.³⁷ In other words, the narrators of *Genji monogatari* embody the voices of *mononoke*, which similarly to the ambiguous nature of *mononoke*, can never be reduced to a single identity.

While the narrators' existences and voices are perhaps analogous to that of *mononoke*, occasionally ladies-in-waiting may have also been expected to serve as actual mediums as well. Becoming ill was often considered to be a result of spirit possession, and usually priests and/or

³⁵ Mitani Kuniaki, *Genji monogatari no gensetsu* (Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2002), 62–66. Needless to say, the study of narrative technique and discourse in *Genji monogatari* is not new. Since the late Heian period, many scholars and intellectuals have commented and annotated the *Genji* text. In general, such annotations and commentaries up to the end of the Edo period are referred to as *kochū* 古注. More recent scholars who have written annotations and commentaries on *Genji* include Nishio Mitsuo, Nakano Kōichi, Mitani Kuniaki, and Higashihara Nobuaki. For Anglophone scholarship on the matter, see Amanda M. Stinchecum, *Narrative Voice in the Tale of Genji* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1985); and Sachiko Matsushita, "A Study of the *Tale of Genji*: Focusing on Interior Monologue" (PhD diss., Australian National University, 2006).

³⁶ Takahashi often describes the author and narrators as *mononoke*-like, though he is aware of the multi-voiced nature of the subjectivities in the text. See Takahashi Tōru, "Monogatari to media," in *Shin monogatari kenkyū*, ed. Monogatari Kenkyūkai, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1993), 32–33.

³⁷ For a detailed analysis of narrative structures and voices in *Genji monogatari*, including a discussion of the narrator's identification with the characters, see Nakayama Masahiko, *Monogatari kōzōron: "Genji monogatari" to sono Furansugo yaku ni tsuite* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1995).

onmyō masters, as well as mediums, would be summoned for exorcism rituals. However, some diaries and journals, including *Murasaki Shikibu nikki* and *Sanuki no Suke nikki* 讃岐典侍日記, record that *mononoke* were transferred into the bodies of ladies-in-waiting who occasionally mediated *mononoke*'s messages for their masters.³⁸ The border between being *mononoke*, those who speak, and mediums, those who speak for, is blurred, and even collapsed into the body and voice of a lady-in-waiting.

Although few ladies-in-waiting in *Genji monogatari* play significant roles as characters, including the Emperor Kiritsubo's messenger, Yugei no Myōbu 鞍負の命婦, and Yūgao's foster sister, in general their unspoken yet ubiquitous presence and absence usually go unmentioned in the text. Given court customs of the time, we must always assume their presence alongside the main characters in action: ladies-in-waiting can be assumed to be behind the screens even during seemingly private conversations or lovemaking. It is their self-“effacing” and self-“concealing” disposition that enables them to serve as characters and narrators as well as rhetorical devices as H. Mack Horton suggests.³⁹ Such ghostly narrators even possess the agency to choose what to narrate and what to leave unnarrated, withholding information from the reader that might speak to their existence and whereabouts. Without these *mononoke*-like ladies-in-waiting who are designated as narrators, the text and concept of *Genji monogatari* as well as the world depicted in the story would simply not exist. The narrative basis of *Genji monogatari* is founded upon and haunted by such ghostly voices.

³⁸ Murasaki Shikibu describes the details of the pacification ritual performed when Empress Consort Shōshi was giving birth. See *Murasaki Shikibu nikki*, SNKBZ, 26: 130–31. See also Sekine Kenji, “Genji monogatari ni okeru shāmanizumu yōso” in *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kanshō* 46, no. 5 (May 1981): 63–67.

³⁹ For further details regarding the ladies-in-waiting in *Genji monogatari*, see H. Mack Horton, “They Also Serve,” in *Approaches to Teaching Murasaki Shikibu's The Tale of Genji*, ed. Edward Kamens (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1993), 95–108.

Monogatari, Mononoke, and Mediation

The notion of mediation and “who speaks for whom” is crucial to approaching questions regarding *mononoke* and *monogatari*. *Mononoke* as well as *monogatari* are products of multi-layered mediation. Just as all communication can be viewed as an act of translation, reading the utterances of the dead in *monogatari*, needless to say, is never entirely transparent

communication.⁴⁰ It is always an act of translation that involves several agents and agencies.

Mononoke normally speak through a medium (*yorimashi* 憑座), often a woman or child,

whereupon *onmyō* masters (*onmyōji* 陰陽師), and/or Buddhist priests then interpret the

utterance. Occasionally, the Department of Divinities (*jingikan* 神祇官) was involved in the

process of mediation, performing augury to interpret the medium’s utterances.⁴¹ Within the realm

of written and spoken narratives, this chain of mediation can be much longer. The voices of the

dead are re-told by the narrator(s) often through the act of overhearing, recorded by the writer(s),

often read aloud by the primary readers, later copied by copyists, commented upon by

annotators, transcribed and translated into print versions, and read by contemporary readers—a

very similar process in fact to how *monogatari* came into being, as we have seen.

⁴⁰ My discussion here of non-transparent communication and issues of translation are inspired by Naoki Sakai’s argument of uncommunicability within homolingual communities. See his “Introduction: Writing for Multiple Audiences and the Heterolingual Address,” in *Translation and Subjectivity: On “Japan” and Cultural Nationalism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 1–17.

⁴¹ Yamada Yūji, “Onryō no shisō,” in *Nihon shisōshi kōza*, vol. 1, ed. Karube Tadashi, Kurozumi Makoto, and Satō Hiroo (Tokyo: Perikansha, 2012), 254. Yamada discusses how, outside of the court or capital, religious practitioners such as *yamabushi* 山伏 (male Shugendō mountain ascetics) and *arukimiko* 歩き巫女 (female spirit mediums) served their localities and performed pacification rituals instead of high-ranking Buddhists priests. For further discussions on the role of *miko* in premodern Japanese society, see Lori Meeks, “The Disappearing Medium: Reassessing the Place of Miko in the Religious Landscape of Premodern Japan,” *History of Religions* 50, no. 3 (2011): 208–60.

The concepts of mediation and medium have been much discussed among various philosophers, such as Karl Marx, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Edmund Husserl, and more recently within media and cultural studies circles including Marshall McLuhan.⁴² The noun “medium,” which means “something between,” is commonly considered to be an agent, which resides in a middle and/or intermediate position, through which a certain purpose is achieved. It is not a coincidence that in English “medium” also signifies a person who possesses the power to communicate with the spirits of the dead or agents of an unknown world. As McLuhan’s most famous saying, “the medium is the message” suggests, I will closely look at materiality and the body of the “medium” who mediates between *mononoke*—the one that is possessing—and the audience, texts, and readers—those who are possessed.⁴³ While posited in contemporary mass media discourse, “the medium is the message” is relevant in reading *mononoke* in *Genji monogatari* as each agent (*mononoke*, the possessed, the possessing, the characters, and the readers) is a medium, mediating the message and event. The questions of who haunts whom, the means by which the haunting agent speaks, and how witnesses interpret the haunting, all convey the messages in the scenes.

In reading *Genji monogatari*, I argue that multi-faced and ambiguous *mononoke* represent this fundamental and unavoidable plurality of mediation, which multiply the identity of *mononoke* as well as make them unidentifiable. We can only comprehend things through

⁴² See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology*, trans. C. J. Arthur, (New York: International Publishers, 1973); G. W. F. Hegel, *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977); Edmund Husserl, *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917)*, trans. John B. Brough (Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Publishing, 2008); and Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965).

⁴³ Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, *The Medium Is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects* (London: Penguin, 1967).

mediation, constantly displacing and replacing what is mediated and what is not, and who is mediating and how. It is therefore the mediation of *mononoke* that haunts us in a similar way as the specters of *monogatari*. In what follows, I explore the voice(s) of the mediated, multiplied, and unidentifiable *mononoke*, and the how these processes of mediation shape *Genji monogatari* itself.

Narrating the Revenant: *Makotoya* まことや

We have seen how the very beginning of *Genji monogatari* starts with rhetorical and narrative voices embedded in indeterminacy and multivalency that set the tone and tenor of the haunted text. With such possibilities in mind, here I examine the way in which potential *mononoke* figures are narrated given the text's inherent undecidability and instability. In particular, I focus on how the narrators' use of the phrase, "*makotoya* まことや," roughly translated as "oh, yes," "... that reminds me," or "come to think of it," signals an unnarrated past and ushers *mononoke* into the story.

Mononoke in *Genji monogatari* are multivalent beings. There is no consensus about which characters become *mononoke* or who haunts whom and when. However, commentators and readers have often singled out several characters in *Genji monogatari* as potential *mononoke*, most notably Rokujō no miyasudokoro. In addition, although he is often considered to be a relatively minor character, in the following chapter I will consider the ambiguous phenomena surrounding Kashiwagi 柏木, a son of Genji's best friend and rival, Tō no Chūjō 頭中将, to be similarly significant. Here, I will focus on the narrators' voices and the revenant figure of Rokujō no miyasudokoro in the context of the phrase *makotoya*.

While there are variations in use of the basic word *makoto* まこと, including *makoto*, *makotoni* まことに, and *makotowa* まことは, the exact phrase, *makotoya* is used fourteen times in *Genji monogatari*. The speaker uses this phrase, usually uttered in conversations, to attract someone's attention. Certainly, the term *makotoya* is not exclusively used in *Genji monogatari*. Before or around the same time as the composition of *Genji monogatari*, other texts feature this phrase, including two cases in *Izumi Shikibu nikki* 和泉式部日記 (1008) and three cases in *Tōnomine shōshō monogatari* 多武峯少将物語 (961–68?). In both of these cases, *makotoya* appears in epistolary correspondence transcribed in the texts.⁴⁴

Significantly, almost all instances of *makotoya* in *Genji* (eleven uses among fourteen) appear in descriptive narrations or *ji no bun*. These descriptive sentences are spoken by the narrator and are supposedly directed towards the listeners or readers. When such a phrase is uttered, therefore, we can expect the narrator's attempt to obtain the reader's or listener's attention. The characteristics of the use of *makotoya* by the narrator lie in sharing memories and past experiences, which are not explicitly written, but assume the readers' knowledge or speculation, thereby positioning the readers as accomplices. The majority of the phrase's usage occurs when the narrator ushers in the protagonist, Hikaru Genji (nine cases). It is noteworthy that next most frequent uses of the phrase are for Rokujō no miyasudokoro (three cases), which, I argue, suggests her unnarrated past and return as a haunting figure.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ There are no uses of まことや in *Ochikubo monogatari* or *Taketori monogatari*. For more data on this vocative, see Tanaka Hitoshi, “‘Makotoya’ Hikaru Genji to katarite o,” *Kokugo kokubun* 50, no. 3 (March 1981): 20–21.

⁴⁵ For further discussions on the uses of “*makotoya*,” see Yoshikai Naoto, “Rokujō no miyasudokoro to ‘makotoya’,” in *Genji monogatari no jinbutsu to kōzō*, ed. Chūkobungaku Kenkyūkai (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1982), 99–119; and Kobayashi Miwako, “Fukusengata jujutsu no monogatari ni okeru kōka,” *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 52, no. 12 (December 1975): 15–28.

Rokujō no miyasudokoro's name first appears in the text in the Aoi 葵 chapter, which is usually considered the ninth chapter of the tale. At the beginning of the Aoi chapter, the narrator speaks of the change of the reign from the Emperor Kiritsubo to Suzaku followed by Hikaru Genji's promotion to new Commander. Although the narrator does not immediately mention any other political changes in the text, the very first phrase, "the change of the throne" 世の中かはりて, indicates an expectation of several social and political reforms such as establishing new regulations, restructuring of offices, and making new official appointments, among other changes in political power.⁴⁶ Such timing also involves a decree of amnesty and various rituals to repose spirits and gods (*tamashizume* 鎮魂) to be performed along with the enthronement of a new emperor and the *Daijōsai/ōnie no matsuri* 大嘗祭 festival. Then the narrator speaks out of the blue:

Oh, yes, come to think of it, the daughter of the late Crown Prince and that Rokujō no miyasudokoro has been (newly) appointed High Priestess of Ise, and since the Commander (Genji)'s devotion is not dependable, [Rokujō no miyasudokoro] has been considering using her daughter's youth as a reason to go down to Ise herself. As the Retired Emperor Kiritsubo hears about the situation, he speaks to Genji, saying that the late Crown Prince had thought very highly of Rokujō no miyasudokoro and bestowed great favor upon her. It is intolerable that you [Genji] should treat her lightly...you should not disgrace any woman; treat them gently with good care and never cause a woman sorrow or resentment [emphasis added]

まことや、かの六条御息所の御腹の前坊の姫君、斎宮にみたまひにしかば、大將の御心ばへもいと頼もしげなきを「幼き御ありさまのうしろめたさにことつけて下りやしなまし」と、かねてより思しけり。院にも、かかることなむと、聞こし召して、「故宮のいとやむごとなく思し、時めかしたまひしものを、軽々しうおしなべたるさまにもてなすなるがいとほしきこと<中略>人のため、恥ぢがましきことなく、いづれをもなだらかにもてなして、女の怨みな負ひそ」とのたまはするにも。。。⁴⁷

⁴⁶ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 18.

⁴⁷ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 18.

Here the audience may be perplexed by this usage of *makotoya, kano*, まことや、かの, a phrase which is normally used to remind the listener/reader of a previously mentioned event or person. The narrator also presumes the readers' knowledge about "that" woman, Rokujō no miyasudokoro, whose past stories must have impacted the current situation. Previously, in the fourth chapter, the Yūgao chapter, it is implied that Genji is visiting a woman in the Rokujō area (*Rokujō watari* 六条わたり), yet it is not until here in the ninth chapter that her name appears explicitly. Unlike most other love interests Genji has encountered, the details of the beginning of their romantic relationship remain absent from the text. We do know that the relationship began with Genji's ardent pursuit of her, yet once their relationship begins, his interest in her immediately wanes.⁴⁸ No further details are provided by the narrator, such as their first night together or exchanges of morning after letter/poems (*kinuginu no fumi* 後朝の文), which are one of the highlights of *monogatari* that involve romantic liaisons between lovers. In contrast, the details of Genji's first encounters with other women and their developing relationships are given much weight in the tale, including episodes with Utsusemi 空蟬, Murasaki no ue 紫の上, Yūgao 夕顔, Akashi no kimi 明石の君, and Onna san no miya 女三宮. When we learn about the lady who resides in the Rokujō area, her relationship with Genji is already almost over, and all their stories remained untold. Thus, when the narrator finally names her in the Aoi chapter, Rokujō no miyasudokoro returns from an unnarrated past. At the same time, "*makotoya, kano*" is a phrase that reminds the reader of her dual presence and absence from the text.

⁴⁸ 六条わたりにも、とけがたかりし御気色をおもむけ聞こえたまひて後、ひき返し、なのめならむはいとほしかし。されど、よそなりし御心惑ひのやうに、あながちなる事はなきも、いかなることにかと見えたり。 *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 147

We could also consider how the change of the throne narrated in the opening of the Aoi chapter perhaps reminds the narrator of Rokujō no miyasudokoro. It should be noted that in the repetition, or even overuse, of the preposition, *no* の, in *Rokujō no miyasudokoro no onhara no Zenbō no himegimi*, 六条御息所の御腹の前坊の姫君, the narrator associates Rokujō no miyasudokoro with the late Crown Prince, Zenbō, and their daughter. The phrase seems to emphasize that this woman can only be defined by the fact that she bore a daughter to the late Crown Prince, who would have been very close to the throne and political center. However, it is also clear that he passed away without ascending to the throne as both her title, *miyasudokoro*, a widow, and his title of “previous Crown Prince” suggests, though the specifics here as well remain unnarrated. I argue the phrases *makotoya* and *kano* presume an unnarrated past, in this case, Rokujō no miyasudokoro’s family background and her relationship with her late husband. This seemingly mundane utterance, *makotoya*, signifies a revenant entity: Rokujō no miyasudokoro’s specter and her story that begins by coming back.

Several scholars such as Kobayashi Miwako, Yoshikai Naoto, and Tanaka Hitoshi have examined the use of this phrase *makotoya* in *Genji monogatari*.⁴⁹ Kobayashi contends that *makotoya* is generally used to describe minor characters, while Tanaka argues that the phrase is used to indicate less significant events or characters from Hikaru Genji’s perspective rather than for the whole plot.⁵⁰ Yoshikai values the importance of such seemingly less significant minor characters, arguing that they enrich what is behind the scenes (*ura no sekai* 裏の世界 and *han sekai* 反世界) as opposed to the main plot (*omote no sekai* 表の世界), and he focuses on several critical roles that Rokujō no miyasudokoro plays as a lover, wife, and mother.⁵¹ Rather than

⁴⁹ Kobayashi, “Fukusengata jujutsu no monogatari ni okeru kōka,” 15–2.

⁵⁰ Tanaka, “‘Makotoya’ Hikaru Genji to katarite to,” 17–37.

⁵¹ Yoshikai Naoto, “Rokujō no miyasudokoro to ‘makotoya,’” 99–119.

simply attaching *makotoya* to certain characters, my own reading of this phrase focuses on a narrative technique that mediates the unnarrated and haunted past, inviting *mononoke* into the narrative discourse.

The narrator's calling up of Rokujō no miyasudokoro from the past hints at the narrators' ability to mediate between the known/narrated and unknown/narrated. In the proceeding sections of the Aoi chapter, Rokujō no miyasudokoro becomes one of the central figures, as seen in the episodes of the quarreling of the carriages (*kuruma arasohi* 車争ひ) and her assumed role in Genji's wife's death. Significantly, the famous quarrel between Genji's first wife, Aoi, and Rokujō no miyasudokoro over a parking space for ox-carriages takes place during the Aoi festival or Kamo festival, which originated as a festival to appease wrathful deities.⁵² This narration suggesting the narrator's knowledge of events untold occurs during the reign change, evoking the imperial family lineage and a past that is revived through the narrator's register of language. Notice, for example, how the narrator recites the newly retired emperor (*in* 院) in Kiritsubo's words. As the phrase "he remarks" とのたまはするにも indicates, the narrator must hold a higher rank and be close enough to the center of politics to overhear or indirectly have access to the emperor's words. Hence, we can assume that the narrator is familiar with the time when the late Crown Prince was still alive, knows how he died, and is aware of any power struggles over the succession of the throne, all while the narrator remains silent on these topics.

Retired Emperor Kiritsubo's remarks to Genji further conjure the late Prince Zenbō's unnarrated past. He says that the late Prince "thought very highly of her [Rokujō] and showed her every attention."⁵³ The Retired Emperor Kiritsubo admonishes Genji that he should not treat

⁵² Ōwa Iwao, *Jinja to kodai ōken saishi* (Tokyo: Hakusuisha, 1989), 152–56.

⁵³ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 18.

her casually, and “never cause a woman sorrow or resentment (*urami* 恨み).”⁵⁴ This remark from Retired Emperor Kiritsubo carries significant weight. As we have seen in the opening phrases in the Kiritsubo chapter, the *urami* from the other consorts is what causes Genji’s mother, Kiritsubo to fall ill (恨みをおふ) and ultimately perish. This remark over sorrow and resentment may draw a connection to the later incident of Rokujō’s possibly haunting Genji’s official wife, Aoi, which I will examine in the following chapter. The Retired Emperor does not simply warn Genji about Rokujō as an individual woman but emphasizes her position as a widow of Zenbō, the late Crown Prince (*komiya* 故宮), and his affection for her. The warning against generating resentment suggests the intertwined familial background of Rokujō no miyasudokoro and the possibility of Zenbō’s shadow and support for Rokujō no miyasudokoro’s becoming *mononoke* that would cause or influence several characters’ illnesses and deaths.

It is Rokujō no miyasudokoro’s actions in haunting various characters in the text that tend to draw the focus of the academic community, but her status as a revenant figure has far broader implications in terms of narration. She represents an entangled and unwritten past, stories that seems to almost ooze out to the surface but remain hidden from complete comprehension. She is defined not by the living but by the dead and the legacy of the dead Crown Prince’s favor from which she will never be free.

Intriguingly, this is the only time in which the text identifies this character as Rokujō no miyasudokoro, the most popular and widely recognized name for her even today. Never again is she mentioned by this name throughout the entire fifty-four chapters of *Genji monogatari*. For most of time, she is only called by her title, miyasudokoro.⁵⁵ While the definition of

⁵⁴ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 18.

⁵⁵ Yoshikai, “Rokujō no miyasudokoro to ‘makotoya,’” 107.

miyasudokoro 御息所 is a title that fluctuates depending on the time and context, there are five to six women called *miyasudokoro* in *Genji*: Rokujō no *miyasudokoro* 六条御息所 (twenty-seven cases); Ichijō no *miyasudokoro* 一条御息所 (twenty-four cases); Kiritsubo 桐壺 (nine cases); Tamakazura ōkimi 玉鬘大君, a daughter of Tamakazura 玉鬘 (eight cases); and, Akashi chūgū 明石中宮, Genji's daughter (two cases).

In general, only women of the court are called *miyasudokoro*, and, even then, only after giving birth to a member of the imperial family.⁵⁶ In most of cases, wives of Crown Princes are called *miyasudokoro*, though there are exceptions, as seen in Kiritsubo, Genji's mother, who was a consort to the emperor. The significance of *miyasudokoro* is that the title could be temporary and mobile. Since, by definition, a crown prince usually becomes the emperor, if a woman had a son with a crown prince or an emperor, she could possibly become the empress consort. For example, Akashi no chūgū is no longer called *miyasudokoro* once her status is established as mother of the emperor. Likewise, Kokiden no nyōgo 弘徽殿女御 and Fujitsubo 藤壺, the emperor's consorts, are never called *miyasudokoro* in the text once their children had become Emperor Suzaku and Emperor Reizei respectively. Ichijō no *miyasudokoro*, on the other hand, a consort to Emperor Suzaku only had a daughter and lived quietly as *miyasudokoro* after Emperor Suzaku's favor for her faded. Once an aristocratic wife's husband passes away, there is no chance for her to change her title. Her title tethers her to the past and the dead. Hence, combining the phrase "*makotoya kano*" and the title "Rokujō no *miyasudokoro*" further signifies Rokujō no

⁵⁶ See Yoshikai, "Rokujō no *miyasudokoro* to 'makotoya,'" 108–109; and Nishizawa Masashi and Uehara Sakukazu ed. *Rokujō no miyasudokoro* (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2005), 136.

miyasudokoro's unchangeable status, and her unexpected/expected return from an unnarrated past.

Narrating the Undecidable: Haunting Yūgao

One could argue that the phrase *makotoya kano* in the beginning of the Aoi chapter also refers back to Rokujō no miyasudokoro's possible involvement in Genji's lover, Yūgao's, death when she is killed by *mononoke* five chapters earlier. Both the Aoi and the Yūgao chapters deal with the most obvious cases of *mononoke* spirit possession, which kill two of the protagonist's beloved women. Recent Japanese scholarship has yet to come to a consensus regarding the identity of the *mononoke* who haunts Yūgao, but Rokujō no miyasudokoro is often cast as a likely candidate.

Let us examine the scene of Yūgao's possession, one of the most uncanny and well-known episodes related to *mononoke* in *monogatari* literature. I argue that this *mononoke* episode eloquently speaks for the crucial role of mediation and narration requisite for *mononoke*'s emergence. I focus on the narrative technique through which the narrator merges into Genji's mind and speaks through Genji's point of view. This episode affords us investigation into various discrepancies and inconsistencies regarding historical references, perspectives, and utterances that are interwoven to generate the text in which *mononoke* phenomena are depicted. Here I also discuss how the narrator's voice variously merges with Genji's and speaks for the *mononoke*, inviting multivalent and indeterminate readings of the episode, including the much disputed Rokujō no miyasudokoro's involvement and the politics behind the event.

The issue of *mononoke* and Yūgao's death have received much scholarly attention, dating as far back as the older, pre-Meiji commentaries of *Genji monogatari* (*kochū* 古注). Most

scholarship is preoccupied with identifying the spirit involved in Yūgao's death and can be roughly separated into three different lines of inquiry. First, many scholars have argued the *mononoke* is indeed Rokujō no miyasudokoro, with some believing her to have been empowered by her kin, including her late husband, late father, and her servants to possess Yūgao.⁵⁷ This line of reading can be traced back to *Kachō yosei* 花鳥余情, written by Ichijō Kanera/Kaneyoshi in the late-fifteenth century. Kanera claimed the beautiful and mysterious woman (をかしげなる女) who appears next to Genji at Yūgao's bedside is the *mononoke*, or *ikiryo* or *ikisudama* 生霊, of Rokujō no miyasudokoro, and many other commentators have followed this interpretation.⁵⁸

The second line of scholarship sees the *mononoke* as floating and earthbound spirits that reside in the abandoned mansion area, primarily associating the spirit with the historical figure Minamoto Tōru 源融 and his residence, Kawara no in 河原院.⁵⁹ Two of the oldest extant Genji commentaries, *Kōan Genji rongi* 弘安源氏論議 (1280) by Minamoto Tomoaki (1260?–1287) and *Kakaishō* 河海抄 (mid-fourteenth century) by Yotsutsuji Yoshinari 四辻善成 (1326–1402) both include annotations that claim the abandoned mansion in the *Genji* text was modeled after

⁵⁷ Several *Genji* scholars, such as Kawasaki Noboru, Mitani Eiichi, Mori Ichirō, and Fukazawa Michio, have examined potential familial and political motives behind Rokujō no miyasudokoro's *mononoke* supported by her late family members, including her late husband who used to be the Crown Prince, Zenbō, and her late father, a minister. For discussions on the historical debate concerning the identities of the *mononoke* in *Genji*, see Fujimoto Katsuyoshi, "Rokujō no miyasudokoro monogatari no shudai," in *Genji monogatari kenkyū shūsei*, vol. 1, ed. Ii Haruki, Masuda Shigeo, and Suzuki Hideo (Tokyo: Kasama Shobō, 1999), 265–310.

⁵⁸ Ichijō Kanera comments that Genji's comparing Rokujō no miyasudokoro with Yūgao was the cause of Rokujō no miyasudokoro's becoming *mononoke*: 六条の御やす所のことなり源氏の君のおもひくらへ給へるによりて邪気になれにや。See Ichijō Kanera, *Kachō yosei*, in *Genji monogatari kochūshaku taisei*, vol. 6, ed. Muromatsu Iwao (Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1978), 36.

⁵⁹ See, for example, Tsumida Fumiko, "Rokujō no miyasudokoro no seisei katei o megutte: 'Rokujō watari' no tokushusei to Kawara no in," *Kokubun*, no. 39 (June 1973): 1–15; and Nishimoto Kyōko, "Kawara no in II," in *Yūgao*, ed. Nishizawa Masashi and Uehara Sakukazu (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2005), 301–304.

the historical Kawara no in.⁶⁰ Also, Yūgao's death scene is often suggested to be based on an episode recorded in *setsuwa* collections such as *Kojidan* 古事談. In *Kojidan*, Minamoto no Tōru's *mononoke* encounters the Retired Emperor Uda 宇多 (867–931) and his consort, Fujiwara Hōshi 藤原褒子 (the exact date of birth and death unknown), at Kawara no in.⁶¹

A third, more recent, branch of scholarship considers the apparition to be a reflection of Genji's mind, a kind of conscience (*kokoro no oni* 心の鬼). This line of inquiry has been influenced by a famous phrase from the poem composed by Murasaki Shikibu herself in *Murasaki Shikibu shū* 紫式部集.⁶² All of these preoccupations with pinning down a single identity of the *mononoke* conceals the *mononoke*'s significance in the narration.⁶³ I want to extend existing narrative and structural analysis by focusing on the issue of mediation and the discrepancy of perspectives, which continues to displace coherent understanding of the essence and full extent of the event to haunt readers. Here we will see how the identities of *mononoke* are ambiguous by nature.

⁶⁰ Minamoto Tomoaki writes, なにかしのいん、もし六条坊門万里小路の河原の院をいへるにや。See Minamoto Tomoaki, *Kōan Genji rongi*, in *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 17, ed. Hanawa Hokinoichi (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1993), 551. Yotsutsuji Yasunari also comments on Nanigashi no in: なにかしの院 河原院敷彼院左大臣源融公舊宅也又號六條院此院是宇多院御跡也。延喜御記曰是日參入六條院此院是故左大臣源融朝臣宅成。大納言源朝臣奉於院。See Yotsutsuji Yoshinari, *Kakaishō*, in *Genji monogatari kochūshaku taisei*, vol. 6 (Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1978), 63.

⁶¹ *Kojidan* in *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, vol. 41, ed. Kawabata Yoshiaki and Araki Hiroshi (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2005), 16–17.

⁶² 絵にもものけつきたる女のみにくき図かきたるうしろに、鬼になりたるもとの妻を、小法師のしぱりたる図書きて、をところは経読みて、物のけ追めたるところを見て。

亡き人にかごととはかけて わづらふも おのが心の鬼にやはあらぬ See Murasaki Shikibu, *Murasaki Shikibu shū zen hyōshaku*, ed. Nanba Hiroshi (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1983), 258. For more on this line of scholarship, see Takehara Hiroshi, “‘Yūgao kan’ no shudai to hōhō ni tsuite: Mononoke shōtairon ni furetsutsu,” *Kokubungaku kenkyū*, no. 8 (November 1972): 13–22.

⁶³ Takahashi Tōru and Nanami Hiroaki also recognize this significance of narrative technique and structure used in the Yūgao chapter. See Nanami Hiroaki, “Yūgao kan no kaiki gatari no hyōgen kōzō,” *Bungaku kenkyū ronshū*, vol. 19 (March 2001): 173–96; and Takahashi Tōru, “Yūgao no maki no hyōgen: Tekusuto, katari, kōzō,” *Bungaku* 50, no. 11 (November 1982): 77–98.

Thus far, I have not employed any common terms of narrative analysis—the first-, second-, third-person, or omniscient narration. It is true that *Genji monogatari*'s narrators tell us what they see, hear, and think, which is similar to a first-person narrative. But at the same time, the narrators speak to the reader, expecting the reader to interact with them, similar to a narrative told in the second-person. The narrators can merge into the characters' minds and tell us their innermost thoughts. However, these thoughts are not necessarily accurate, and the narrators' scope of knowledge is not necessarily omniscient. As Noguchi Takehiko argues, no third-person narrator in Japanese literature existed until very end of Edo period. Thus, it is difficult to describe the narration of *Genji monogatari* using existing modern terminology.⁶⁴ In particular, the narrators are not only plural but are fluid, possessing various narrative voices, perspectives, and narrative timings. This fluidity negates the possibility of total comprehension of *mononoke*.

The Yūgao chapter begins with Genji's traveling to the Fifth Street (Gojō 五条) area to visit his old wet-nurse who is now sick and took a vow to become a nun.

Around when Genji was making a secret visit at Rokujō, on the way he decided to visit his old wet-nurse, Daini no menoto, who lives [in a residence] on Gojō street, and who fell seriously ill and had become a nun.

六条わたりの御忍び歩きのころ、内裏よりまかでたまふ中宿に、大貳の乳母のいたくわづらひて尼になりにはけるとぶらはむとて、五条なる家たづねておはしたり。⁶⁵

Though often unrecognized by present-day readers, the topographical orientation of this passage is crucial for establishing a shift in tone and narration. The Gojō area is on the periphery of the capital, Heian-kyō 平安京. Genji, who resides at Nijō-in 二条院 (his wife and the minister of the

⁶⁴ Noguchi Takehiko, *Sanninshō no hakken made* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1994). For further comparative study of *Genji monogatari*'s narration in modern literary terminology, see Nakayama, *Monogatari Kōzōron*.

⁶⁵ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 135.

left's daughter, Aoi's, residence was on Sanjō 三条 street) never steps further south of the Rokujō area except for occasional visits to a temple in Kitayama 北山 and when he exiles himself outside of the capital in Suma 須磨. As a general rule, the higher an aristocrat's status, the closer they could live to the Imperial Palace, which was located between Ichijō and Nijō street. According to *Chiteiki* 池亭記 (982), written by Yoshishige Yasutane 慶滋保胤 (933–1002), not many residences existed on the west side (*Ukyō* 右京) of the capital, but aristocrats of all ranks lived in the area above Shijō 四条 street on the east side (*Sakyō* 左京).⁶⁶ Rashōmon 羅生門, which was built to protect the south end of Heian-kyō was located on Kujō 九条 street. The area below Shijō street stretching to Kujō street (including the Rokujō area) was where commoners and the lowest-ranking aristocrats lived and was considered somewhat removed from the cultural and political center of the capital. While waiting to enter the nurse's house at Gojō street, Genji observes that the area is untidy and creepy (*mitsukashige* むつかしげ).⁶⁷ For Genji, and for many other aristocrats who serve at the court, the Gojō and Rokujō areas are an unfamiliar and unsettling sight.

On the sixteenth day of the eighth month, Genji secretly takes Yūgao to a “certain mansion,” *nanigashi no in* なにかしの院, near the Gojō and Rokujō area where he had visited his former wet-nurse. Whether the lady who lives at Rokujō (most likely Rokujō no miyasudokoro) is involved in Yūgao's death or not, the location of the Rokujō area itself seems to mediate *mononoke*, as seen in old commentaries' assumptions that the estate Genji is taking Yūgao to is reference to Kawara-no-in. By the time *Genji monogatari* was composed, the name

⁶⁶ Yoshishige Yasutane, *Chiteiki*, in *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, vol. 27, ed. Satake Akihiro (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992), 87.

⁶⁷ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, *SNKBZ*, 20: 135.

of Kawara-no-in was already imagined as a ruined garden and mansion where the old master, the restless spirit of Minamoto no Tōru (822–95) lingered. As Paul Atkins points out in his study on Kawara-no-in, the ruins can be seen in a poem by Ki no Tsurayuki 紀貫之 (866?–945) in *Kokinshū* (913?) that depicts the abandoned estate and deserted garden after Tōru’s death.⁶⁸ Kawara-no-in had become a literary trope to evoke nostalgia, mourning, and ruin in Heian-kyō. Kawara-no-in forms a boundary between the other world and this world, embracing the coexistence of aspects of prosperity/ruin, rise/fall, and triumph/loss, and life/death. The similar depiction of an abandoned garden and the proximity of “Nanigashi no in 何某の院” in *Genji monogatari* to that of the real Kawara-no-in might have fueled the contemporary readers’ imaginations. The narrator further confirms the desolation of the place:

[The garden is] entirely deserted and without any human presence; it stretches far. Clusters of trees grow poor and aged, and the grasses in front of him are nothing but unattractive; everything looks like an autumn moor. The lake is filled with waterweeds and the place is eerie and desolate Genji speaks, ‘This place is eerie and desolate. But demons will overlook me [if they discover it is me, Hikaru Genji].’

いといたく荒れて、人目もなくはるばるとみわたされて、木立いとうとましくもの古りたり。け近き草木などはことに見どころなく、みな秋の野にて、池も水草に埋もれたれば、いとけ疎げになりける所かな。＜略＞「け疎くもなりける所かな。さりとも鬼なども我をば見ゆるしてん」とのたまふ⁶⁹

The narrator describes the view of the garden at the mansion, and, although she does not quote Genji’s thoughts, her gaze seems very close to Genji’s observations. Notice that the sentence highlights that it is Genji who actually speaks the exactly the same words that the narrator was thinking and narrating. This mediatory reversal of the narrator-character roles at the mansion

⁶⁸ かは原の左のおほいまうちぎみの身まかりてののち、かの家にまかりてありけるに、塩釜といふ所のさまをつくれりけるを見てよめる 君まさで煙絶えにし塩竈のうら寂しくも見え渡るかな *Kokinshū*, SNKBZ, 11: 322–23. See Paul S. Atkins, “Depictions of the Kawara-no-in in Medieval Japanese Nō Drama,” *Asian Theatre Journal* 27, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 1–22.

⁶⁹ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 161.

right before a *mononoke* appears suggests the fluidity of the mediator as a witness and character and the possibility of her collusion as a medium for the *mononoke* phenomenon that follows.

In addition, Genji may be aware of the historical references of the site, or at least the possibility of some evil spirits' presence. While the text provides the historical references of the area, Genji himself seems to overlook the warnings and potential dangers of the historic site, believing that he would be an exception to escape any potential wrath of demons. The text therefore demonstrates Genji's assumptions regarding *mononoke*, which may or may not affect his perception and mediation of the event as well.

Late in the evening, as Genji falls to sleep, he sees a beautiful woman by their pillow. She says, 'You do not consider visiting a person whom I regard very highly. Instead you bring a person who has nothing particular to offer, and you favor her. How unpleasant and unbearable.' She attempts to shake awake the woman (Yūgao) next to him. He wakes up as he feels he is struck by the *mononoke*, and the lamp goes out.

宵過ぐるほど、少し寝入り給へるに、御枕上にいとをかしげなる女居て、「おのがいとめでたしと見奉るをば尋ね思ほさで、かくことなることなき人を率ておはして時めかし給ふこそ、いとめざましくつらけれ。」とて、この御かたはらの人をかき起こさむとすに見給ふ。物におそはるる心地しておどろきたまへれば、灯も消えにけり。⁷⁰

The reading for *ono ga ito medetashi to mitatematsuru oba tazune obohosa de* おのがいとめでたしと見奉るをば尋ね思ほさで is controversial, and depends on how one understands the supposedly omitted word between *mitatematsuru* 見奉る and *oba* をば. Since *mitatematsuru* 見奉る is an attributive form of the verb (*rentaikei* 連体形), some scholars argue that the two possible nouns that could follow are either person (*hito* 人) or fact (*koto* 事). Scholars, including translator Royall Tyler, who believe the missing word to be *koto* 事, generally also read *ono* お

⁷⁰ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 164.

の in おのがいとめでたしと見奉るをば尋ね思ほさで as reference to Rokujō no miyasudokoro. They contend that Rokujō no miyasudokoro is speaking to Genji. We can see a clear example of this interpretation in Tyler’s translation: “You are wonder to me, but you do not care to visit me; no, you bring a tedious creature here and lavish yourself upon her. It is hateful of you and very wrong.”⁷¹ While both “person” or “fact” are possible missing words here, as Yamada Masahiro and Ino Yōko’s study shows, when paired up with an attributive form of the verb, the case article (*kaku joshi* 格助詞) *o ba* をば is usually used to compare and contrast the same kind of word (e.g., princess and prince or old man and old lady) and, more often than not, is used for people.⁷² If we read the implied missing word as person 人, then there is a third person who regards “someone other than Yūgao” highly and speaks for that person. This is the reading that I have tentatively translated above. Scholars who read this way still tend to make some links between Rokujō no miyasudokoro and the *mononoke*, arguing that this おの may be the late Crown Prince who speaks through his beautiful wife’s body, or a lady-in-waiting who serves Rokujō no miyasudokoro.

Whether either of these readings are correct or not, we must notice that Rokujō no miyasudokoro is never named, nor does Genji identify the beautiful woman as her, despite the fact that Genji alone witnesses her apparition and hears what she says. The narrator confirms that Genji dozes off in the late evening. But, instead of saying that the beautiful woman tried to shake Yūgao awake by simply saying *kaki okosamu to su* かき起こさむとす, the narrator adds that “so Genji sees,” or *mitamahu* 見たまふ. This phrasing emphasizes that Genji is the medium here

⁷¹ Murasaki Shikibu, *The Tale of Genji*, trans. Royall Tyler (New York: Penguin Books, 2003), 67.

⁷² Yamada Masahiro and Ino Yōko, “Genji monogatari no bunnō kōza Oba,” in *Rokujō no miyasudokoro*, ed. Nishizawa Masahi and Uehara Sakukazu (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2005), 295–301.

and the story is narrated through what he hears and sees. In the very next sentence, the narrator sympathizes with Genji and defines “their” feeling of being haunted by *mono(noke)* 物に襲はるる心地して without honorific words, implying the close distance between the narrator and Genji. She can identify herself with Genji’s mind and feels his terror *before* he wakes up. As if a *mononoke* herself, the narrator can enter inside of Genji’s dreams, which is usually considered to be a passage between this world and the other world.

When Genji wakes, he finds that Yūgao is faint and limp, and no one is available to help them.

No one could hear him [calling] and no one comes. This woman is trembling with fear and loss, not knowing what to do. Soaked in sweat, she looks like she is losing her consciousness.⁷³

人え聞きつけで参らぬに、この女君いみじくわななきまどひて、いかさまにせむと思へり。汗もしとどになりて、我かの気色なり。

As the narrator says no one is coming 人え聞きつけで参らぬ, we know that she is there witnessing the event or again merging into Genji’s mind. Compared to the narration of Genji’s “seeing” the unidentified beautiful woman, here the narrator affirms Yūgao’s condition as trembling and sweating, and then observes what she “looks like” based on what she and/or Genji is seeing. In observing Yūgao, the narrator and Genji’s gaze and mind seem to agree with each other. In other words, the narrator, who can see the event with Genji when no one else could be around in the darkness, and can even enter Genji’s dreams, creates distance from Genji’s own view of the beautiful woman by adding that it was Genji who saw 見たまふ, suggesting that she may disagree with what Genji saw. Here the text depicts a discrepancy and oscillation between the two mediators, Genji and the narrator.

⁷³ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 164.

Genji “sees” the apparition of the woman again when someone finally brings a lamp, but the attendant hesitates to approach Genji out of respect.

‘Come, bring it here, [don’t worry, impropriety] depends on the situation at hand!’ he says. He *sees* her in the torchlight, at the pillow side. Genji *sees* a trace of the woman whom he *saw* in his dream and vanished. Shocked and terrified, thinking he has heard of such things only in old tales, however, he is anxious to know what happened with this lady [Yūgao]. Without care for his appearance, he lays beside her and tries to wake her up. But she just becomes cold, no longer breathing, and dies. Nothing can be said. [emphasis added]

「なほ持て来や、所に従ひてこそ」とて、召し寄せて見たまへば、ただこの枕上に、夢に見えつる容貌したる女、面影に見えてふと消え失せぬ。「昔の物語などにこそ、かかることは聞け」と、いとめづらかにむくつけけれど、まづ、「この人いかになりぬるぞ」と思ほす心騒ぎに、身の上も知られたまはず、添ひ臥して、「やや」と、おどろかしたまへど、ただ冷えに冷え入りて、息は疾く絶え果てにけり。言はむかたなし。⁷⁴

The narrator repeats “see” three times, emphasizing Genji’s act of seeing. The narrator, who observes Genji’s actions and reports his words and movements, avoids revealing her own insights and observations regarding the woman whom Genji is seeing throughout. While the narrator can objectively perceive Genji’s frantic emotions and discern Yūgao’s process of dying, she consistently refuses to tell the reader what she herself sees of the mysterious woman. Nanami Hiroaki discusses this narrative technique as characteristic of horror stories by comparing the first-person voice that Edgar Allan Poe uses in many of his works. Nanami argues for the effectiveness of the narrative structure in creating terror in the *mononoke* incident by being mainly narrated through Genji’s perspective with limited knowledge. This narrative structure allows readers to identify themselves with the protagonist and thereby intensify their horror.⁷⁵

I argue, however, that the shifting narrative perspective is not just a technique for intensifying the effects of terror through limiting knowledge for the character and the reader. It

⁷⁴ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 167.

⁷⁵ See Nanami, “Yūgao kan no kaiki no katari no hyōgen kōzō.”

also reveals the significance of the “mediating” role of *mononoke* that unceasingly escape from total comprehension and displace meanings, reminding the readers that a *mononoke*, or “ghost” in Derrida’s words, “is something that one does not know...if precisely it is, if it exists...this being-there of an absent or departed one no longer belongs to knowledge.”⁷⁶ The narrator only reports Genji’s perspective while withholding her own. This structure and mediation of *mononoke* in fact suggests various possibilities of discrepancy, disagreement, and “un-narration” between and/or behind the event that the text informs. The narrator accentuates how Genji sees the woman in his dream and sees the trace of the woman after waking, confirming that the woman’s shadow “disappears” 消え失せぬ. In other words, the narrator does not tell of the presence of the woman’s trace but only speaks for its disappearance. This oscillation of gaze and voice, intermingling the narrator’s and the character’s perspectives, generates unavoidable ambiguity and multivalence of *mononoke* phenomena that haunts the text and its readers.

This scene is a good example of what I mean by the unavoidable plurality of mediation. Especially in a text like *Genji monogatari*, the polysemic voices and the discrepancies between the multiple gazes and accounts continuously multiply and thereby engender the phenomenon of *mononoke*. The notion of hauntology is relevant here since it provides language to describe the fluidity of identity and meaning among individuals, marking the dynamic and inevitable shades of influence that link one person’s experience to another’s, both in the past, present, and future.

The haunting of Yūgao suggests that Genji himself was complicit in this haunting and narrating process as one of the possible mediums for the haunting. In other words, Genji participates in the mediation of the event, manifesting the *mononoke* in his sight, and letting the narrator enter his body and mind. Genji himself surrenders to the narrator to see and relay what

⁷⁶ Derrida, *Specters of Marx*, 5.

he sees and thinks. At the same time, he also claims agency for his gaze so that the narrator must distance herself from it. In fact, even before the haunting episode is traditionally thought to begin, Genji had already given his mind over to the narrator as he echoes the narrator's remarks about the garden. Alternatively, he might have read the narrator's mind and vocalized her thoughts, foreshadowing his later complicity in the haunting to come.

The confusion surrounding the identity of the *mononoke* results from more than the narrator and Genji's complicit relationship at the site of the haunting. From the beginning of the Yūgao chapter, the text provides the readers with various hints and historical references regarding the *mononoke*'s possible identity, including Rokujō no miyasudokoro and an anonymous ghost in Kawara-no-in. In addition, before Yūgao dies, Genji assumes that it was a fox or some other creature 狐などやうの物 that possesses her.⁷⁷ In the end, however, Genji concludes that it was a *mononoke* who resides at the ruinous old mansion 荒れたりし所に住みけむ物 and who was captivated by Genji's charm and thus decided to kill Yūgao. Genji once again sees the mysterious woman in his dream on a later night after holding a small memorial service on the forty-ninth day after Yūgao's death.⁷⁸ Hence, while the text depicts details of the *mononoke* incident, these details are relayed through Genji's eyes, the narrator's observations, and various contextual references.

There are inevitable discrepancies and differences among these details. It is this mediation and narration that generate the indefinable *mononoke*. In other words, it is in these

⁷⁷ こはなぞ。あな、もの狂ほしの物怖ぢや。荒れたる所は、狐などやうのものの、人を脅やかさむとて、け恐ろしう思はするならむ。まろあれば、さやうのものには脅されじ。 *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SKNZ, 20: 166.

⁷⁸ 君は、「夢をだに見ばや」と、思しわたるに、この法事したまひて、またの夜、ほのかに、かのありし院ながら、添ひたりし女のさまも同じやうにて見えければ、「荒れたりし所に住みけむ物の、我に見入れけむたよりに、かくなりぬること」と、思し出づるにもゆゆしくなむ。 *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SKNZ, 20: 194.

discrepancies and gaps that *mononoke* (re)emerge, destabilizing identity, agency, and comprehension. At the same time, instead of providing comprehensive details to the audience to facilitate comprehension, the narrator, or *monogatari*, grounds itself in the co-experiences and intergrowth with *mononoke*, providing multiplicity of differences, requiring constant reengagement and reinvestigation of the text.

The ending of the Yūgao chapter therefore signals a revenant moment in which *monogatari* seems to begin again, concluding with the narrator's confession-like soliloquy:

I have kept Genji's such troublesome tribulations in secret, as he determined that he would like to bury and conceal these experiences. But since people say that what I am telling sounds fictional, and they wonder why people (like myself) who know him so well lavish praise upon him, thinking of him as one who has no flaw since he is a son of an emperor [that's why I am relaying this incident now]. Now I cannot escape from censure since I talk too much...

かやうのくだくだしきことは、あながちに隠ろへ忍びたまひしもいとほしくて、みな漏らしとどめたるを、「など、帝の御子ならむからに、見む人さへ、かたほならずものほめがちなる」と、作りごとめきてとりなす人ものしたまひければなむ。あまりもの言ひさがなき罪、さりどころなく。。。⁷⁹

She explains that since all the stories about Genji are too perfect and fiction-like, she has to add these *mononoke* stories to prove the wholeness and truth regarding Genji as a person. Here the narrator apparently speaks from an unidentifiable future, recalling past incidents that Genji kept silent. The *monogatari* starts by coming back yet again.

⁷⁹ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 196.

Conclusion

In reading *Genji monogatari*, I have argued for the significance of the unstable and polysemous nature of *mononoke*, focusing on the multiplicity of narrative perspectives and voices. We have seen that *mononoke* are inherently mediated and performative traces that resist reduction to singular beings (or non-beings), continually displacing identity and meaning. Drawing on Derrida's concepts of ghosts, haunting, and hauntology, I demonstrated the how the revenant entities of *mononoke* and *monogatari* challenge static identities and definitions as well as our knowledge and comprehension.

The ubiquitous *mononoke* in *Genji monogatari* manifest themselves not only as characters but also as narrative voices crucial for creating *monogatari*. As we have seen, *Genji monogatari* begins by confounding time and space, even potentially nullifying the veracity of the story and all of its contents. Such undecidability and uncertainty is reinforced by the narrative voices of plural ghost-like ladies-in-waiting, whose presences and absences, as well as knowing and not-knowing, are often withheld from the reader. Their ghostly presences and absences shape and de-shape the text.

We have also seen how the text is complicit in invoking *mononoke* appearances. Rokujō no miyasudokoro represents the persistence of the past. Her revenant spirit is enabled by the voices of ghost-like narrators, as her character is already narrated as a revenant *mononoke* even before her first entrance in the text. In closely reading the *mononoke* incidents in the Yūgao chapter, we have seen how the narrators and characters merge with each other to share and narrate stories. These multiple mediations and narrations shared by the narrators and characters coalesce to generate the indefinable *mononoke*. In so doing, the text demonstrates the way in which *mononoke* and *monogatari* emerge together as haunted and haunting entities.

Mononoke appearances in *monogatari* encourage us to challenge seemingly stable meanings and expect the unexpected. *Mononoke* and *monogatari* (re)create and destabilize each other in an intertwined and fluid relationship. When *mononoke* appear in the text, it is a signal to the reader that there is something unnarrated that requires further inquiry. They invite readers to delve beneath the surface level of the text. These hauntings are occasions where the past and present intermingle and the multivalence of language flourishes, urging readings of what is not explicitly written. Characters, narrators, and readers together mediate *mononoke*'s voices, while at the same time *mononoke* mediate the text and speak for the unnarrated past.

Chapter Two

Narrating *Mononoke* in *The Tale of Genji* Part Two: Specters of Genealogy

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I examined the polysemic features of *mononoke* in *Genji monogatari*, focusing on the role of narrators as mediators, as well as *mononoke*'s own narrative voices and shifting perspectives. I have thus far emphasized the undecidable and multivalent nature of *mononoke* as they are mediated through characters and narrators in *Genji*. In this chapter, I further examine the interdependent relationship of *mononoke* and kinship. As I have suggested in the introduction, becoming a powerful vengeful spirit, or even suffering as a victim of such a spirit, was a privileged phenomenon that could provide political power and familial legitimacy in elite aristocratic culture. My focus here turns to the significance of kinship and genealogical ties that not only mediate *mononoke*'s existences but are reciprocally mediated by *mononoke* in the text. While the indeterminacy of *mononoke*'s identities and their mediated voices are a key to understanding the structure of narration underlying *Genji* and, more importantly, narrative tales (*monogatari*) in general, in this chapter, I will question the apparent contradiction that *mononoke* identity is both indeterminate as well as associated with a vengeful loser targeting a victor and his or her family line, a discourse imbedded in *mononoke*'s emergence since ancient times. I argue here that kinship is a fluid and ambivalent concept, and that in *Genji*, *mononoke* and kinship are in fact mutually dependent. It is in the interplay between spirits and family ties that both phenomena take on substance and meaning.

Genealogical concerns play a significant role in *Genji*, and the complexities of kinship relations are featured throughout the text. As Richard Okada points out, one of the most frequent and important terms in *Genji* is *suji* 筋, which is used to mean both story-line and kinship line.¹ The multivalence of this term hints at how story lines and kinship lines are interwoven in the text, both integral to the structure of the tale as a whole. I argue that the significance of kinship is further manifested in the appearances of *mononoke* in the tale. Revenant spirits challenge and broaden the concept of kinship beyond simple genealogical charts by revealing transgressions of family boundaries and even the significance of the omission of relationships between characters.

In examining the complex connections between *mononoke* and kinship, my approach is particularly inspired by Peter Wade's discussion of kinship as a network of "rhizomic hybridity," as elaborated by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. The rhizome motif is useful when thinking about kinship since it suggests root systems that constantly spread in various directions from random nodes, generating both underground roots and aboveground shoots, forming complex webs of unpredictable shapes that are continually in process and break down the concept of origins, linear development, and historical evolutions.² In other words, notions of kinship are hybrid and dynamic entities which constantly form "roots" to the past and "routes" into the prospective future. This type of rhizomic kinship lends itself to an imaginative reconstruction and elaboration of the relationships between humans and *mononoke* found in *Genji*. I contend that kinship in the text is characterized by the tension between roots to the past and routes to the future and the dynamic process of being and becoming. *Mononoke* are key to understanding this dynamic and haunted network of kinship within the tale.

¹ H. Richard Okada, ed., *The Tale of Genji: Japanese Literature in English*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Routledge, 2011), 10.

² Peter Wade, "Hybridity Theory and Kinship Thinking," *Cultural Studies* 19, no. 5 (2005): 602–21.

Mononoke serve as a type of nexus where roots and routes come together. In particular, by focusing on birth and death, which are indispensable moments in family formation and genealogical narratives, I explore how *mononoke* serve as keys for recapturing roots and generating prospective routes for the future. First, I examine the episode in which Aoi 葵, an official wife of Hikaru Genji, is visited by *mononoke* in the last stages of her pregnancy and when she eventually perishes. Birth and death constitute some of the biggest life events in which *mononoke*'s involvement facilitate the construction and reinforcement of familial roots and routes. The attacks further reveal the significance of Genji's lover Rokujō's kinship. Second, I examine the familial complexities surrounding the seemingly minor character Kashiwagi 柏木 in order to further explore how *mononoke* enable him to transgress boundaries between several families as well as ensure the continuation of his kinship from the past into the future.

By focusing on what is not explicitly written in these moments of *mononoke* intervention, my readings challenge earlier understandings of *Genji* that developed out of a tradition of seeking to match the tale's content with corresponding historical events and figures. Instead, I draw inspiration from Wade's concept of roots and routes to offer new and hybrid approaches to reading *Genji* by reflecting on the roots of traditional readings of the past millennium while providing my own routes that destabilize origins and allow the unnarrated to be read, thereby providing new possible interpretations.³ Though *mononoke* and kinship appear to be separate phenomena, *Genji* allows us to see how they share key characteristics. Just as we might describe *mononoke* as revenant figures that always come back from the past, kinship too comes back from past. Kinship is defined by the dead; it is the haunting presence of those who lived in the past that gives relevancy and legitimacy to the generational order within the families of the living.

³ Peter Wade, 610.

The Problem of Kinship in *Genji monogatari*

The genealogical connections of the characters in *Genji* have long been a central concern of the field. Yet despite the important place of the deceased in the formulation of kinship, *mononoke* have rarely been included in discussions of genealogy. The small amount of scholarship that has touched upon spirits and family relationships has tended to naturalize the analytical framework of the family. Historian Fukutō Sanae points out that while there are a number of works that discuss historical features of the Heian family within *Genji*, most scholars regard family and marriage practices as static and stable entities, despite the fact that the exact time span of the composition of *Genji* remains unknown. Furthermore, the period depicted in the tale covers over seven decades and four imperial reigns, from the first Kiritsubo 桐壺 chapter to the last extant Yume no ukihashi 夢浮橋 chapter. Styles and notions of marriage and family changed over the course of several generations whether or not the text recognizes these changes.⁴ The tenuous grasp we have on the relationship between *Genji* and its historical context urges us to reconsider notions of kinship based on critical readings of the text.

There are more than five-hundred characters who appear in *Genji*, and at least as far back as the late Heian period, scholars have dedicated themselves to the rigorous task of sorting out genealogical relationships between these characters.⁵ One of the most notable and

⁴ Fukutō Sanae, “Heian chūki no kon’in to ie, kazoku,” in *Kōza Genji monogatari kenkyū*, vol. 2, *Genji monogatari to sono jidai*, ed. Kanō Shigefumi and Ii Haruki (Tokyo: Ōfū, 2006), 74–99.

⁵ See Asao Hiroyoshi, “Rokujō no miyasudokoro to sentei: Mononoke o shiza to shita *Genji monogatari* no kōzō,” *Chūko Bungaku*, no. 35 (May 1985): 19–28; Asao Hiroyoshi, *Genji monogatari no junkyo to keifu* (Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2004); Shimizu Yoshiko, “Tennō-ke no junkyo to keifu,” in *Genji monogatari no buntai to hōhō* (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1980); and Doris G. Bargen, *Mapping Courtship and Kinship in Classical Japan: The Tale of Genji and Its Predecessors* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2015).

comprehensive of all the *Genji* genealogies is *Sanetaka-bon Genji monogatari keizu* 実隆本源氏物語系図, produced by Sanjōnishi Sanetaka 三条西実隆 (1455–1537) in 1488. The oldest extant genealogy of the tale's characters is *Kujōke-hon Genji monogatari kokeizu* 九条家本源氏物語古系図, composed around the late twelfth century. It is likely that simplified genealogies, called *fu* 譜, were created and circulated to aid those who read the text.⁶ Over the past millennium, later scholars have added their own meticulous studies to these initial works in an attempt to map the tale's complicated genealogies to historical figures and imperial family lines.

My own study is indebted to this body of scholarship engaged in identifying genealogical relationships between characters and discussing how such relationships contribute to the theme of rulership and marriage politics in the text. At the same time, my investigation goes beyond a traditional focus on kingship and the significance of the succession of the throne based on patrilineal lines (*ōken-ron* 王権論). My main line of inquiry relates to how *mononoke* allow the characters to embody imperial kinship or membership in a certain family beyond the imperial line. In short, what do such hauntings and revenant forces unveil about the mechanics and storytelling involved in forming kinship ties and genealogies?

Before moving on to my reading of *Genji*, I want to first clarify my position and theoretical frame regarding the concept of kinship. Definitions of kinship have been controversial in various disciplines, including the fields of sociology, history, and anthropology. In European and North American scholarly communities, numerous scholars have contributed to studies on kinship, most notably Friedrich Engels, David Émile Durkheim, Henry Lewis Morgan, Claude Levi-Strauss, and David Schneider, all of who explored kinship beyond

⁶ Tokiwa Kazuko, *Genji monogatari kokeizu no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1973), 9–20.

biological/blood ties.⁷ Based on numerous ethnographic studies and historical research available today, it is perhaps fair to state that kinship is a social, cultural, economic, as well as ideological, institution that can transcend biological unity, and through which procreation, filiation, and descent can be performed postnatally. More recently, many thinkers, including Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, Julia Kristeva, Judith Butler, and Kelly Oliver, have participated in this discussion of kinship in terms of the ideological relationship between the state and family, as well as considering the question of subjectivity based on psychoanalytic and feminist approaches. These critical studies further complicate the concept of kinship not only as a bond among members of a family that share some sort of interest with each other but also as an institution correlated and conditioned by broader political, social, and cultural forces.⁸

That kinship is not an *a priori* biological fact is critical when discussing premodern Japanese family lines and their construction. Although various social, historical, cultural, and religious factors intermingle in forming the concept of kinship in premodern Japan, many scholars agree that especially in Heian Japan (794–1185), the term *ie* 家 held special prominence.⁹ *Ie* can variously refer to house, home, those who share the same property, those

⁷ See Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (New York: International Publishers, 1942); Émile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, trans. Joseph W. Swain (New York: Free Press, 1965); Lewis Henry Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997); Claude Levi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (Boston: Beacon, 1969); and David M. Schneider, *A Critique of the Study of Kinship* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984).

⁸ See also Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983); Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982); Judith Butler, *Antigone's Claim: Kinship between Life and Death* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000); Kelly Oliver, *Family Values: Subjects between Nature and Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

⁹ There are numerous controversies regarding the structure of family formation in early and medieval Japan. Prominent debates include topics of marriage and bloodlines, monogamy versus polygamy, patrilineal and matrilineal systems, and official lineages, to name a few. For some of the most important recent scholarship in this area, see Fukutō Sanae, *Ie seiritsushi no kenkyū: Sosen saishi, onna, kodomo* (Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 1991); Fukutō, *Heian ōchō shakai no jendā: Ie, ōken, seiai* (Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2005); Fukutō, *Heian ōchō no kodomotachi: Ōken to ie, warabe* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan,

who share common ancestors, or those who will presumably share descendants. All of these meanings potentially outweigh blood ties and the subjectivity of individual members. In an important sense, *ie* as a structure is *imagined*, shared by members of a group based on common ancestors—who very well may not be blood-related—and future descendants.¹⁰ While I do not intend to solve the long-debated problem of what exactly kinship is, nor precisely define the concept of *ie* in Heian Japan, I hope my readings of the text will contribute to discussions of contemporary aristocratic family life. As the anthropologist Marshall Sahlins points out, myriad ethnographic reports and historical documents can at best only exemplify, rather than verify, the concept of kinship.¹¹ My principal aim therefore is to examine how kinship plays out in the depiction of *mononoke* and the profound effect the mutual dependency of *mononoke* and kinship have on mediating and constituting narrative texts.

What's in a Name: The Haunted Topographical Associations of Rokujō's Mansion

Before examining the possible involvement of Rokujō no miyasudokoro's 六条御息所 vengeful spirit at Aoi's sickbed, it is first necessary to examine the significance of her name and

2004); Fukutō, *Heianchō no haha to ko: Kizoku to shomin no kazoku seikatsushi* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1991); Kudō Shigenori, *Genji monogatari no kekkon: Heianchō no kon'in seido to ren'aitan* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2012); Kudō, *Heianchō no kekkon seido to bungaku* (Tokyo: Kazama Shobō, 1994); Takamure Itsue and Kurihara Hiromu, *Heian Kamakura Muromachi kazoku no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1985); Kurihara Hiromu, *Heian zenki no kazoku to shinzoku* (Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2008); William H. McCullough, *Japanese Marriage Institutions in the Heian Period* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967); Peter Nickerson, "The Meaning of Matrilocality: Kinship, Property, and Politics in Mid-Heian," *Monumenta Nipponica* 48, no. 4 (1993): 429–67; Doris G. Borgen, *Mapping Courtship and Kinship in Classical Japan* (2015); Hu Jie, *Heian kizoku no kon'in kanshū to Genji monogatari* (Tokyo: Kazama Shobō, 2001); and Wakita Haruko, *Nihon chūsei joseishi no kenkyū: Seibetsu yakuwari buntan to bosei, kasei, seiai* (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1992).

¹⁰ See Akata Mitsuo, *Ie no denshō to senzokan* (Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin, 1988); Akata, ed., *Sorei shrinkō* (Tokyo: Yūzankaku, 1991); Fukutō Sanae, *Ie seiritsushi no kenkyū* (1991); Itō Mikiharu, "Sosen sūhai to 'ie'," in *Sorei Shrinkō*, ed. Akata Mitsuo (Tokyo: Yūzankaku, 1991), 373; Takeda Chōshū, *Nihonjin no "ie" to shūkyō* (Tokyo: Hyōronsha, 1976); and Yonemura Chiyo, *"Ie" o yomu* (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 2014), 34–35.

¹¹ Marshall Sahlins, *What Kinship Is—and Is Not* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 2.

family background. While the naming of characters in *Genji* is quite complicated, and occasionally inconsistent, the name of Rokujō no miyasudokoro, who may be the most influential *mononoke* figure throughout the tale, provides us with important kinship associations. In short, Genji's most infamous lover bares her family history in her name.

In her first entrance in the tale, the narrator introduces the character by her name and title—Rokujō no miyasudokoro—an appellation that has since been conventionally used by many Japanese scholars as well as readers. Lady Rokujō's title, *miyasudokoro*, is one commonly given to a wife of a crown prince or an emperor, thereby attaching her to her late husband and signaling her unchangeable marital status as his widow. The significance of her name is put into stark contrast when compared to many other female characters, whose names are usually associated with the poems they compose in the first chapter in which they appear, such as Aoi 葵, Utsusemi 空蟬, and Asagao no kimi 朝顔の君. Rokujō no miyasudokoro, on the other hand, is presented in a very different manner during her first entrance in the text at the start of the Aoi chapter.

From the very beginning, her name is introduced by the narrator, and later by Retired Emperor Kiritsubo, with strong imperial associations. She is immediately associated with her late husband, Zenbō 前坊, (literally the “previous” Crown Prince), and her daughter with Zenbō, who is thus of the imperial family line, which entitles her to become Ise Saigū 伊勢斎宮, an unmarried imperial princess serving at Ise Grand Shrine (Ise Jingū 伊勢神宮). As *Genji* scholar Yoshikai Naoto has shown, throughout the tale, Rokujō no miyasudokoro is addressed as simply “miyasudokoro” 御息所 twenty-seven times.¹² Hence even while she is having an affair with her

¹² Yoshikai Naoto, “Rokujō no miyasudokoro to ‘makotoya,’” in *Genji monogatari no jinbutsu to kōzō*, ed. Chūko Bungaku Kenkyūkai (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1982), 99–119.

new lover, Genji, her title reminds readers of her deceased family and her status as a mother to the future empress consort.

Rokujō no miyasudokoro's name bears more valences beyond her widow status. She is described as a lady of the Rokujō area (*Rokujō watari* 六条わたり)—literally, a Lady of the Sixth Street District—an area of the capital located outside of the vicinity of the Imperial Palace.¹³ The Rokujō area signifies her affiliation with her estate located on the periphery of the Heian aristocrats' territory, geographically and metaphorically distant from the Imperial Palace. Most other female characters who similarly carry the place-name where they reside are members of the imperial family, consorts of emperors, or princesses, such as Kiritsubo 桐壺, Kokiden 弘徽殿, and Fujitsubo 藤壺. Rokujō 六条, on the other hand, is another case altogether. The place name “Rokujō” does not refer to an imperial property but rather to an estate that she most likely inherited from her late-father minister. While there is no explicit explanation regarding from whom she inherited the residence, once again the significance of the minutia of names here is important.¹⁴

In the simple choice of appellation, the text seems to emphasize what Rokujō no miyasudokoro represents beyond her own self—her estates and her family, as well as her family's aim to gain power in the court by arranging for her to marry a member of the imperial family. The narrator tells us how her father once held high hopes for her to become an empress

¹³ *Genji monogatari*, ed. Abe Akio et al., vol. 1, *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* (hereafter *SNKBZ*) (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1994), 20: 135.

¹⁴ The Rokujō estate was not initially called “in 院,” or “miya 宮,” which would signify an estate owned by a member of imperial house. The famous estate name, Rokujō-in 六条院 gains that designation only once Genji rebuilds the mansion for the legitimate proprietor, Empress Consort Akikonomu 秋好, Rokujō's daughter whom he sponsors around the same time he himself becomes Jun Daijō Tennō 準太上天皇, a title equal in status to a retired emperor. See Sakai Yoshiki, “Hikaru Genji-zō keisei ni okeru ‘in’: Naze sono kyotaku ha ‘in’ to yobareruka,” *Geibun kenkyū*, no. 48 (March 1986), 64–80. *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, *SNKBZ*, 21: 93.

consort, but these plans were dashed at the very last moment as Zenbō did not accede to the throne.¹⁵ Her name—a combination of the location of a non-imperial residence as well as her title as a widow—embodies her family’s failed expectations and her resulting physical distance from the imperial palace.

More importantly, for readers of the tale familiar with the culture of the capital, the name Rokujō, or Sixth Street District, has ghostly implications that foreshadow the Lady’s possible involvement in spirit possession later in the tale. The areas around the Fifth and Sixth streets were already commonly associated with hauntings and literary imagery of *mononoke* in the time *Genji* was written, and the possible real-world historical counterpart to Rokujō no miyasudokoro’s mansion has intrigued many medieval annotators and scholars. As I discussed in the previous chapter, one of the most famous *mononoke*-related incidents in the tale depicts Genji’s lover, Yūgao, attacked and killed by *mononoke* in an abandoned mansion (Nanigashi-no-in 何某院) near Rokujō’s mansion. In Yotsutsuji Yoshinari’s 四辻善成 (1326–1402) *Genji* commentary, *Kakaishō* 河海抄 (1362–67?), he notes that both fictional locations, Rokujō watari 六条渡 and Nanigashi-no-in, are references to the Kawara-no-in 河原院 area. This real-world location of Kawara-no-in is a well-known, old, and elegant villa founded by Minamoto Tōru 源融 (822–95), who is often called the Kawara Minister of the Left (Kawara Sadaijin 河原左大臣), named after his famous mansion.¹⁶

¹⁵ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 93.

¹⁶ Commentator Yoshinari provides annotations on “Rokujō watari” in the beginning of the Yūgao chapter, referring to an episode from section 81 in *Ise monogatari*: “Once, a certain minister of the left built a very interesting house in the Rokujō area by the water’s edge of Kamo River.” See *Ise monogatari*, in SNKBZ, 12: 182. Yotsutsuji Yoshinari also notes in his annotations that Nanigashi-no-in is “the minister of left, Lord Tōru’s, old estate Kawara-no-in [which was later given to the Retired Emperor Uda, and now is the remains of Uda’s Rokujō mansion],” pointing once again to the association with Kawara-no-in. See Yotsutsuji Yoshinari, *Kakaishō*, in *Genji monogatari kochūshaku taisei*, vol. 6 (Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1978), 63.

Minamoto Tōru himself was believed to have become a vengeful spirit, obsessed with his estate and his past. These *mononoke* episodes appear in a variety of literature, such as *Gōdanshō* 江談抄 (1104–08?), *Konjaku monogatari shū* 今昔物語集 (c. 1120), and *Uji shūi monogatari* 宇治拾遺物語 (1221?).¹⁷ Though the finer details vary, these stories follow a similar arc. Tōru appears before Retired Emperor Uda, who acquired Kawara-no-in through Tōru’s second son, Noboru, and Tōru reveals to the Retired Emperor that his restless spirit still resides in the mansion.¹⁸ This widely-told anecdote embodies an important theme in medieval literature—that of ghosts or spirits that tend to haunt the sites where they formerly lived.

Hence the topographical associations of Rokujō no miyasudokoro’s name evoke the history of the area, including the ruins, *mononoke*, and a haunted estate. Such history conjures up episodes of the ghostly Kawara-no-in and the apparitions of her dead kin and family estate. In other words, her name mediates the past and her family relationships that are deeply rooted in the estate as well as her family’s failed ambitions, suggesting the possibility of her becoming a vengeful spirit as a sort of storied family enterprise.

Mononoke at the Bedside: Birth, Sickness, and Death

While names associated with estates signify the importance of ancestral roots, sites of childbirth emphasize routes, ensuring the continuation of the family line. And it is at the site of childbirth where *mononoke* often play crucial roles. In the “Aoi” (Heartvine) chapter, the Rokujō

¹⁷ For further details on Kawara-no-in’s history and reception, see Paul S. Atkins, “Depictions of the Kawara-No-in in Medieval Japanese Nō Drama,” *Asian Theatre Journal* 27, no. 1 (2010): 1–22; and Masuda Shigeo, “Kawara-no-in aishi,” in *Bungaku kūkan to shite no Heiankyō*, ed. Gotō Shōko (Tokyo: Benseisha, 1994): 33–55.

¹⁸ *Uji shūi monogatari*, *SNKBZ*, 50: 380; and Masuda Shigeo, “Rokujō no miyasudokoro no junkyo: Yūgao-kan kara Aoi-kan e,” in *Genji Monogatari no jinbutsu to kōzō*, ed. Chūko Bungaku Kenkyūkai (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1982).

daughter and father are mentioned together when Genji's official wife is undergoing a very difficult delivery and falls into critical condition while being attacked by *mononoke*. Aoi falls seriously ill immediately after a famous quarrel over a parking space intended for ox-carriages (*kuruma arasoi* 車争い) at the Aoi festival. Her antagonist in this quarrel is none other than Rokujō no miyasudokoro, and in the end, Aoi wins out and Rokujō no miyasudokoro is disgraced. Traditionally Aoi's sickness and difficult delivery are understood as, at least partially, a result of this incident, which causes Rokujō no miyasudokoro's living spirit to emerge and possess Aoi. While the Buddhist and ascetic rites and prayers are performed, there are many *mononoke* figures who appear at the bedside one after another, causing Aoi great agony. There is one figure in particular who actually possesses Aoi and cannot be exorcised since the *mononoke* never reveals its identity, a key step toward pacification.¹⁹

The narrator describes how Aoi's condition gets progressively worse as she suffers from these *mononoke*. She is not the only one suffering, however. Rokujō is also nursing a troubled heart after hearing rumors that the identity of the tenacious *mononoke* is in fact her own living wrath (*ikisudama* 生霊), or the spirit of her late father minister (*ko chichi otodo* 故父大臣).²⁰ While the narration makes clear Rokujō no miyasudokoro's suffering such humiliation and her attempts to suppress her complicated feelings toward her lover, Genji, her father's background and history remains hidden at this point in the tale. In fact, besides Rokujō no miyasudokoro's recollection that her father had high hopes for her and family's future, other details about him remain un-narrated in the text. Likewise, we do not know for sure why or how he died; why

¹⁹ 物の怪、生霊などいふもの多く出で来てさまざま名のりする中に、人にさらに移らず、ただみづからの御身につと添ひたるさまにて。。。また片時離るるおりもなきもの一つあり。 *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, *SNKBZ*, 21: 32.

²⁰ 大殿には、御物の怪いたう起こりていみじうわづらひたまふ。この御生霊、故父大臣の御霊などいふものありと聞きたまふにつけて、思しつづくれば。。。 *SNKBZ*, 21: 35.

Zenbō, Rokujō no miyasudokoro's late husband, was not appointed emperor; nor when, how, or why Zenbō died.²¹ The reader can reasonably suspect a possibility that Rokujō no miyasudokoro's father died of indignation. The rumors of the spirit that possesses Aoi refer to it as *goryō* 御霊,²² which traditionally referred to the dead spirit of someone who held a high status but died of indignation, frequently for political reasons. Here the reader has a glimpse of the unnarrated stories that emerge from *mononoke* episodes. In this case, the unnarrated perhaps involves a political dispute between the Rokujō and Aoi families in addition to Rokujō no miyasudokoro's individual wrath or jealousy.

Many extant Heian documents depict *mononoke* attacking expecting mothers in the last stage of pregnancy and during childbirth. The motif of *mononoke* appearing during birth, especially the birth of an emperor's child and occasionally the birth of a successor of the influential Northern branch of Fujiwara family, is ubiquitous in historical records and courtiers' diaries, such as *Ōkagami* 大鏡 (c. 1119), *Shōyūki* 小右記 (978–1032), and *Gonki* 権記 (992–1026), as well as *Murasaki Shikibu nikki* 紫式部日記 (1008–10) written by the attributed author of *The Tale of Genji*. Murasaki Shikibu 紫式部 (978–?) vividly describes the scene of the birth of Emperor Ichijō's son by Fujiwara Shōshi 藤原彰子 (988–1074), the eldest daughter of Fujiwara no Michinaga. The author details pacification rituals at Shōshi's bedside conducted by

²¹ The term *zenbō* refers to a Crown Prince who does not take a throne primarily for two reasons: death before his enthronement or abdication from the title. A medieval commentator, Ichijō Kanera or Kaneyoshi/Kanera 一条兼良 (1402–81), in his *Genji* annotations, *Kachō yosei* 花鳥余情, written in 1472, speculates that Zenbō might have abdicated from the title of Crown Prince for an unknown cause, and draws upon the historical example of Prince Atsuakira 敦明 (994–1051) or Ko-Ichijō-in 小一条院. Prince Atsuakira, eldest son of the Emperor Sanjō 三条 (976–1017), was forced to abandon his title under pressure from Fujiwara Michinaga 藤原道長 (966–1028), the head of *midōryū* 御堂流, or the Midō line, of the Northern Branch of the Fujiwara. Ichijō Kanera, *Kachō yosei*, in *Genji monogatari kochūshaku taisei*, vol. 6 (Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1978), 70.

²² *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 35.

ascetic monks and *onmyō* masters to appease *mononoke* who try to intervene and stop Shōshi from giving birth to an heir to the Emperor. More than forty people, including ladies-in-waiting and members of the Fujiwara family, were watching behind a bamboo screen.²³ In the author's account, thanks to all of the Buddhist priests and *onmyō* masters, Shōshi survives and gives birth to the emperor's successor.

All of these texts, including Murasaki Shikibu's account, reinforce the notion that the appearance of *mononoke* is related to one of the most important family events, childbirth. The most politically powerful families, especially the imperial family and the Fujiwara family seemed to especially draw the attention of *mononoke* who haunt their family lines. A successful birth ensured by overcoming *mononoke* attacks through arranging pacification rituals in front of an audience could effectively demonstrate the power of the head of the family and confirm the family's future continuation.

At the same time, several historical documents also depict a parent-child pair appearing as *mononoke*, similar to the rumors regarding Rokujō and her father. The most notable pairs include Fujiwara Motokata 藤原元方 (888–953), the head of Southern Branch of the Fujiwara, and his daughter Sukehime 祐姫 (date of birth and death unknown), and Fujiwara Akimitsu 藤原顯光 (944–1021), a member of the Kujō line of the Northern Branch of the Fujiwara and his daughter Enshi 延子 (984–1019). For example, Motokata haunts Fujiwara Morosuke 藤原師輔 (908–60) and his daughter consort (*nyōgo* 女御) Anshi 安子 (927–64) who was later Empress Consort to Emperor Murakami 村上 (926–67) and mother of Emperor Reizei 冷泉 (950–1011) and Emperor Enyū 円融 (959–91). Motokata performs his haunting on behalf of (or occasionally

²³ *Murasaki Shikibu nikki*, SNKBZ, 26: 130–35.

along with) his daughter Sukehime, a consort (*kōi* 更衣) to Emperor Murakami, whose son, the first prince Hirohira 広平 was defeated by the second Prince Norihira 憲平 (later Emperor Reizei) in a competition to become Crown Prince.²⁴ Various episodes related to Motokata's *mononoke*'s intervention into his political rival's daughter's childbirth emphasizes a father's high hope for his own daughter's success in producing a crown prince and ambition to thereby himself become a regent or chancellor, the same ambition held by Rokujō no miyasudokoro's father.

Because the regency was dependent on marriages between the Fujiwara and the Crown Prince or Emperor, the continuation of kinship was important politics. Producing heirs—especially healthy daughters who could marry to the throne—was essential to holding power. According to historical records and *monogatari* alike, this is where *mononoke* were most active. In another well-known example, Fujiwara Akimitsu's daughter Enshi was married to Prince Atsuakira 敦明 (994–1051), who then took Fujiwara Kanshi 寛子 (999–1025), a daughter of Fujiwara Michinaga 藤原道長 (966–1028), as a second wife in return for abdicating his position as Crown Prince and thus lost the opportunity for Akimitsu's family to become maternal relatives with an emperor. Hence Fujiwara Akimitsu is said to have cast a spell on Michinaga and swear that he would haunt Michinaga's descendants. Indeed, in *Eiga monogatari*, the spiteful spirit of Akimitsu, often along with that of Enshi, haunts four of Michinaga's daughters, Sonshi 尊子 (1003?–1087?), Kishi 嬉子 (1007–25), and Kenshi 妍子 (994–1027), successfully bringing about the death of Kishi during childbirth and causing Kanshi and Kenshi to take the tonsure, another way to terminate the continuation of kinship.²⁵

²⁴ See *Ōkagami* in *SNKBZ*, 34: 147–72, and *Eiga monogatari*, vol. 1, in *SNKBZ*, 31: 41–46.

²⁵ *Eiga monogatari*, vol. 2, in *SNKBZ*, 32: 481–83, 505–506; *Eiga monogatari*, vol. 3, in *SNKBZ*, 33: 115.

Through these textual examples we can sense a common understanding in Heian discourse of dual father/daughter pairs haunting their political rivals. In *Genji*, however, Rokujō differs from the above pattern in the *mononoke*'s ambiguity and unrevealed identity. In the examples I discussed above, Motokata/Sukehime and Akimitsu/Enshi usually reveal their identity and wax eloquent about their motives. They make their tactics explicit and publicly rejoice in their successful hauntings through a medium's voice. The backstory of these gathered spirits and the reasons for their possessions are explicitly narrated and easily understood.

However, in *Genji*, the narrator only reveals that people speculate and gossip about Rokujō's father and her own spirit since the identity of the most tenacious *mononoke* possessing Aoi remains unknown. This is where the possibility of unnarrated stories and most likely political conflicts emerge between Aoi's father's family, the Minister of the Left, and Rokujō's father. Even if the text never confirms the circulating rumors regarding the *mononoke* identity, this discourse mirrors that found in other Heian texts I have presented: a father and daughter as a unit, sharing the same purpose in a *mononoke* phenomenon. A key to understanding this discourse is that becoming or being haunted by *mononoke* is a quality that runs in a kinship line. At the same time, this speculation over the *mononoke*'s identity as a daughter-father unit and/or assumption that the *mononoke* phenomenon is associated with family machinations depends on unnarrated parts of the text and the ambiguity of the narration that withholds the explicit identity of the *mononoke*/vengeful spirit.

The undecidability of *mononoke* identities mirrors the multivalent nature of language and voices, especially in poetry, allowing us to explore various possibilities of reading that are not explicitly written in the tale. In Aoi's *mononoke* bedside scene, kinship and unnarrated stories surrounding Rokujō no miyasudokoro grow even more complicated. In front of Genji, a

mononoke (supposedly Rokujō no miyasudokoro's living spirit) composes a poem. Royall Tyler translates the poem in the following way:

This spirit of mine that, sighing and suffering, wanders the heavens,
Oh, stop it now; tie a knot where in front the two hems meet.²⁶

なげきわびそらにみだるるわがたま(魂)をむすびとどめよしたがひのつま²⁷

One literal translation of the poem would be:

My intense grieving soul scattering and floating in the sky, please tie my wandering soul
with the hem of my robe.

Nageki wabi/ sora ni/ midaruru/ wagatama o/ musubi todomeyo/ shitagai no tsuma.

At first glance, the poem seems to express Rokujō's request for Genji to prevent her spirit from wandering by tying down her robe's overlapping hem. The word, *tsuma* indicates the hem or the edge of the robe but it could also refer to spouse or lover, either male or female. Similarly, the phrase *shitagai* could refer to a number of different things. The phrase could refer to part of the inside of the robe that overlaps the opposite side of the robe in front, or it could be read as "to follow," or "to be faithful." Hence, it is possible to read the supposed words of Rokujō no miyasudokoro as calling Genji "my faithful husband." It could also be Zenbō, her late husband's voice, which empowers Rokujō no miyasudokoro and addresses her as "my faithful wife." While my reading here is only one example of what the poem is able to suggest, this possibility demonstrates the multivalence of *mononoke* phenomena and the palimpsest of kinship they embody.

Reading the poem through Zenbō's perspective is strengthened by a close analysis on the subsidiary homophonic levels of the words. Let us focus on *wabi/wabu* in *nagekiwabi* (sighing

²⁶ *The Tale of Genji*, trans. Royall Tyler (New York: Viking, 2001), 174.

²⁷ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 40.

and suffering) and *musubi (hi) todo (to) meyo*. The word *wabu* has multiple meanings; it can be a suffix to express “that one cannot help doing...,” “helplessly/unhappily (do something),” “miserably unable to complete something,” or it can serve as a verb, “to sigh in grief.” These are combined and used in Tyler’s translation above. The verb *wabu* itself, however, could also mean “to fall into reduced circumstances” or “to go to ruin,” which would suggest Zenbō or Rokujō’s family’s having fallen upon bad times. Furthermore, the word *sora* signifies not only the sky or the heavens but also fruitlessness or the status of being “in vain.” Thus, the first part of the poem could read as Zenbō’s voicing his mind, “grieving and being ruined, my spirit wanders in vain.” In this reading, we see it is not only Rokujō’s father and herself who emerge as *mononoke* but also her husband’s voice from the past, underpinning their kinship. Yet questions remain: who caused Zenbō’s ruin and who is causing his grief?²⁸

Overtly politicized narrative is again withheld from the *Genji* text. We can only learn that Zenbō is the younger brother of Emperor Kiritsubo and that he somehow failed to become emperor, dying prematurely. However, the text tells us of a rumor accusing Rokujō no miyasudokoro’s father of possessing Aoi. This rumor suggests that the late minister was jealous because his own machinations to promote his daughter to empress consort were dashed when Zenbō failed to take the throne. We can only infer the unnarrated background and possibility of a political dispute between the Minister of the Left and Zenbō/the late minister. If Aoi successfully gave birth to a boy, the boy would not only be Genji’s successor but also a boon to the Minister

²⁸ Many scholars, including early annotators such as Ichijō Kanera, have attempted to compare the genealogy of the Japanese imperial family to that of characters found in *Genji*. Hirokawa Katsumi agrees with Ichijō Kanera’s annotations that describe a similarity between the historical abdication of crown princes and Zenbō. Hirokawa argues that the accumulated vengeful spirits of the historical crown princes who were deposed by the Fujiwara family from the title (*hitaishi* 廢太子) correspond with Zenbō. See Hirokawa Katsumi, *Shinsō no tennō: Genji monogatari no kokyō* (Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin, 1990), 37.

of the Left's house by making strong ties with Genji, who is after all the favorite prodigy of Emperor Kiritsubo. It is this suspicion described in the tale that makes this unnarrated backstory the most plausible: Rokujō's father, wanting to intervene into the prosperity of the Minister of Left, attempts to prevent the birth of the child.

We know that both the positions of the Minister of the Left and the Minister of the Right were occupied by the Fujiwara clan for almost a century. Their political hegemony reached its height with Michinaga through strategic intermarriages with the imperial family, which coincides with the composition of *Genji*. Scholars agree that the descriptions of the court in *Genji* reflect the political climate of the era. Members of the Fujiwara occupied several major positions, including both the minister of the Right and the Left, during Kiritsubo's and Suzaku's reign. Some argue that *Genji* describes the imperial family's attempt to maintain the imperial bloodline and reclaim their political power through the Minamoto branch of the imperial line. Considering that Aoi's family might have caused Zenbō's grief, or the late minister's grudge toward gossiping people, we see the appearance of *mononoke*, whether identified or unidentified, speak to a much larger and complex unnarrated past—a past that is hung with webs of family relationships in which Rokujō no miyasudokoro, her father, and her late husband are forged into kinship through the narration of *mononoke* phenomena.

Establishing kinship through becoming *mononoke* is not simply one-sided. It is not only a matter of who haunts whom, but also how the victims and their family define and even strengthen their own kinship ties through the experience of possession. When Aoi's condition worsens as she is surrounded by *mononoke*, Genji, who has been rather uninterested in his wife of political marriage, finally starts visiting her and arranging prayers and rituals for her himself. He seems drawn to his sick, dying wife as many *mononoke* related to her appear one after

another. The appearance of both Aoi's and Genji's deceased kin fuels his feelings toward his otherwise estranged wife.

[As a result of] exorcism prayers, many *mononoke*, dead and living spirits, appear and identify themselves...One is the deceased wet-nurse, and the others claim they are spirits who have haunted her parents' kin for generations, emerging on this occasion at random since Aoi is weak. They are not severe or powerful entities.

もののけ、生すだまなどいふもの多く出で来て、さまざまの名のりするなかに、人にさらに移らず、ただみづからの御身につと添ひたるさまにて、ことにおどろおどろしうわづらはしきこゆることもなけれど、また、片時離るる折もなきもの一つあり。いみじき験者どもにも従はず、執念きけしき、おぼろけのものにあらずと見えたり。＜略＞ものなど問はせたまへど、さして聞こえ当つることもなし。もののけとても、わざと深き御かたきと聞こゆるもなし。過ぎにける御乳母だつ人、もしは親の御方につけつつ伝はりたるものの、弱目に出で来たるなど、むねむねしからずぞ乱れ現はるる...ただつくづく、音をのみ泣きたまひて、折々は胸をせき上げつつ、いみじう堪へがたげに惑ふわざをしたまへば、いかにおはすべきにかと、ゆゆしう悲しく思しあわてたり。院よりも、御とぶらひ隙なく、御祈りのことまで思し寄せたまふさまのかたじけなきにつけても、いとど惜しげなる人の御身なり。²⁹

The spirits who identify themselves reveal that they have been closely associated with Aoi's family for generations, and while their intentions are ambiguous, Aoi's sickbed becomes a kind of family reunion.

This ghostly family gathering shows how kinship is not necessarily limited to blood or marriage. We can assume that the dead wet-nurse is most likely not biologically related to Aoi. That said, as I argued earlier, biological lineage is not always paramount. Considering the closeness between aristocratic children and their wet-nurses, readers can sense through the appearance of this spirit that "kinship" once again is not limited to blood-based bonds but also domestic relationships and shared experience. By appearing at Aoi's bedside while she is giving birth, these *mononoke* from the past are all included in the production of offspring and future

²⁹ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 32.

familial routes. Just as the family line is set to continue forward with the birth of a child, so too is its past reaffirmed by the presence of the *mononoke*.³⁰

In general, childbirth in this period is often thought of as a type of *kegare* 穢れ, or impurity/pollution. This so-called “childbirth pollution” (*san'e* 産穢) required people who played a physical part in the birthing process to avoid specified locations until the *kegare* was purified. This is not to say that births were sparsely attended: family members, retainers, ladies-in-waiting, and religious practitioners participated in the occasion. In most circumstances, the father of the child or the new mother arranged prayers in case the delivery became complicated or *mononoke* appeared. Fukutō Sanae and Kojima Naoko have both accurately pointed out that family ties in premodern Japan were not *a priori* facts but were formed and developed through such family rituals and seasonal ceremonies.³¹ Here we see that childbirth was a family ritual intended not simply to welcome new members but also to reconnect with the dead and forge kinship links anew.

While the episodes above describe stories in which the mother and newborn baby survive despite the *mononoke*’s intervention, childbirth generally entailed a great danger of death. Giving birth in premodern Japan could be a transference of the mother’s life to her child. Such was the case for Aoi who lost her life eventually in *Genji*. While the bodies of aristocratic women were generally hidden, childbirth (or the deathbed) was a very rare occasion in which numerous people were present and could possibly have a glimpse of the moment of both birth

³⁰ For further details on wet-nurses in the Heian period, see Nishimura Hiroko, “‘Menoto’ and ‘menoto’ kō,” in her *Chūsei no kazoku to josei* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002), 304–20; and Thomas D. Conlan, “Thicker Than Blood: The Social and Political Significance of Wet Nurses in Japan, 950–1330,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 65, no. 1 (2005): 159–205.

³¹ See Fukutō Sanae, *Heian ōcho no kodomotachi* (2004); Fukutō Sanae, *Heian ōcho no chichi to ko: Kizoku to shomin no ie to yōiku* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 2010); and Kojima Naoko, *Genji monogatari no sei to seitan: Ōchō bunkashiron* (Tokyo: Rikkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2004).

and death. Childbirth as well as pacification rituals, which often happened in tandem, were public spectacles.

Genji himself seems to have been irresistibly drawn to the increasingly dire situation of his wife. We see him becoming increasingly enchanted by the once estranged Aoi now lying down and dying with a swollen belly. Genji is led inside the curtain and watches her struggling form.

He lifts the curtain and looks inside. Any person would be moved to see her lying there with her large curved belly, looking so beautiful, and since he is her husband, he loses his composure and cannot help but feel regret and pity. In vivid contrast to her white gown, her long abundant hair, which is tied at the end, is lying beside her. He realizes how fragile and beautiful she is more than ever before. Taking her hand, he says, “How pitiful. You are making me very sad.” He can no longer speak the words and weeps. Her beautiful look that was so inapproachable and severe before, now with an expiring gaze filled with tears, captivates Genji’s heart.

御几帳の帷子引き上げて見たてまつりたまへば、いとをかしげにて、御腹はいみじう高うて臥したまへるさま、よそ人だに、見たてまつらむに心乱れぬべし。まして惜しう悲しう思す、ことわりなり。白き御衣に、色あひいとはなやかにて、御髪のと長うこちたきを、引き結ひてうち添へたるも、「かうてこそ、らうたげになまめきたる方添ひてをかしかりけれ」と見ゆ。御手をとらへて、「あな、いみじ。心憂きめを見せたまふかな」とて、ものも聞こえたまはず泣きたまへば、例はいとわづらはしう恥づかしげなる御まみを、いとたゆげに見上げて、うちまもりきこえたまふに涙のこぼるるさまを見たまふは、いかがあはれの浅からむ。³²

Genji is bewitched by Aoi’s frail, but venerable beauty as she is dying and possessed by *mononoke*. The text suggests that the figures of Aoi and the *mononoke* most often attributed to Rokujō no miyasudokoro merge through the act of possession. The gentle gaze that Aoi had toward Genji may even have been mediated by this vengeful spirit. Ironically this is the first time Genji feels strong love toward Aoi and they finally feel close to each other.

Aoi’s possession and childbirth brings the family together physically and emotionally.

³² *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 38–39.

Aoi's parents are also present, appreciating their son-in-law's care and arrangements for their daughter, rekindling marriage-based kinship at Aoi's sickbed. Spirit possession, as well as childbirth and the deathbed, represents a moment in which the past, bodies, and emotions tend to be salient, vulnerably revealed and narrated. By sharing these moments and spaces, the participants deepen their sense of mutuality of being and experience the formation and reinforcement of kinship.

I would like to return now to the scene where Aoi or the *mononoke* recites her/his poem, which, as I have argued, may in fact reflect Zenbō's voice and hence various kinship lines and identities, past and future, may overlap. The poem reflects the multifaceted nature of *mononoke*, blurring the identity of Aoi, Rokujō no miyasudokoro, her father, and Zenbō. However, while the various *mononoke* eventually cause Aoi's death, they do not take the new baby away. The baby boy, Yūgiri 夕霧, is born as soon as Rokujō/her father/Zenbō disappears.

...when she [Aoi] becomes a little quiet, her mother brings hot medicinal water for her. As soon as she is held upright, the baby emerges. Everyone rejoices greatly while some spirits that were expelled and entered the medium are cursing and vexed with jealous rage, causing [the onlookers] to worry over matters of the afterbirth.

すこし御声も静まりたまへければ、隙おあはするにやとて、宮の御湯持て寄せ給へけるに、かき起こされたまひて、ほどなく生まれたまひぬ。うれしと思すこと限りなきに、人に駆り移したまへける御物の怪どもねたがりまどふけはひいどもの騒がしうて後のことまたいと心もとなし。³³

Similar to Empress Consort Shōshi's story or many other successful episodes of giving birth, the moment is often depicted as the family's triumph over *mononoke* intervention, proving their conquering of the past and securing the prospect of the family's future. Thus, being possessed by *mononoke* and expelling them became a ritual to claim power over *mononoke* and thereby the family line. Sure enough, Yūgiri, while he lost his mother, would grow up to be a healthy and

³³ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 41.

productive member of his family. Yūgiri would also serve as a good grandson to the Minister of the Left's house, as well as a dutiful son-in-law to Tō no Chūjō 頭中将, who bridges the Genji family and the Minister of the Left's family. At the risk of over-statement, being possessed and then having the *mononoke* expelled during childbirth or at the sickbed is a common trope in texts detailing elite court life that combines the pacification of dead spirits with family ritual. More importantly this family ritual serves to incorporate and domesticate the dead, whether they hold a grudge or just appear randomly. Childbirth is a spatial-temporal nexus of the exchange of death, life, past lives, and future lives, all of which rhizomatically intercross roots and routes and form a construct of kinship involving both *mononoke* and the victims.

Family from the Past: Connecting Ancestors, “*Makotoya*,” and Kashiwagi

This section explores the familial connections of one of the members of the Minister of the Left's family, Kashiwagi. Kashiwagi is the eldest son of Genji's life-long friend and cousin, Tō no Chūjo, which makes him Aoi's nephew. Kashiwagi is also the biological father of Genji's second son, Kaoru 薫, who is the protagonist of the last ten chapters of the tale. As first son of the household, Kashiwagi is supposed to be heir to the family name, if not property and family enterprise. However, I argue that he oscillates and transgresses boundaries between several families. It is only through his experiences of being possessed, dying, and then possessing others that he is finally able to establish a kinship that is closely related to that of the Fujiwara ancestry and that he will pass down to his descendants. Kashiwagi's episodes embody the hybridity of kinship that refuses to be sorted out in merely one line of genealogy.

As mentioned, the Fujiwara domination of court politics by the family reached its height during the period when *Genji* was written. Scholars agree that, through intertextual associations,

the description of the court in *Genji* corresponds with this political climate of the era. While the family name Fujiwara does not explicitly appear in the *Genji*, there are several passages that suggest that the Minister of the Left is indeed a Fujiwara. The name of “Tō” no Saishō (藤宰相), a half-brother of Kashiwagi, alludes to this connection.³⁴ Moreover, in the text, the daughter of Minister of the Right resides in Kokiden, a residence for Fujiwara daughters who happened to be the highest ranked consorts and dowagers during the reign of Emperor Daigo 醍醐 (897–930).³⁵ It is not my intention here to identify historical counterparts for all of the characters nor to broach the controversial topic of where to draw the boundary between historical fact and fiction. We can see, however, that the text demonstrates a comprehensively imagined “Fujiwara kinship,” in addition to an imperial kinship, including the branches between which Kashiwagi fluctuates and transgresses.

In the previous chapter, we saw the significance of the phrase, “*makotoya* まことや,” used for the entrance of Rokujō no miyasudokoro, hinting at a broader, unknown past narrative. This phrase is also used when the narrator introduces Kashiwagi, stating that “Oh, yes, the Intendant of the Right Gate Watch has now become the Counselor!” (*Makotoya, Emon no kami ha Chūnagon ni nariniki kashi* まことや、衛門督は中納言になりにかし) in the “Wakana ge” chapter.³⁶ The newly appointed Counselor Kashiwagi is the eldest son of Aoi’s brother, Tō

³⁴ In Japanese, the pronunciation of *tō* is the Chinese-derived reading (*on-yomi*) for *fuji* 藤, the first character of the two character name Fujiwara 藤原. Historically members of Fujiwara were also addressed as Tō or Tōshi 藤氏.

³⁵ Empress Consort Shōshi, Michinaga’s daughter whom Murasaki Shikibu served, however, did not live in the Kokiden but the Fujitsubo because the Kokiden was occupied by the Dowager Senshi, Michinaga’s sister. See Masuda Shigeo, “Genji Monogatari no kōkyū,” in *Genji monogatari kenkyū shūsei*, ed. Masuda Shigeo, Suzuki Hideo, and Ii Haruki, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Kazama Shobō, 1998), 167–79.

³⁶ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, SNKBZ, 23: 217. Throughout *Genji*, the word “*makotoya*” appears thirteen times. Six of those appearances introduce particular characters: Koremitsu, Akashi Nyūdo, Omi no kimi, Kashiwagi, and Rokujō, who is introduced twice. Note that three out of these six characters are related to the Fujiwara. Koremitsu’s daughter has the first part of the Fujiwara 藤原 appellation in her own name

no Chūjō and Kashiwagi is assured to be the future head of the family. As I will examine in more detail later, although several yin-yang masters report that Kashiwagi is possessed by a woman's spirit on his sickbed, his spirit possession is not generally considered to be caused by Rokujō no miyasudokoro's vengeful spirit. However, I will argue that Kashiwagi's actions and his affair with Onna san no miya 女三宮 take place under the influence of *mononoke*, and “*makotoya*” is again used to invoke the past, this time making an association with his kinship. Keywords associated with Kashiwagi such as *mono*, *midaregawashi* 乱れがはし (disoriented, disordered, and disturbing), and *kemari* unveil Kashiwagi's political ambitions and provide critical links with the Fujiwara line. Following these links will allow a creative reading of the passage of the first affair between Kashiwagi and Onna san no miya in which I will argue that a *mononoke* influences their relationship.

As Imai Hisayo and Ishikawa Michiko have pointed out, despite Kashiwagi's important position as the eldest son of Tō no Chūjō, his entrance to the plot of *Genji* is relatively late.³⁷ The earlier spotlight was given to the second son of Tō no Chūjō and Kashiwagi's younger brother, Kōbai 紅梅, who first appears in a ceremonial occasion in the tenth chapter of the tale.³⁸ Kōbai is

and is called Tō 藤 no naishino suke. Moreover, some have pointed out the Akashi family's seeming immunity from *mononoke* attacks, highlighting the potential relationship between the Akashi and Kiritsubo lines, as well as the link between Rokujō's family and Akashi-Kiritsubo. See Richard Okada, *Figures of Resistance: Language, Poetry, and Narrating in the Tale of Genji and Other Mid-Heian Texts* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991), 276. Unfortunately, these complex relationships are outside of the scope of this dissertation. However, this use of “*makotoya*” reinforces my own reading and is worthy of future research.

³⁷ Imai Hisayo, “Monogatari keizu no shikaku: Udaijinke no keifu ni tsuite,” *Nihon Bungaku*, no. 96 (September 2001): 1–12; Ishikawa Michiko, “*Genji monogatari ni okeru Kashiwagi no sonzai*,” *Hokuriku koten kenkyū*, no. 17 (2002): 25–35.

³⁸ 中将の御子の、今年初めて殿上する、八つ、九つばかりにて、声いとおに、「心ばへもかどかどしう、容貌もをかしくて、御遊びのすこし乱れゆくほど腹の二郎なりけり。世の人の思へる寄せ重くて、おぼえことにかしづけり。もしろく、笙の笛吹きなどするを、うつくしびもてあそびたまふ。四の君 高砂」を出だして謡ふ、いとうつくし。大将の君、御衣脱ぎてかづけたまふ。 *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 141.

praised for his beautiful voice fit for singing *Takasago* 高砂. So great is his talent and charm that Genji himself bestows his robe, one of the most significant gestures a member of the imperial family or higher-ranking aristocrats can show. Since then, Kōbai appears at various celebratory occasions sponsored by the Minister of the Left's household as a bright son of Tō no Chūjō. Oddly, despite his status as the first son, Kashiwagi's first entrance to the text is not until the twenty-first chapter (Otome 乙女), much later than his younger brother. When he is introduced, Kashiwagi only appears as one of Tō no Chūjō's many sons. Moreover, compared to Kōbai, his talent and personality traits are not mentioned at all, nor is his relationship with his father or grandparents. It almost seems as if he is not a significant member of the Minister of the Left's family despite his important status as heir.

In "Kochō," the twenty-fourth chapter of the text, finally Kashiwagi comes to the surface of the story when he writes a love letter to Genji's adopted daughter, Tamakazura 玉鬘, who is also the daughter of Yūgao 夕顔. This episode in fact involves a complicated transgression of kinship since Tamakazura's biological father is Tō no Chūjō, making her a half-sister of Kashiwagi, a fact that has so far been kept secret. Even in a historical period in which marriage between close family members was not unusual, marrying a sibling, including a half sibling, was considered taboo. Readers are reminded that Kashiwagi, who has not been strongly associated with the Minister of the Left's side of family, is indeed a member of the family when he transgresses bloodlines and unknowingly pursues his half-sister.

In some ways, Kashiwagi's distant relationship with the Minister of the Left's household may not have seemed odd during the mid-Heian period. Children of high-ranking aristocrats tended to be kept and raised by the mother's side of the family. As Imai Hisayo and Ishikawa

Michiko argue, Kashiwagi was therefore considered to be a part of his mother's family.³⁹ His mother was the fourth daughter of the Minister of the Right, a political opponent of the Minister of the Left and Genji. Despite this rivalry, the families were intertwined—the family of the Minister of the Right included Dowager Kokiden, who was the mother of Genji's half-brother Emperor Suzaku, who causes Genji's self-imposed exile to Suma. Kashiwagi's unreserved manners and conversations with his sisters at the Minister of the Right's household are narrated several times, emphasizing his open and relaxed relationship with his family there compared to a tenser relationship with his father. Kashiwagi speaks with his father only occasionally when he visits the house.⁴⁰ Such episodes emphasize Kashiwagi's close relationship to the Minister of the Right's family rather than the Minister of the Left's until the early stages of his adult life.

Kashiwagi becomes an increasingly prominent character in the “Wakana jō” 若菜上 chapter with the first entrance of Onna san no miya 女三宮 when Retired Emperor Suzaku 朱雀 begins looking for a husband for his beloved daughter. After a period of absence from the story, Kashiwagi reappears as a potential candidate. The text emphasizes Kashiwagi's long-held political ambitions and determination “to marry a princess and no one else.”⁴¹ Suzaku ultimately chooses Genji as a suitable husband-guardian for the young and immature Onna san no miya. Kashiwagi is greatly disappointed, and he firmly believes that his lower rank and family standing are to blame. Kashiwagi's obsession with Onna san no miya never vanishes. Eventually he makes advances to Onna san no miya and perpetrates adultery during the Aoi Festival, the same festival where the famous carriage quarrel took place between Rokujō no miyasudokoro and

³⁹ See Imai, “Monogatari keizu no shikaku,” and Ishikawa, “*Genji monogatari* ni okeru Kashiwagi no sonzai.”

⁴⁰ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, SNKBZ, 22: 241–42, 321.

⁴¹ 今まで独りのみありて、皇女たちならずは得じ、と思へる。 *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, SNKBZ, 23: 37.

Genji's wife Aoi in years past. This Aoi Festival connection is the reason some scholars argue that the incident was caused by Rokujō no miyasudokoro in order to intervene into the peaceful marriage and the succession of the Genji-Onna san no miya line.

Most of the stories involving Kashiwagi in the Wakana 若菜 (*jō* 上 and *ge* 下) chapters take place at the Rokujō-in, or Rokujō mansion. As the name suggests, this mansion was built at Rokujō and Kyōgoku where Rokujō no miyasudokoro's old residence had been. Rokujō no miyasudokoro left this property to Genji as she entrusted her daughter, Akikonomu to his care. This splendid mansion becomes Genji's emblem as he installs his wives and adopted daughters there. Fujii Sadakazu argues that the Rokujō-in was designed and built to pacify Rokujō no miyasudokoro's restless spirit and points out her spirit's dual aspect as a vengeful and guardian spirit.⁴² Whether pacification is Genji's intention or not, the Rokujō-in becomes a stage for Rokujō's spirit's reappearance for the first time after eighteen years of muted presence since her death. Although Rokujō no miyasudokoro's spirit first makes her declared appearance in front of Genji at his wife Murasaki no ue's 紫の上 sickbed much later in the "Wakana *ge*" 若菜下 chapter, *mononoke* are interspersed throughout the chapter, gradually possessing Kashiwagi and Onna san no miya.

Takeda Seiko and Reginald Jackson agree that the word, *midare* 乱れ or *midaregawashi* 乱れがはし (disorderly/ disturbing) frequently appears to signify Kashiwagi's actions and his state of mind in the Wakana chapters.⁴³ Interestingly enough, before the Wakana chapters, while

⁴² Fujii Sadakazu, *Genji monogatari* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2000), 307–20.

⁴³ Takeda Seiko, "Midaregawashi' ki Kashiwagi": *Jinbutsu de yomu Genji monogatari* (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2006), 249–65. Reginald Jackson associates the noun "*midare*" with Kashiwagi. Here I am focusing on the adjective "*midare gawashi*," which includes the meaning "to cause disorder" to someone or something. See Jackson's "Scripting the Moribund: The Genji Scrolls' Aesthetics of Decomposition," in *Reading the Tale of Genji: Its Picture-Scrolls, Texts and Romance*, ed. Richard Stanley-Baker, Murakami Fuminobu, and Jeremy Tambling (Folkestone, UK: Global Oriental, 2009), 3–36.

Kashiwagi is rarely mentioned, when his name does appear, he is praised for his calmness and collectedness (*shizumaritaru* 静まりたる) in public.⁴⁴ This contradicts the characteristics of Kashiwagi's usual personality and behavior in the Wakana chapters, particularly at the Rokujō-in, a haunted site, and may be in part due to his being possessed and his oscillations between kinship lines.

The first case in which *midaregawashi* is used in relation to Kashiwagi is seen in Genji's utterances during a game of *kemari* 蹴鞠 at the Rokujō-in. *Kemari* was a game enjoyed by elite members of society in which they kept a ball in the air without use of their hands by striking it with their feet and other parts of their bodies. Genji summons Kashiwagi and other young noblemen to the game of *kemari*, where Genji, now middle-aged and newly married to Onna san no miya, enjoys watching their frenzied performances. “*Kemari* is indeed a disorderly and rough sport,” says Genji, “but it requires a certain skill.”⁴⁵ Despite describing the sport of *kemari* here, the word *midaregawashi* significantly foreshadows later “disturbing” incidents. The game provides Kashiwagi an extraordinary opportunity to see (*kaimami* 垣間見, which literally means “peeping through a fence hole”) Onna san no miya, which rekindles and intensifies Kashiwagi's desire for her. According to the commentary of *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, the repetition of *midaregawashi* in the passages describes both *kemari* and foreshadows later chaos, events that shake the order of the Rokujō-in to its foundation.⁴⁶ The commentators see the word *midaregawashi* as one of the motifs of the Wakana chapters. Notably, the narrator continues to emphasize Kashiwagi's superiority at this disorderly game over other men:

⁴⁴公卿といへど、この人のおぼえに、かならずしも並ぶまじきこそ多かれ。さる中にもいと静まりたるひとなり。 *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, *SNKBZ*, 22: 180; 右の中將は、ましてすこししづまりて、心恥づかしき氣まされたり。いかにぞや、おとづれきこゆや。 *SNKBZ*, 22: 228.

⁴⁵ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, *SNKBZ*, 23: 137.

⁴⁶ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, *SNKBZ*, 23: 140.

Although other young men try to excel in skill, no one can compete with Kashiwagi, even though he joins them briefly. He is a handsome and graceful man...it is amusing to see his *midaregawashi* attitude.⁴⁷

Thus, while the word *midaregawashi* may function as one of the themes of the chapter, Kashiwagi stands at the center of disorder.

The link between Kashiwagi and the game of *kemari*, which the narrator and Genji repeatedly associate with such words as *midare* and *midaregawashi* (chaotic and disorderly), continues to be emphasized, and provides political associations, increasingly implicating the family of the Minister of the Left. First, Kashiwagi's skill in *kemari* is considered to be passed down in his family line as Genji reflects:

Tō no Chūjō was always trying to compete with me, but it was only in *kemari* that my skill was no match for him. For such a trivial thing [such as *kemari*], there is no tradition to pass on, but even so, it is a skill that runs in a family and is very special (*mono o suji wa nao koyo nakari keri* ものの筋はなほこよなかりけり).⁴⁸

Here suddenly we see Kashiwagi's affiliation with his father, the Minister of the Left's family and his family line, emphasizing Kashiwagi's inheritance of the skill that runs in the family, which also links him to the historical Fujiwara. The association of *kemari* with the Fujiwara has a long history, which involves intermingling kinship between the Fujiwara and the imperial family. According to the *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀, the relationship between Prince Nakano Ōe 中大兄 (626–71) and the founder of the Fujiwara family, Nakatomi no Kamatari 中臣鎌足 (614–69), began at a game of *kemari* in 644 when the Prince's shoe went flying off.⁴⁹ Kamatari, who

⁴⁷ For example, Genji says, "The Consultant could not contain himself, whether he is a Senior noble or not." 上達部なりとも、わかき衛府司たちなどかみだれたまはざらむ。The narrator, then continues to narrate, "*Kemari* is indeed an un-stately and chaotic thing, but..." さまよく静かならぬ乱れ事なめれど... *SNKBZ*, 23: 128–39.

⁴⁸ ものの筋はなほこよなかりけり。。。家の伝へなどに書き留めれたらむこそ興はあらめ。*SNKBZ*, 23: 144.

⁴⁹ *Nihon shoki*, vol. 3, *SNKBZ*, 4: 86–87.

was waiting for an opportunity to approach the Prince, brought it back to him. Together they eventually carried out a *coup d'état*, assassinating Soga no Iruka 蘇我入鹿 (?–645), who held strong influence over Empress Kōgyoku 皇極 and the court. This *coup d'état* led to the Taika Reforms (*Taika no kaishin* 大化の改新) in 645, a restructuring of the political system and codification of law based on the precedent of Tang China. The reforms allowed the imperial family to regain political power from the Soga clan and solidify the imperial court's control of a centralized government. Nakatomi no Kamatari continued to support Prince Nakano Ōe, later Emperor Tenji 天智, who rewarded his trusted ally with the surname Fujiwara.

Regardless of the anecdote's historical veracity, it is significant that Kashiwagi came to embody the tradition of the Fujiwara family on the basis of this “disorderly” game. Here we can see Wade's concept of a tension between roots and routes, in which rather winding roots embody the family tradition of *kemari* back to the Fujiwara founder, Kamatari. The story of family origins and belonging is re-imagined and re-narrated, coexisting with the migrations and displacements of routes.⁵⁰ Thus, the importance of family tradition and ancestors is made significant by interweaving Kashiwagi's predicament with history and *monogatari*.

Despite certain similarities, Kashiwagi diverges from his historical ancestor. Instead of founding a powerful family, Kashiwagi fails to secure a legitimate heir. His desires for two different women are rejected by two powerful men, Emperor Suzaku and Genji, and his romantic misadventures cause disorder and eventually transgress kinship boundaries. Historical accounts tell us that Fujiwara no Kamatari was granted two women, Kagami no Ōkimi 鏡王女, one of Emperor Tenji's wives, and Yasumiko 安見兒, who was the Emperor's *uneme* 采女 (private

⁵⁰ Wade, “Hybridity Theory and Kinship Thinking,” 611.

court lady), in return for his loyalty.⁵¹ In contrast to the historical Emperor Tenji, who gave his own wives to Kamatari, in *Genji* the Retired Emperor Suzaku expresses his concern about the ambition of those outside of the imperial family to secure relationships with members of the imperial family. He characterizes such ambitious aristocrats who do not know their proper place as “disorderly” (*midaregawashiki koto* 乱れがはしきこと) when he seeks a husband for his daughter Onna san no miya.⁵² Retired Emperor Suzaku imagines a firm line between the imperial family and non-imperial families and does not consider Kashiwagi to be kin, despite Kashiwagi’s matrilineal connection to the imperial family (biologically, Kashiwagi is his cousin on his mother’s side). Ironically, Kashiwagi’s desires for gaining access to a member of the imperial family, Onna san no miya, eventually succeeds through an illicit relationship (perhaps even rape), further transgressing various family lines, morality, and loyalty. Whereas Kashiwagi’s historical counterpart, Kamatari, was awarded two women from the emperor, ironically, despite Kashiwagi’s famous encounter with Genji’s surrogate daughter, Tamakazura, and his wife, Onna san no miya, he will enjoy no such “happy endings.” Ultimately, Kashiwagi discovers that Tamakazura is in fact his sister, and Genji will not forgive his affair with his newly wed wife, Onna san no miya. While the historical name of “Fujiwara” is never mentioned, reading histories, genealogies, and *monogatari* as a product of rhizomic hybridity allows us to explore the unnarrated and to participate in narrative routes. By emphasizing Kashiwagi’s great skill in *kemari*, which represents the inherited skill of the Fujiwara, as well as his similarities to Kamatari, the text depicts Kashiwagi as embodying the Fujiwara legacy while he transgresses and oscillates between various lines.

⁵¹ In *Manyōshū*, there are two related poems by Fujiwara no Kamatari: one is a reply to Princess Kagami and the other is read when Kamatari obtained Yasumiko. See *Manyō shū*, vol. 2, *SNKBZ*, 7: 84–85.

⁵² *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, *SNKBZ*, 23: 32–33.

The “Disorderly” Kashiwagi: *Mononoke* at Work in the Kashiwagi-Onna san no miya Affair

The words used to describe the game of *kemari* as disorderly, *midare* and *midaregawashi*, frequently appear in *Genji* and other Heian texts to describe the condition of being possessed. Recall the poem composed by the *mononoke* appearing at the scene of Aoi’s giving birth earlier. There, *mononoke* themselves describe their wondering souls as *midaru* as seen in “My intense grieving soul scattering and floating in the sky, please tie my wandering soul with the hem of my robe” (*nageki wabi/ sora ni/ midaruru/ wagatama o/ musubi todomeyo/ shitagai no tsuma*).⁵³ We can see the same usage of the word in an episode involving Genji’s adopted daughter (and Kashiwagi’s half-sister) Tamakazura in the “Makibashira” 真木柱 chapter, where disorderly behavior and confused minds influenced by *mononoke* are characterized as the “heart of *midare*.”⁵⁴ When Higekuro 髭黒, newlywed husband of Tamakazura, confronts his first wife who is disturbed by the news that he is going to see his second wife, her wild jealousy suggests she has been possessed by *mononoke*. Higekuro tries to console her and tells her that he has been keeping in faith with her despite her illness and possession. Higekuro continues to describe her unusual state of mind as *midaregawashi*:

I have no intention of neglecting you, but you are angry with me because of the confusion of a woman’s mind (*on kokoro no midaregawashi mama ni* 御心の乱れがはしままに) being carried away by *mononoke*.⁵⁵

Midare is used variously by witnesses who describe the sight of possession, by victims of the possession, and even by *mononoke* themselves. Shortly after the above episode, when Ichijō no miyasudokoro, the mother of Kashiwagi’s first wife Ochiba no miya, is attacked by the

⁵³ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 21: 40.

⁵⁴ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, SNKBZ, 22: 359.

⁵⁵ SNKBZ, 22: 359.

unidentified *mononoke* and falls ill, she expresses her pain: “I am extremely ill and confused” (*ito midarigawashige ni habereba* いと乱れがはしげにはべれば).⁵⁶ These are only a few of the examples of *mononoke* incidents from the tale in which characters in a state of mind influenced by *mononoke* are described with the word *midare*.

The tale consistently uses *midare* to indicate unnarrated *mononoke* presences. The signs of *mononoke* permeate the descriptions around the day Kashiwagi played *kemari*; in particular, *midare/midaregawashiki* is used when Kashiwagi first has a chance to glimpse Onna san no miya on the day of *kemari*. Considering the regular association of the term *midare* with a *mononoke*’s presence, it may not be coincidence that at the scene of *kemari*, though it is windless day,⁵⁷ the cherry blossoms suddenly start scattering in a disorderly manner (*hana midaregawashiku chiru meri* 花みだれがはしくちるめり).⁵⁸ Then, immediately after that, the blinds are pulled off by a running Chinese cat, exposing Onna san no miya to Kashiwagi who has been longing for her sight for six years. The Chinese cat, as if incited by the falling petals, runs out from beneath a blind:

The Chinese cat darts out from the under a blind...[the cat] is on a long cord, which is caught on *mono*, and becomes entangled. The cat struggles, trying to escape. While doing so, the blind is lifted to reveal the inside. No one moved quickly to pull the blind down.

唐猫の。。。にはかにみすのつまより走りいづるに。。。綱いと長くつきたりけるをものにひきかけまつはれにけるを、にげむとひこじろふほどに、みすのそばいとあらはにひきあげられたるをとみにひきなほすひともなし。⁵⁹

The sentence in which the cat is “caught on *mono*” can be understood two ways. Conventionally it reads that the cat’s leash is stuck on something. But it is also possible to read the passage such

⁵⁶ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, SNKBZ, 23: 423. Takeda also points out that the word *midaregawashi* is associated with *mononoke* in these chapters. See, for example, *Genji monogatari*, 3 SNKBZ, 22: 254–55.

⁵⁷ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, SNKBZ, 23: 138.

⁵⁸ SNKBZ, 23: 140.

⁵⁹ SNKBZ, 23: 140.

that the cat is possessed by *mononoke* (as frequently *mononoke* are also referred to as *mono* in premodern texts), possibly even by Rokujō no miyasudokoro who haunts her old residence and confesses later that “she was present and beside Onna san no miya.”⁶⁰ The disorderly and eerie sudden gust of wind also indicates a *mononoke*’s presence, and the wind and cat together end up providing an opportunity for Kashiwagi to have a glimpse of Onna san no miya. Kashiwagi is unable to suppress his obsession toward her after this incident. Kashiwagi’s peeping, which might have been caused by *mononoke*, eventually leads to his self-destruction and Onna san no miya’s renouncing the world. But more importantly, it contributes to the birth of his son Kaoru, who crosses over even more family-lines, including the Imperial family, Genji, and secretly the Fujiwara.

While Kashiwagi and *mononoke* cause disorder in kinship lines by transgressing them, Kashiwagi and *mononoke* also constructively facilitate the formation of kinship. Let us further examine the passages in which Kashiwagi finally succeeds in having an affair with Onna san no miya. Some scholars agree that Rokujō’s vengeful spirit indirectly affects Kashiwagi and Onna san no miya by keeping Genji’s attention diverted to his most beloved wife, Murasaki, who is possessed and sickened during the affair. A close reading of the text provides more indications that there may be even more involvement by *mononoke* in possessing Kashiwagi and facilitating his affair with Onna san no miya more directly.

It is important to reemphasize the shift in Kashiwagi’s apparent demeanor. He had previously been consistently described as a rational gentleman and characterized as calm (*shizukanaru* 静かなる) before he encountered Onna san no miya. At first, he is able to constrain himself against an immediate advance toward her, and he repeatedly states his

⁶⁰ SNKBZ, 23: 310.

determination that he has no intention to advance himself any further than to obtain Onna san no miya's utterance (*aware* あはれ) for him. What he (and often the reader) does not realize is that there is already a *mononoke* force acting here, as the *mononoke*-like narrator rightly describes Onna san no miya's feeling when she is lifted and carried away by Kashiwagi as "she is attacked by *mono*" (*mono ni osowaruru kato* ものにおそはるるか)と).⁶¹

The narrator describes how Kashiwagi speaks nonsense to Onna san no miya, speaking in "mysterious words" that Onna san no miya had never heard before (*ayashiku kikimo shiranu koto* あやしく聞きも知らぬこと).⁶² Upon hearing these words, she thereby loses her consciousness (*mono mo oboe tamawanu* ものもおぼえたまはぬ), which further indicates a trance-like encounter.⁶³ The narrator then enters Kashiwagi's mind:

He imagined her from afar as a person shrouded in mystic dignity, a person he was sure would make him feel insignificant were he to approach her in a familiar manner; yet, he felt he just had to give her even the tiniest hint of his ardent feelings and was not intending to force himself upon her in any way whatsoever. However, now he finds that she does not appear as unapproachable and haughty as he imagined. Rather, she is endearing and ever yielding. He thinks her engagingly frail aura is formidably graceful as if she were not a real creature. His firm self-possession has now vanished. He is absorbed in confusion and only longs to carry her off into hiding somewhere, leaving no trace, so as to fade away from this realm.

よその思ひやりはいつくしく、もの馴れて見えたてまつらむも恥づかしくおしはかられたまふに、ただかばかりも思ひつめたる片はし聞こえ知らせて、なかなかかけしきことはやみなむと思ひしかど、いとさばかり気高う恥づかしげにはあらで、なつかしく、らうたげに、やはやはとのみ見えたまふ御けはひの、あてにいみじく思ゆることぞ 人ににさせたまはざりける。さかしくおもひしづむる心も失せて、いづちも率て隠したてまつりて、わが身もよにふるさまならず、跡絶えてやみなばとまで思ひ乱れぬ。⁶⁴

⁶¹ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, SNKBZ, 23: 224.

⁶² SNKBZ, 23: 224.

⁶³ SNKBZ, 23: 224.

⁶⁴ SNKBZ, 23: 225–26.

In the Japanese passages, there are a significant number of words that indicate the *mononoke*'s presence. Here *mononoke* deprive Kashiwagi of sanity and show him an illusion. Or it could be that *mononoke* also possess Onna san no miya and seduce Kashiwagi. Kashiwagi imagined that he should restrain his inordinate feelings urging him to have affair with her, an ambition that is described as “*mono*” (*mono narete mie tatematsuramu* もの馴れて見えたてまつらむ). Then Kashiwagi only sees Onna san no miya's frail (*yawayawa* やはやはと) aura/sign (*kehai* けはひ), which suggests a phantom-like being. Kashiwagi feels that Onna san no miya is *ate ni imiji* あてにいみじ, which I have tentatively translated as “formidably graceful.” However, the word *imiji* (very, extremely) derives from *imu* 忌む, which means “ominous” thereby suggesting that “[Kashiwagi feels] Onna san no miya is ominous as if she were not a real creature.”

The key word *midare* is also used to describe Kashiwagi here. Kashiwagi's sanity vanishes as his mind is described as *midarenu* 乱れぬ, a word that hints at his state of being possessed. Later, the affair causes Kashiwagi to suffer from a guilty conscious battered by Genji's gaze, and his foot ailment worsens—*midari kaku byō* 乱り脚病, literally “disorderly foot ailment”—yet another “*midare*” association with him.⁶⁵ I contend that this description of Kashiwagi's foot ailment in terms that hint at *mononoke* influence is far from coincidental. In fact, after his affair with Onna san nomiya, the text retrospectively reveals that Kashiwagi had been suffering from this ailment since early spring, before his advances and confused behavior begins, a fact that has not attracted any attention in scholarship analyzing Kashiwagi's forceful love affair with Onna san no miya.⁶⁶ I argue that Kashiwagi's suffering from such a “*midare*”

⁶⁵ SNKBZ, 23: 276.

⁶⁶ 月ごろ、方々に思しなむ御事うけたまはり嘆きはべりながら、春のころはいより、例もわづらひはべる乱り脚病といふものところせく起こりわづらひはべりて、はかばかしく踏み立つる事もはべらず。。。SNKBZ, 23: 275–76.

disease when he approaches Onna san no miya further suggests he may have been possessed by *mononoke*.

While Rokujō's vengeful spirit later clearly declares that she made Onna san no miya renounce the world,⁶⁷ Onna san no miya's troubles (and her pregnancy with Kaoru) in fact begins with the first affair with Kashiwagi under the possible influences of *mononoke*. In this reading, the *mononoke*'s presence encourages Kashiwagi and Onna san no miya's forbidden liaison, which thereby affects various family lines, the Fujiwara (Kashiwagi), Suzaku 朱雀 /Sentei 先帝's bloodline (Onna san no miya and Kaoru, as well as Kashiwagi's first wife, Onna ni no miya 女二宮/Ochiba no miya 落葉宮, a sister of Onna san no miya), as well as Genji's family line. Possessed by *mononoke*, Kashiwagi causes disorder, crossing kinship lines. While he may fail in generating a public extension of his family, through the involvement of *mononoke* he succeeds in producing a new offspring, Kaoru, who is the future protagonist of *Genji* and who bears a hidden kinship, a central thread of the tale.

Kashiwagi's Death and Reemergence as *Mononoke*

While Kashiwagi's initial foot ailment is indication of his possession by *mononoke*, his sickness and death further signify his crossing over various kinship lines and spaces. Kashiwagi's condition worsens, fueled by despair as Onna san no miya continues to refuse to meet or write him after the affair. Kashiwagi's father and mother worry about him living apart from them. They want him to stay at their house rather than his current residence, where he lives

⁶⁷ かうぞあるよ。いとかしこう取り返しつと、ひとりば思したりしが、いとねたかりしかば、このわたりにさりげなくてなむ日ごろさぶらいつる。今は帰りなむ。とてうち笑う。SNKBZ, 23: 310. There are similar scenes in *Eiga monogatari* in which Fujiwara Akimitsu and his daughter Enshi shout in triumph declaring that it was them who made Empress Consort Kanshi renounce the world after possessing her. See *Eiga monogatari*, vol. 2, SNKBZ, 32: 482.

with his first wife, Onna ni no miya/Ochiba no miya, a sister of Onna san no miya.⁶⁸ As Fukutō Sanae points out, styles of living became increasingly varied and diverse during the mid-Heian period, but the wife's parents often provided a home for the couple, and the extended family would sometimes live together.⁶⁹ Since Ochiba no miya is a daughter of the Retired Emperor Suzaku, Suzaku has provided the residence for Ochiba no miya's mother, his daughter, and Kashiwagi. Kashiwagi's parents' request is thus met by strong disagreement from the Ochiba no miya side of the family, especially the mother. The text emphasizes that this is not common practice as Ochiba no miya's mother strongly insists that the couple should never be apart especially when the husband is so sick.⁷⁰ However, Kashiwagi is already convinced that he will die before his parents' passing, one of the worst sins a son can commit according to Confucian and Buddhist thought. He believes that he must obey his parents' wishes and die in their presence if he is indeed to perish first. In the end, Kashiwagi moves to his parents' house in order to die as the eldest son of Tō no Chūjō, the heir incapable of continuing the family line.

Compared to Aoi's sickbed, Kashiwagi's bed is quiet in terms of *mononoke*. In addition to providing medical care, Kashiwagi's father, Tō no Chūjō, invites prominent ascetic monks, Buddhist priests, and *onmyō* masters, arranging pacification rituals and sutra-chanting. He also orders divination specialists to figure out the cause of his son's illness, but to no avail. Onmyō masters assume that there might be a woman's spirit accompanying Kashiwagi, but she does not seem to identify herself.⁷¹ At Aoi's bedside, we saw *mononoke* that seemed to have kinship

⁶⁸ 大臣、母北の方思し騒ぎて、よそよそにていとおぼつかなしとて、殿に渡してたてまつりたまふを、女宮の思したるさま、またいと心苦し。 *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, SNKBZ, 23: 281.

⁶⁹ See Fukutō, *Heian ōcho shakai no jendā*, 57–80; and Fukutō, *Heian ōchō no kodomotachi*, 302–20.

⁷⁰ 世のこととして、親をばなほさるものにおきたてまつりて、かかる御仲らひは、あるをりもかかるおりも、離れたまはぬこと例のことなれ、かくひき別れて、たひらかにものしたまふまでも過ぐしたまはむが心尽しなるべきことを。しばしここにてかくて試みたまへ。 *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4 SNKBZ, 23: 281–82.

⁷¹ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4 SNKBZ, 23: 293.

relations with the Minister of the Left's house, or possible political enemies. This time, although Kashiwagi is in fact a nephew of Aoi, and grandson of the Minister of the Left, no *mononoke* claims kinship with him nor considers him as a rival—almost as if they refuse to admit Kashiwagi is a family member of that house. During the *kemari* match at Rokujō mansion, the text emphasized his affiliation with Fujiwara ancestry as if Kashiwagi was to embody the family line. But now, on his deathbed, Kashiwagi's kinship again becomes blurred and confused. Notice that Kashiwagi does not have any children beyond his newly born illegitimate son, Kaoru, a fact that should never be revealed. Through his illegitimate son, Kashiwagi is physically crossing house boundaries, and his kinship is disorderly and ragged.

While Kashiwagi's illness is suggested to be a result of transgressing family borders, at the same time it appears to strengthen his close relationship with his family. It may at first appear that Kashiwagi's death prevents him from the legitimate continuation of his own kinship. Once again, however, we can see the power of *mononoke* to intervene in the process of kinship formation when Kashiwagi himself becomes a *mononoke*. As a *mononoke*, Kashiwagi appears in the dream of his best friend Yūgiri to ensure that his bloodline and his family tradition continue. After Kashiwagi's passing, Yūgiri, who is also Genji's eldest son, visits Kashiwagi's widow and receives Kashiwagi's flute (*yokobue* 横笛) as a memento. On that night, Yūgiri sees the ghostly figure of his deceased friend in his dream. Kashiwagi, now as *mononoke*, composes a poem:

If the blow of the flute is sounded,
I wish the sound would be passed on down in my own roots.

笛竹に吹きよる風のことならば末の世ながき音/根につたへなむ⁷²

He then adds, "I had someone else in mind" (*omoukata koto ni haberiki* 思ふ方異にはべり

⁷² *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4 SNKBZ, 23: 360.

き).⁷³ Yūgiri, who had only suspected Kashiwagi and Onna san no miya's relationship, is now convinced that the newly born baby, Kaoru, is actually Kashiwagi's son and assumes that Kashiwagi wants his flute to be inherited by his biological son Kaoru. Yūgiri then entrusts the flute to Genji and tells him about the dream. There seems to be an unspoken understanding between the father and son. They both silently acknowledge Kashiwagi to be the biological father of Kaoru who is the rightful owner of the flute. Similar to skill in *kemari*, musical skills and instruments tended to be inherited within members of family. Only by dying and becoming *mononoke* is Kashiwagi able ensure a continuation in his descendants.

More importantly, the identity of Kashiwagi's *mononoke* and his desire to pass on his flute to his biological son as a continuation of family tradition are only made possible through Yūgiri's and Genji's mediation and assistance. The flute inherited from Kashiwagi and the secret kinship becomes one of the central motifs for the later part of the tale when Kaoru masters the instrument. This music continues to remind characters and readers of Kaoru's intertwined kinship with the imperial (his mother, Princess Onna san no miya), Kashiwagi (or Fujiwara), as well as the Genji families. Kashiwagi's memories, stories, and his secret kinship are affirmed by others, namely Genji and Yūgiri, and this is where the later part of *The Tale of Genji* begins.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the significant relationship between kinship and *mononoke*. I have suggested kinship and genealogical concerns permeate *Genji* as often reflected in the terms *suji*—both story-line and/or kinship line—and *midare*, or disorder/transgression. Peter Wade's concept of kinship as a network of rhizomic hybridity inspires new readings of the text and

⁷³ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4 SNKBZ, 23: 360.

rethinking the relationship between kinship and *mononoke*. By incorporating spirit possession and the voices of the dead into the network of rhizomic hybridity, this chapter further enriches rhizomic theories by explicating incorporeal aspects of genealogical formation beyond traditional roots and routes. Both *mononoke* and kinship are unstable and multivalent phenomena, but at the same time they are interdependent and help to define each other. In *Genji*, *mononoke*'s appearances from an unnarrated past at Aoi's deathbed strengthen kinship, even crossing several bloodlines and family lines. A focus on roots and routes allows us to examine absence and the unnarrated in the text, especially in reading the Rokujō family and Kashiwagi episodes. It is in these absences that focusing on *mononoke* phenomena and their voices allows for recreating and reimagining the past and generating kinship narratives.

I have argued that the construction of genealogy and the definition of kinship groups are both key elements of narratives or *monogatari*. The process of tracing back one's roots to a set of ancestors is in itself a type of narrative. As we have seen in *Genji*, the discourse of kinship is constantly "in-the-making," and creating *monogatari* similarly involves continually expanding and weaving roots and routes. In the following chapter, I will continue to expand upon this theme by analyzing Buddhist texts and historical records written by Jien (1155–1225), Archbishop of the Tendai Buddhist sect, who was also a son of the powerful Fujiwara family. I will turn to explore how the rhetoric of *mononoke* and kinship helped to authorize religious and political ideologies and elevate family status during the medieval period.

Chapter Three

Speaking in Reasons: The Seen, the Unseen, and the Between in Jien's Writings

‘*Onryō*’ are beings who held vindictive spirits during their lifetimes in this world and thus haunt their adversaries. The effects could befall one household or the whole land. *Onryō* use slander and falsehood to cause disturbance and destroy people in the same way [that living humans through hatred and resentment destroy each other]. *Onryō*, however, carry out their revenge, which could not have been achieved in the realm of the Seen, from the realm of the Unseen.
—Jien, *Gukanshō*¹

This text [*Gukanshō*] should be named *Dōri monogatari* 道理物語 (Tales of Reason)
—Kurokawa Harumura, annotation to *Gukanshō*²

Introduction

The late Heian and early medieval periods witnessed the rise of warrior aristocrats who usurped political and economic power from the previously court-centered imperial government. The long peace and cultural flourishing that marked the hegemony of the imperial family and aristocratic class during the Heian era started to decline as military nobles seized political power. Frequent warrior uprisings and power struggles, especially the widespread Genpei 源平 War of 1180–85 between the Taira 平 and the Minamoto 源, affected regions far beyond the confines of the capital. Contemporary commentators regularly recorded the chaos: burning of temples and

¹ 怨霊ト云フハ、センハタゞ現世ナガラフカク意趣ヲムスビテカタキニトリテ、小家ヨリニモヲヨビテ<中略>讒言ソラ事ヲツクリニイダスニテ世ノミダレ又人ノ損ズル事ハタゞヲナジ事ナリ。顕ニソノムクイヲハタサネバ冥ニナルバカリナリ。Jien, *Gukanshō*, ed. Okami Masao and Akamatsu Toshihide, in *Nihon bungaku koten taikei* (hereafter *NBKT*), vol. 86 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1967), 339.

² 此書。。。一名道理物語とも名つけへきもの成 Kurokawa Harumura, “Preface,” in *Gukanshō* (1832), vol. 6, second page of unpaginated preface. Held by the National Diet Library.

fields, bloody battles in the cities and in the countryside, and bodies abandoned along the roadside.

Vengeful, restless spirits of the dead were widely believed to have roamed during this period, causing additional calamities such as earthquakes, famines, and fires. Many observers saw this violent state of affairs as the beginning of the age of decay or *mappō* 末法 according to Japanese Buddhist chronology.³ According to Jien 慈円 (1155–1225), an abbot of the Tendai 天台 sect and a prominent poet, these wars were provoked by vengeful sprits according to a certain reason/logic or *dōri* 道理. Jien was also the author of *Gukanshō* 愚管抄, the first major interpretive history (*shiron* 史論) produced around the Jōkyū 承久 Rebellion of 1221. Jien believed the pacification of vengeful souls was an urgent necessity to secure royal authority and to protect the polity—namely, an arrangement where the imperial family and Fujiwara Regent-Chancellor houses (*sekkanke* 摂関家) cooperated with one another.⁴ This partnership between the imperial line and the Fujiwara, Jien argues, resulted from an ancient divine agreement between the Sun Goddess Amaterasu and Amenokoyane no mikoto 天児屋根命, the Fujiwara's ancestral deity, as recorded in the *Nihon shoki* (720).⁵ Jien's advocacy for the rituals for appeasing *onryō* and establishing a site for pacification rituals are well recorded in his own famous historical works, his letters, and Buddhist prayers (*ganmon* 願文).

³ *Mappō*, the final degenerate period of Buddhist Law that was thought to have begun in 1052.

⁴ The title, *Gukanshō*, is sometimes translated into English as “A Fool’s Account,” “Jotting of A Fool,” or “Ignorant Views” because of the predominant meaning of the character *gu* 愚. However, according to Matsuzono Hitoshi, the character *gu* during Jien’s time was very often used for personal accounts and diaries of intellectual courtiers to indicate humility. For example, consider *Gumaiki* 愚昧記 written by Sanjō Sanefusa (1147–1220). *Gukanshō* should be understood as an instance of formalized modesty rather than Jien’s proclamation of his foolishness or ignorance. See Matsuzono Hitoshi, *Nikki no ie: Chūsei kokka no kiroku soshiki* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997), 97–98.

⁵ *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 140.

This chapter attempts to shed new light on the ideology and discourse surrounding vengeful spirits during the late twelfth- and early thirteenth-centuries by focusing on Jien's writings on *onryō*. Recall that Buddhist institutions and advocates helped create the lifecycle of *onryō*, especially by establishing Buddhism's ability to placate vengeful spirits with special knowledge involving spells or incantations (*juso* 呪詛 or *jujutsu* 呪術).⁶ Jien was able to both effectively command the power of efficacious rituals to appease restless spirits and offer *kotowari* 理/ *dōri* 道理, or “reason,” to identify and explain the existence of such spirits.⁷

Although Jien was one of the most important priests of the Tendai sect and a prominent and prolific poet of his age, his works have drawn little scholarly attention compared to many other canonical literary works produced between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such as *Ōkagami* 大鏡 (1086–1123?), *Konjaku monogatari* 今昔物語集 (c. 1120), *Hōjōki* 方丈記 (1212) and *Heike monogatari* 平家物語 (c. 1240). Only a few literary studies of *Gukanshō* exist, and most of Jien's other religious writings have gone largely unexplored.⁸ Perhaps one of the

⁶ See Toshio Kuroda and Allan G. Grapard, “The World of Spirit Pacification: Issues of State and Religion,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3/4 (Fall 1996): 321–51; and Taira Masayuki, “Kuroda Toshio and the Kenmitsu Taisei Theory,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3/4 (Fall 1996): 427–48.

⁷ As Keller Kimbrough, Charlotte Eubanks, Taira Masayuki, and others have shown, Kenmitsu Buddhism sublimated the diverse concept of “magic” or “spells” into systematized rational knowledge. See Keller R. Kimbrough, “Reading the Miraculous Powers of Japanese Poetry: Spells, Truth Acts, and a Medieval Buddhist Poetics of the Supernatural,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 32, no.1 (2005): 1–33; Charlotte Eubanks, *Miracles of Book and Body: Buddhist Textual Culture and Medieval Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011); and Taira Masayuki, “Chūsei Bukkyō ni okeru jujutsusei to gōrisei,” *Kokuritsu rekishi minzoku hakubutsukan kenkyū hōkoku*, no. 157 (2010): 159–73.

⁸ For Anglophone scholarship on Jien's work, see Erin L. Brightwell, “The Mirror of China: Language Selection, Images of China, and Narrating Japan in the Kamakura Period (1185–1333)” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2014), 151–61; Delmer M. Brown and Ichirō Ishida, ed. and trans., *The Future and the Past: A Translation and Study of the Gukanshō, an Interpretative History of Japan Written in 1219* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979); Charles H. Hambrick, “The ‘Gukanshō’: A Religious View of Japanese History,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1 (March, 1978): 37–58; and Michael Marra, “The Conquest of Mappō: Jien and Kitabatake Chikafusa,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, vol. 12, no. 4 (December 1985): 319–41.

reasons for this apparent oversight is that the identification of Jien as the actual author of *Gukanshō* was uncertain until 1921 when Miura Hiroaki's extensive research substantiated Jien as the author, a claim that is now generally accepted.⁹

This chapter examines several texts dealing with *onryō* and *mononoke* written during a period that saw the burgeoning of *setsuwa* 説話 (didactic Buddhist tales), which have formed a major source base for scholarship on extraordinary phenomena.¹⁰ My work diverges from the majority of research on these colorful didactic tales by focusing on Jien's work to reconstruct a complex epistemological framework in which *onryō* played a crucial role. In the seventh chapter of *Gukanshō*, Jien tries to define *onryō* and attempts to comprehend related phenomena, incorporating the idea of Buddhist Law and his own interpretations. Jien summarizes: "*Onryō* are returned spirits that cause disorder and misery in order to carry out revenge that could not be completed while they were alive."¹¹ He claims that each individual *onryō* has a reason or *dōri* behind its return as a vengeful spirit.¹²

Analyzing *Gukanshō* and Jien's other writings as works of literature highlights how Jien adds to the discourse of *mononoke* and the legitimacy of sovereignty and kinship. Throughout his writings, Jien adds layers of connections to the notion of sovereignty and even his own genealogy by defining the identities of many historical *onryō* as his distant relatives and how each should be pacified. Jien was a son of Fujiwara no Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097–1164).

⁹ Miura Hiroyuki, "Gukanshō no kenkyū," *Shirin* 6, no. 1 (January 1921), 1–29. The exact year *Gukanshō* was produced is still a subject of debate among scholars, including the famous annotator of *Gukanshō*, Akamatsu Toshihide, and other *Gukanshō* specialists such as Ishida Ichirō and Ozaki Isamu. Many agree, however, that the text was likely written and edited around the Jōkyū Rebellion in 1221.

¹⁰ The term *onryō* 怨霊 is rarely used in *setsuwa* collections. Famous chapters dealing with strange phenomena, such as the twenty-seventh chapter of *Konjaku monogatari*, tend to use *akuryō* 悪霊 instead. In *Gukanshō*, Jien repeatedly, if not exclusively, uses the term *onryō* 怨霊.

¹¹ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 339.

¹² Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 337.

Tadamichi was a head of the Northern Fujiwara Branch (*Tōshi no chōja* 藤氏長者), Regent (*sesshō* 摂政), Chief Advisor (*kanpaku* 関白), and Chancellor (*dajō-daijin* 太政大臣) to the sovereigns. Jien was also younger brother of Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149–1207), another imperial regent and the great-grandfather of the Kamakura shogun Fujiwara/Kujō Yoritsune 藤原/九条頼経 (1167–1206). Admittedly, *Gukanshō* may not be *monogatari* in a conventional sense, and I do not mean to simply suggest all history is ultimately a “story” or “narrative.” But Jien’s use of *onryō* and genealogies in his rhetoric resonates with other *monogatari* I analyze, such as *Genji monogatari* and *Hōgen monogatari*. My interest in *Gukanshō* is twofold. First, *Gukanshō* offers a detailed definition of *onryō* and provides long lists of vengeful spirits. Secondly, the text itself provides the means to question the often-assumed trinary division between history, genealogy, and fictional tales (*monogatari*), especially in terms of styles of narration.

Scholarship on *onryō* tends to naturalize the phenomena of vengeful spirits as either forces beyond human comprehension or identifiable beings in need of pacification and suppression. One of my goals in this chapter is to show the complex roles of special knowledge and rhetoric in both the creation and the suppression of vengeful spirits. I pay close attention to Jien’s efforts to mediate between this world—the seen world (*kenkai* 顕界) and the other world—the unseen world (*meikai* 冥界). After Buddhism became a means to both define and placate *mononoke*, special religious knowledge became an important element of *onryō* discourse. In Jien’s writings and rhetoric, he elevated himself as one who possessed the knowledge and power to mediate between the seen and the unseen. The recognition of the sophisticated and advanced knowledge and incantations that Buddhist actors wielded in order to “protect” the state is not entirely new. However, my contribution here is to demonstrate how the emergence and

subsequent mediation of *onryō* was also a crucial part of a discourse of legitimacy for the Fujiwara family, Buddhism at large, as well as the court.

Unlike the undecidable *mononoke* in *Genji monogatari*, written two-hundred years earlier, Jien clearly names the vengeful spirits that appear in his text. Thus, he uses the term *onryō* rather than *mononoke*. In the very act of describing these spirits as *onryō* rather than *mononoke*, Jien already exercises his control over these restless beings and legitimizes his power as a chief abbot as well as a member of the Fujiwara. Just as there is mutual dependence between kinship and *mononoke* as seen in previous chapters, so too is there mutual dependence between the Fujiwara family and vengeful spirits. Accordingly, Jien lists his own grandfather among the most prominent *onryō* of his time.

In this chapter, I first briefly introduce Jien's historical and familial background that inform his writings. I then examine Jien's views on *onryō* that he recorded in his prayers (*gammon* 願文) and pledges (*kishōmon* 起請文) written approximately fifteen years prior to *Gukanshō*. Most of these texts are compiled in *Mon'yōki* 門葉記 of Enryaku-ji Shōren-in 延暦寺青蓮院, a temple record that has not yet been explored in English scholarship.¹³ Next, I examine the literary significance and political facets of *Gukanshō* beyond the general notion of the text as a historical account and intellectual treatise. I will reconsider the fluidity of the important keyword “*dōri*,” or “reason,” to decode Jien's writings. Lastly, I investigate the complexities of Jien's definition of *onryō* and the world view of the seen and the unseen in *Gukanshō*.

A close reading of Jien's work reveals the mobility and heterogeneity of spaces and habitats in the realms of the seen and the unseen. This reading contrasts with a strict dualistic

¹³ Takakusu Junjirō and Kaigyoku Watanabe, ed. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, *Zuzōbu* 圖像部, vol. 12 (Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924).

understanding of Buddhist cosmology as demarcating the seen/visible world from the unseen/invisible world. By exploring these Buddhist texts and Jien's theories on *onryō* as well as the realms of the seen and unseen, I will examine the place of *onryō* in supporting ruling elites' claims to power. Elites both inside and outside the court relied on the existence of *onryō* to legitimate their rule and the political status of their family. Both the ability to pacify *onryō* as well as having a genealogical connection to these vengeful spirits formed an important basis for one's claim to power.

Jien's View on *Onryō* Management by the Imperial Family

Before he set brush to paper to compose *Gukanshō*, Jien had already begun to formulate his views on the interdependence between *onryō* and the realm ruled by the imperial family. By Jien's lifetime, religious practices surrounding vengeful spirits (*onryō-goryō shinkō*) had become popular at all levels of society. Placatory performances for the dead, performed by lute-playing itinerant monks (*biwa hōshi* 琵琶法師), had become widespread outside of the court. The late twelfth-century was a period of disturbance in early Japanese history that saw various disasters and the rampancy of *onryō* who had met wrongful or violent deaths, including the Retired Emperor Sutoku 崇徳 (1119–64), Fujiwara Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078–1162), and Fujiwara Yorinaga 藤原頼長 (1120–56), along with the Heike family, who suffered completely decimation. Suffice to say there were a number of strange occurrences after the Heike were destroyed, such as a series of earthquakes after 1184, plagues, and droughts that afflicted the area surrounding the capital.¹⁴ With their world turned upside-down by civil wars, political intrigue, and various disasters, people sought for ways to understand the cause of these calamities and to

¹⁴ Tokyo-fu Gakumu-bu Shakai-ka ed. *Nihon tensai chihenshi* (Tokyo: Kairo Shoin, 2004), 115–18.

alleviate their anxiety and fear by identifying *onryō* and pacifying them. The urgency of the project of identification and pacification was felt not only by many religious figures and political elites but also by people outside of the capital.¹⁵

Jien himself believed the frequent disasters were directly caused by the restless and angry *onryō*. In 1204, Jien composed a prayer (*ganmon*) when he established Daisenpōin 大懺法院 as a temple for pacifying the vengeful spirits. Jien explains in this prayer (*Daisenpōin jōjō kishō no koto* 大懺法院条々起請事) that, despite the spread of placatory practices throughout broader society, it was ultimately the imperial family's responsibility—and even privilege—to identify and pacify *onryō*.

Since the law of the Buddha arrived during the sovereign Kinmei's 欽明 reign, the law of the Buddha had been protecting the Royal law.... Yet after the Hōgen disturbance, vengeful spirits spread all over the realm. No benevolent measures have been taken and no imperial council has been held to save these vengeful souls.... Only the law of the Buddha can placate these restless spirits, including the sacred soul of Retired Emperor Sutoku and the vengeful spirit of Chisoku-in 知足院 [Fujiwara Tadazane], and thereby help the imperial family... [The law of the Buddha] will pacify the vengeful and restless spirits, rectifying their evil to righteousness and bestowing peace instead of suffering. Based on the law of Buddha and the Royal law, with the Buddha and gods' sacred assistance, calamity will turn into fortune, and peace and tranquility will spread to the people who fulfill the Buddha and gods' wishes.

欽明天皇御宇仏法将来之後、一向以仏法守王法以来<略> 然保元以後乱世之今、怨靈満一天亡卒在四海、雖然未聞拔濟之徳政、亦無中興之朝議歟<略> 濟度彼怨靈扶助此朝家、唯在仏法之法力、<略> 就中崇徳院聖霊・知足院怨霊<略>

¹⁵ The need to placate the restless spirits on the streets of the capital in Kyoto led to an increase in *biwa hōshi* performances. These itinerant performers mainly recited *The Tale of the Heike*, which included episodes featuring members of the Heike family and various victims who died during the battles. *Biwa hōshi* performed at shrines, temples, and other places of worship. Elsewhere, they drew crowds by standing at crossroads under an open oiled parasol. The shadows the parasol cast represented a sacred place. With plaintive lute sounds and voices trained specifically for reciting *Heike*, *biwa hōshi* became a fitting mediums to pacify the restless souls of the dead. For more on *biwa hōshi*, see David Bialock, "Biwa Masters and Musical Hierophanies in the *Heike monogatari* and Other Medieval Texts," *Journal of Religion in Japan* 2, no. 2/3 (2013): 119–51; Hyōdō Hiromi, *Biwa hōshi: "Ikai" o kataru hitobito* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2009); and Pierre-François Souyri, *The World Turned Upside Down* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001).

然則怨靈亡卒之満国、依作善之廻向、捨邪帰正、拔苦与楽、仏法王法之告時、以
仏神之冥助転禍為福、安穩太平祈願 已是仏神利生御素意也。。。¹⁶

Given the placatory focus of Daisenpōin, the temple let their monks practice music and recitation and actively accepted blind monks and *biwa hōshi*. Jien's *ganmon* reveals a common concern that pacifying *onryō* was necessary for the continuation of rule by the imperial family and to bring peace back to the realm. More importantly, Jien emphasizes the importance of the connection between the law of the Buddha (*Buppō*) and imperial law (*Ōhō*) in order to bring about order and peace in society.

This logic of the Buddhist's role of "protecting the nation" (*chingo kokka*) represents a doctrine that assumes a symbolic relationship between the realm and Buddhism¹⁷ (*ōbō buppō sōi ron* 王法仏法相依論).¹⁸ Although this passage from Jien's prayer clearly states that the law of the Buddha is needed to placate the vengeful spirits and protect the imperial law, he also calls out the imperial family's failure to take responsibility for such restless spirits. In other words, the *ganmon* suggests that the law of the Buddha would step in when imperial law alone was insufficient to appease *onryō*. Jien's *ganmon* exemplifies both the intermingling of the court and Buddhist institutions as well as the of the inseparability of imperial rule from vengeful spirits.

One of the intriguing placatory measures that Daisenpōin favored was ritualistic performance, namely the recitation of war tales and songs. References to this emphasis on such

¹⁶ *Mon'yōki*, in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, *Zuzōbu*, vol. 12, ed. Takakusu Junjirō and Watanabe Kaigyoku (Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924), 12.

¹⁷ In this dissertation, I often translate *buppō* 仏法 as "the law of the Buddha" or "Buddhist law," but occasional gloss *buppō* as Buddhism where it is appropriate. However, I must point out that Jien himself only uses *buppō* and never *bukkyō* 仏教 in his *Gukanshō*. For further insight into the use of *buppō* in medieval texts, see Makino Junji, "Heike monogatari no 'buppō,'" *Kodai kenkyūgaku kenkyūjo kiyō*, vol. 14 (2010): 57–69.

¹⁸ See Kuroda Toshio's *Obō to buppō: Chuseishi no kozu* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1983); and "Obō to Buppō," in his *Kuroda Toshio chosakushu* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1994): 185–96.

performances can be found in many contemporary texts and later works that reflect back upon the period following the Genpei war. Kenkō Hōshi's 兼好法師 (1283–1352) famous passages from *Tsurezuregusa* 徒然草 (c. 1330–31) mention the emergence of the texts of *Heike monogatari* and the training of blind *biwa hōshi*:

During the reign of the Emperor Go-Toba, Shinano Zenji, formerly the governor known as Shinano Yukinaga, was once famous for his dance and musical performances...[but] he decided to enter the temple, abandoning his further musical training. Priest Jichin [Jien], who took in talented people, showed mercy on this monk Shinano and fed him [at the temple]. It was this priest Shinano who created *Heike monogatari* and taught a blind monk called Shōbutsu. *Biwa hōshi* today inherit the natural voice of Shōbutsu.

後鳥羽院の御時、信濃前司行長、稽古の誉ありけるが、樂府の御論議の番に召されて、七徳の舞を二つ忘れたりければ、五徳の冠者と異名を附きにけるを、心憂き事にして、学問を捨てて遁世したりけるを、慈鎮和尚、一芸ある者をば、下部までも召し置きて、不便にせさせ給ひければ、この信濃入道を扶持し給ひけり。この行長入道、平家物語を作りて、生仏といひける盲目に教へて語らせけり。さて、山門の事を殊にゆゆしく書けり。九郎判官の事は委しく知りて書き載せたり。蒲冠者の事はよく知らざりけるにや、多くの事どもを記し洩らせり。武士の事、弓馬の業は、生仏、東国の者にて、武士に問ひ聞きて書かせけり。かの生仏が生れつきの声を、今の琵琶法師は学びたるなり。¹⁹

Many scholars believe that this temple is likely where Shinano Zenji Yukinaga 信濃前司行長 (date of birth and death unknown), a possible author of *Heike monogatari*, stayed and created the *Heike* texts. As is well known, *Heike monogatari*, especially when performed by *biwa hōshi*, possessed many placatory aspects. While the credibility of the authorship of *Heike monogatari* is still questionable, it is important to note that literature like *Heike monogatari* and other pacification methods were believed to have been developed under Jien, a grandson of Fujiwara Tadazane. Tadazane was punished in the aftermath of the Hōgen disturbance and, according to earlier *ganmon* composed by Jien, became an *onryō*. Daisenpōin also served as a *goganji* 御願

¹⁹ Yoshida Kenkō, *Tsurezuregusa*, in *Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshū*, vol. 27 (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1971), 269.

寺, a temple that specialized in praying for members of the imperial family—in this case, Retired Emperor Go-Toba 後鳥羽 (1180–1239).²⁰

In other words, Daisenpōin embodied the intertwined coexistence of laws of the Buddha and those of the imperial family. The association of *biwa hōshi* with Daisenpōin suggests that in addition to court-sponsored placation enterprises as part of political ideology, popular placatory performances and literature were also connected to politics and state activities. Daisenpōin was one such temple that disseminated placatory literature to the capital and beyond.²¹ In his historical writings, Jien expands upon the relationship between the court and Buddhism on a more personal level, weaving in his own genealogy into *onryō* discourse.

Jien and *Gukanshō*'s Historical Context

Before examining *Gukanshō* itself, it is necessary to briefly delve into changes in the nature of the Fujiwara family from what we have seen in earlier chapters, paying particular attention to the Kujō 九条 house,²² with which Jien was closely affiliated. Jien grew up amid the power struggles and disturbances at the nexus of the courtier elites. More specifically, Jien was born into one of the houses of the Fujiwara Regents and Chancellors (*sekkanke* 摂関家), one of the most powerful of the houses among the already powerful Fujiwara family. As one of many

²⁰ Hyōdō, *Biwa hōshi*, 52–53.

²¹ Hyōdō, *Biwa hōshi*, 52–53.

²² It is difficult to strictly distinguish and translate terms such as *ie* 家 and *ryū* 流 in discussing the Fujiwara in the late Heian and early medieval periods, especially when these family branches were still fluid (including various forms of adoption and intermarriage). In this chapter, I have roughly followed the following categorization. First, I use “Fujiwara family” for members of the Fujiwara as a whole. The next level grouping of the Fujiwara, “branch,” includes the Northern Branch (*hokke*)—Fujiwara Yoshifusa’s descendent group. I use “line” for the term, *ryū*, which tends to be used for particular schools of skills, manners, etiquette. While *sekke/sekkanke*, such as the Kujō and the Konoe, were called Kujō *ryū* and Konoe *ryū*, I use the word “house” in order to avoid confusion.

children of Fujiwara no Tadamichi, several of Jien's siblings occupied positions of great power. His three older brothers, most notably Kujō Kanezane, assumed the role of Regent, while three sisters became Empresses Consort.

Jien's own rise to a powerful position underscores his privileged background. At the time, elites of distinguished religious institutions, especially the Tendai and Shingon Buddhist sects, were either members of the imperial family or sons of prominent aristocrats. These religious elites, thus, wielded significant political influence. Four-times appointed abbot of the Tendai sect, Jien himself served as personal Guardian Priest (*gojisō* 護持僧) of Retired Emperor Go-Toba, two of the highest positions that a Buddhist priest could achieve.²³ Jien was very close to the center of politics, and thus his written works, whether prayers or historical accounts, need to be understood within the context of the political circles from which he emerged and actively sought to reproduce.

The late Heian period has been commonly discussed in terms of the transition of political power from aristocracy to military governance. However, such a transition had not yet been totally completed (if it ever would be). Courtiers always maintained a certain degree of political power, especially in the realm of the production of knowledge and histories and the management of the discourse of the seen and the unseen. For Jien, *onryō* management was one of the most important tactics to restore and maintain the Fujiwara family's authority.

In Jien's texts, it appears that this power of knowledge production regarding *onryō* could help reverse the seemingly receding tide of Fujiwara dominance. Jien's father, Fujiwara Tadamichi, was once a head of the Northern Fujiwara Branch, or more precisely the Midōryū 御

²³ His appointments were made in 1192, 1201, 1212, and 1213. While it was not uncommon for prominent priests to take the position several times, Jien is one of few priests who assumed the rank four times along with Cloistered Imperial Prince Son'en (1298–1356), a son of Emperor Fushimi.

堂流 line from Fujiwara no Michinaga 藤原道長 (966–1027), who had reached the peak of Fujiwara regency politics through inter-marriage.²⁴ Michinaga's son, Yorimichi 頼通 (992–1074), succeeded his father's position as Regent and Councilor. Even after fifty years of regency, however, Yorimichi still did not have any daughters who could bear a crown prince. The Fujiwara lost much of their political power as regents when the unrelated Emperor Go-Sanjō 後三条 (1034–73) ascended to the throne in 1068. Emperor Go-Sanjō became the first emperor in almost two-hundred years who did not have any blood or marriage relationships to the Northern Fujiwara Branch. Eventually various civil disturbances, many of which involved courtiers' families fighting against each other, caused further confusion turbulence in political power.

The weakening of the regency and the beginning of the *insei* period together form the necessary historical context for understanding Jien's political and social position. As the power of the Northern branch of the Fujiwara dispersed, several family lines and branches descended from Yorimichi, called *sekke* 摂家, struggled to legitimize their family authority and establish family traditions. In addition to the disputed positions of the regent and chancellor, gaining the position of the head of the Fujiwara became another point of contention and engendered a family feud. In the twelfth-century, the five *sekke* included the Konoe 近衛, Kujō 九条, Ichijō 一条, Takatsukasa 鷹司, and Nijō 二条 houses. During Jien's time, the head of the Fujiwara tended to come from the Konoe or Kujō houses.²⁵ As father-to-son hereditary practice became more

²⁴ For further studies on family systems in general and Fujiwara families from the late Heian and Kamakura periods, see Akashi Kazunori, *Kodai, chūsei no ie to jōsei: Kazoku no riron* (Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2006); Higuchi Kentarō, *Chūsei sekkanke no ie to kenryoku* (Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2011); Hirayama Toshijirō, *Nihon chūsei kazoku no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppankyoku, 1980); Komoto Mitsugi and Yagi Tōru, *Kazoku to shisha saishi* (Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 2006); and Saeki Tomohiro, *Chūsei zenki no seiji kōzō to ōke* (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2015).

²⁵ Initially, the Midō line split into the Konoe and Matsudono branches, but after regent Matsudono Moroie (1172–1238) passed away, the branch eventually fell into decline and no longer produced regents

common, each particular lineage within the same house strove to establish their legitimacy. A key practice to establish each family's authority lay in creating a family diary, *kaki* 家記 or *nikki* 日記, which recorded rules of ceremony and etiquette (*yūsoku kojitsu* 有職故実).²⁶

We can see the importance of these family/house records within the Fujiwara families as both material regalia and family practice. The three most important physical pieces of proof of Fujiwara authority included the ownership of Higashi Sanjō Palace estate (the residence of the head of the Fujiwara); a family heirloom, called Shuki Daiban 朱器台盤, consisting of a set of vermilion-lacquered dishes and drinking vessels; and, importantly, a diary, *Midō Kanpaku-ki* 御堂関白記, written by Fujiwara no Michinaga. According to Matsuzono Hitoshi, who has conducted extensive studies on the *sekkon* family records, the diary was in possession of the Konoe house. The Konoe house was considered to possess special knowledge of family histories and important court customs and traditions that directly related to the politics of the time. Matsuzono explains that although Kujō Kanezane assumed leadership of the Fujiwara family, the regency, and the chancellorship, he did not seem to own any manuscripts from Michinaga's diary.²⁷ These manuscripts remained in the hands of the Konoe family, along with all of the wisdom and important court rules and traditions contained therein.²⁸ Since the possession of such family records was crucial to establish family legitimacy, it was urgent for Kanezane to create his own familial records, which may have contributed to his achievement of writing his own extensive diary, *Gyokuyō* 玉葉.

or chancellors. A more in-depth consideration of the shift of power within the Fujiwara families is beyond the scope of this chapter. For more on these issues, see Higuchi Kentarō, *Chūsei sekkonke no ie to kenryoku* (Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2011)

²⁶ See Saeki Tomohiro, *Chūsei zenki no seiji kōzō to ōke*, 6–7; and Matsuzono Hitoshi, *Nikki no ie: Chūsei kokka no kiroku soshiki* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997).

²⁷ Matsuzono Hitoshi, *Nikki no ie*, 202–204.

²⁸ Saeki Tomohiro, *Chūsei zenki no seiji kōzō to ōke*, 202–15.

Kanezane's close brother and ally, Jien, produced his own *Gukanshō*, which greatly reflects this effort to legitimize the Fujiwara *sekke* houses and their symbiotic political authority with the imperial family. Ōsumi Kazuo contends that one of the significant differences between *Gukanshō* and the other historical accounts that Jien seemed to use as references, such as *Ōkagami* and *Eiga monogatari*, lies in how the Fujiwara family is addressed as a unit.²⁹ Throughout *Gukanshō*, the term “Fujiwara” and the character for Fuji or Tō 藤 is only used around ten times. Instead, Jien mainly uses the term for the regent houses, *sekke*, or, more commonly in Jien's writing, *setsuroku* 摂籙. *Setsuroku* generally referred to houses that were authorized to be appointed as either a regent (*sesshō*), who supported a child/young emperor, and/or a chief advisor (*kanpaku*), who continued to serve an adult emperor. Needless to say, this political system controlled by such *sesshō* and *kanpaku* (often referred to as *sekkon seiji* 摂関政治) secured the Fujiwara family's political hegemony ever since Fujiwara Yoshifusa 藤原良房 (804–72) became the first “commoner” regent to his grandson, Emperor Seiwa 清和 (850–81) in 866. For Jien, however, the rightful Fujiwara *setsuroku* house retained a narrower meaning, only referring to the Kujō.

Like many other courtiers in his time, Jien regarded the Engi 延喜 and Tenryaku 天曆 periods of the early tenth century as ideal exemplars of governance, where the emperors were supported by a Fujiwara regency. He commended the relationship between the sovereign and their subjects during this time as natural as a fish to water (*kunshin gattai gyosui no gi* 君臣合体魚水ノ儀).³⁰ Valorizing Engi and Tenryaku periods ultimately helped Jien to legitimize the Kujō

²⁹ Ōsumi Kazuo, *Gukanshō o yomu: Chūsei Nihon no rekishikan* (Tokyo: Kōdansha Gakujutsu Bunko, 1999), 174–78.

³⁰ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 333.

house. He contended that the Kujō house was the rightful descendent of Fujiwara/Kujō Morosuke 九条師輔 (909–60). Although Morosuke was never *sesshō* or *kanpaku*, he inherited the *de jure* regency house to assist the imperial family, and he then established the Kujō line, which eventually was handed to Kujō Kanezane.³¹ Jien explained that Morosuke, the rightful successor to Tadahira's governance, prayed for his descendants to inherit the regency. Morosuke's wish was granted by a chief abbot of Enryaku-ji, Jie 慈恵 (also known as Ryōgen 良源, 912–85), an incarnation of Kannon Bodhisattva. Morosuke's female descendants subsequently gave birth to both imperial successors and regents, and thus the descendants of Morosuke had flourished until the reign of Emperor Go-Reizei.³² Hence, by claiming the rightful descendance from Fujiwara Morosuke, the founder of Kujō line, Jien's valorization of the Fujiwara family, or more precisely the Kujō house, is inseparable from his motive for composing *Gukanshō*. His writing ultimately legitimizes the Kujō house, Morosuke's rightful successor, and maintains the power to produce written knowledge and histories. This legitimacy, in Jien's view, was also protected by entities in the Unseen. With this legitimacy also came the practical knowledge for managing such entities, including *onryō*.

³¹ Generally speaking, Kujō ryū 九条流 refers to a branch founded by Kujō Morosuke, while Kujō ke 九条家 refers to the house founded by Kujō Kanezane, although the latter is often also addressed as Kujō ryū. Kujō Morosuke was a son of Fujiwara Tadahira 藤原忠平, also known as Teishinkō 貞信公 (880–949), who was later considered to be a major actor in the “glorious rule of Tenryaku” (Tenryaku *no chi* 天曆の治).

³² アニノ小野宮ドノニサキダチテ一定ウセナムズトシラセ玉ヒテ。ワガミコソ短祚ニウケタリトモ。我子孫ニ摂政ヲバツタエンニ。又ワガ子孫ヲ帝ノグワイセキトハナサムトチカイテ。観音ノ化身ノ叡山ノ慈恵大僧正トシダンノチギリフカクシテ。横川ノミネニ楞嚴三昧院トイフ寺ヲタテテ。九條ドノノ御存日ニハ。法花堂バカリヲマツヅクリテ。ノボリテ大衆ノ内ニテ火ウチノ火ヲウチテ。ワガコノ願成就スベクバ三度ガ中ニツケトテウタセ玉ヒケルニ。一番ニ火ウチツケテ。法花堂ノ常燈ニハツケラレタリ。イマニキエズト申ツタヘタリ。サレバソノ御ムスメノハラニ。冷泉。円融ノ両帝ヨリハジメテ後冷泉院マデ。継躰守文ノキミ。内覧撰籙ノ臣アザヤカニサカリナリ。 Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 157–58.

Jien first started to write *Gukanshō* around the Jokyū 承久 disturbance of 1221. He continuously edited and added sections to culminate in a total of seven chapters. Chapters One and Two are imperial chronicles, or *Kōtei nendaiki* 皇帝年代記, which stretch from the reign of the legendary Emperor Jinmu 神武 (711 BCE–585 BCE) to Emperor Go-Horikawa 後堀河 (1212–34 CE). Chapters Three through Six together form a “Brief Narrative History of Japan” (*Honchō ryakushi* 本朝略史) from the seventh-century BCE to the year 1219 CE. And finally, Chapter Seven includes personal commentaries on interpretations of history. Jien also discusses his theoretical presuppositions surrounding various concepts and key terms that he uses throughout *Gukanshō*. Many scholars agree that Jien began the manuscript before the Jokyū disturbance partially in an attempt to dissuade the Retired Emperor Go-Toba from opposing the Kamakura military government when the relations between the two sides worsened.³³ For Jien, it was time for society to accept “the reason” for why the imperial family, the *setsuroku* Fujiwara, and the rising military rulers would inevitably cooperate and unite.

The composition of *Gukanshō* also corresponds to a period of change in the shogunate-controlled Kamakura. The Kamakura bakufu and the imperial court negotiated regarding the appointment of the next shogun after the assassination of the third shogun Minamoto Sanetomo 源実朝 (1192–1219) in 1219, when the two-year-old Kujō Yoritsune 九条頼経 (1218–56) entered Kamakura as the future aristocratic shogun. As Ishida Ichirō and Delmer Brown both argue, Jien tried to convince readers that the future aristocratic shogun Yoritsune, a son of the

³³ See Taga Munehaya, *Jien no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1980), 266–71. Other scholars who agree on Jien’s intent include Fukazawa Tōru, Kanda Tatsumi, Nagasaki Hiroshi, and Ōsumi Kazuo. For more on the issue of Jien’s motivation for composing *Gukanshō*, see Fukazawa Tōru, *Gukanshō no uso to makoto: Rekishi gatari no jiko genkyūsei o koete* (Tokyo: Shinwasha, 2006); Kanda Tatsumi, “Gukanshō to iu ‘gengo kōi,’” *Bungaku* 8, no. 6 (November/December 2007): 14–24; and Nagasaki Hiroshi, *Ransei no seijiron gukanshō o yomu* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2016).

³³ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 324.

Kujō *setsuroku* house, was the divinely ordained leader that the deities had always planned upon.³⁴ Jien's rhetoric can be clearly seen in his statement in which he claims:

After a period of time of warriors controlling the state, all military leaders [the Heike and the Minamoto] were lost...the appointment of the young Lord Yoritsune of the *setsuroku* house as the next shogun has occurred because the ancestral deities—the Sun Goddess, Great Hachiman Bodhisattva, and Ame no koyane no mikoto—believe that the state should return to the ancient formula of joint rule by the imperial family and their loyal servant, the *setsuroku* family.

今ハ又武者ノ出デ来テ、將軍トテ君ト撰籙ノ家トヲ押シ籠メテ世ヲトリタルコトノ世ノ果テニハ侍ルホドニ、此武將ヲミナ失ヒ果テテ、誰ニモ郎從トナルベキ武士バカリニナシテ、ソノ將軍ニハ撰籙ノ臣ノ家ノ君公（＝頼經）ヲナサレヌル事ノ、イカニモイカニモ宗廟神ノ、猶君臣合体シテ昔ニ歸リテ世ヲシバシ治メント思シ召シタルニテ侍レバ、ソノ始終ヲ申シ通シ侍ルベキ也。³⁵

Jien emphasizes Kujō Yoritsune's entering the Kamakura bakufu as proof of "joint rule by the imperial family and its loyal servant." In reality, however, this move represented the joint rule of the Kujō (the Fujiwara) and Kamakura bakufu, since Yoritsune's parents, Kujō Michiie 九条道家 (1193–1252) and Saionji Rinshi 西園寺掄子 (1192–1251), were both from the Fujiwara family (Saionji is a branch of the Kan'in 閑院 line). Jien invokes the ancestral gods as representatives of the imperial line to legitimize an imagined continuation of this joint rule. By so doing, Jien uses imperial authority to boost Yorimichi's power without undermining the imperial family, an ultimately indispensable key to the Fujiwara's legitimacy.

This historical context should inform our reading of Jien's *Gukanshō*. Considering the political upheavals of the time and the machinations of Jien and his family members is especially

³⁴ Delmer M. Brown and Ichirō Ishida, ed. and trans., *The Future and the Past: A Translation and Study of the Gukanshō, an Interpretative History of Japan Written in 1219* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 6–8.

³⁵ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 332–33.

important when reading one of the most frequently and uncritically quoted passages by historians and literary scholars:

[W]hen Retired Emperor Toba died on the second day of the seventh month of 1156, the rebellions of the state of Japan (*Nihonkoku no rangyaku* 日本國ノ乱逆) broke out, and Japan's Military Age (*musa no yo* 武者ノ世) had begun.

保元々年七月二日鳥羽院ウセサセ給ヒテ後。日本國ノ乱逆ト云コトハヲコリテ後。ムサノ世ニナリニケル也ケリ。コノ次第ノコトハリヲコレハセンニ思テ書置侍ルナリ。³⁶

This passage is often interpreted as an aristocratic priest's lamentation over a waning aristocracy. However, it also must be read in the context that this announcement of the arrival of the Military Age is in fact simply a prelude to Jien's rhetoric heralding the re-unification of the imperial family and the *setsuroku* Fujiwara. The old guard now quietly possessed substantial military authority under a new guise.

Narrating Histories in Japanese Katakana

Let us now turn to examine the narration of *Gukanshō* as the first interpretative history of the state written by an individual author. What makes *Gukanshō*'s narration worth considering is its use of the first-person perspective, occasionally addressing Jien as a third person, as if he himself is one of the characters in the text. This narration resonates with what I have characterized as a facet of *monogatari* as seen in *Genji*. Unlike *Genji monogatari* or other historical tales that tend to be categorized as “*rekishi monogatari*,” such as *Eiga Monogatari* and *Ōkagami*, that are written in hiragana, the original texts of *Gukanshō* are written in *katakana*. Traditionally, chronicles and family records or diaries were considered to be prestigious documents and were thus traditionally written in Sino-Japanese (*kanbun* 漢文). One could argue

³⁶ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 206.

that Jien understood the usefulness of *katakana* as a priest who was more familiar with this syllabary since he would have read Buddhist texts that frequently used *katakana* as reading aids.

But Jien further explains his rationale for writing in *katakana* as follows:

Besides these imperial chronicles, I have provided a general overview of the transition of “reason” from the time of Emperor Jinmu to last year. People who wish to read this should understand the changes of “reason.” I have mainly written in *kana* 仮名 because I followed the “reason” as I understood it. My primary motivation is to write this book for those who have no knowledge of such things. In this final age of Buddhist Law, those who work on written texts in pursuit of scholarship, whether noble or poor, priest or laymen, have some knowledge of *mana* 真名 but achieve no comprehension of accurate reason... There are many books such as the Chronicles of Japan (*Nihongi*) and others including the *ritsuryō* codes, but there is hardly anyone who has the slightest understanding of them. With *kana*, people can reach the essence of Japanese words, or *yamato kotoba*, regardless of the characters. One may laugh at my writing in *kana*, believing that it is nonsense to write in this way and that some *kana* are still difficult to read. There are some words like *hatato*, *muzuto*, *shakuto*, *doto*, etc... in my writing, which I believe lie at the core of *yamato kotoba*. Everyone understands what they mean [if written in *kana*] ...

此皇代年代ノ外ニ神武ヨリ去々年ニ至ルマデ世ノ移リ行道理ノ一通リヲ書ケリ。是ヲ能々心得テミン人ハ見ラルベキ也。偏ニ仮名ニ書ツクル事ハ是モ道理ヲ思ヒテ書ル也。先是ヲカクカカント思ヒ寄事ハ物知レル事ナキ人ノ料也。此末代ザマノ事ヲ知ルニ文簿ニタヅサハレル人ハ。貴キモ卑モ。僧ニモ俗ニモ。有難ク学問ハサスガスル由ニテ。僅ニ真名ノ文字ヲバ読ドモ。又ソノ義理ヲ悟リ知レル人ハナシ。＜略＞日本紀以下律令ハ我國ノ事ナレドモ。今スコシ読解人アリ難シ。仮名ニ書バカリニテハ。倭詞ノ本体ニテ文字ヘカカラズ。仮名ニ書タルモ。猶読ニクキ程ノコトバヲ無下ノ事ニシテ人ニ是ヲ笑フ。ハタト。ムズト。シヤクト。トウトナドイフ詞ドモ也。是コソ此倭辞ノ本体ニテハアレ。此詞ドモノ心ヲバ人皆是ヲシレリ。³⁷

³⁷ Jien explains his rationale for writing *katakana* at least twice in *Gukanshō*—in the second chapter and the seventh chapter—in a similar manner. Here I am primarily considering a passage from the second chapter. See Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 127–28. I agree with Erin Brightwell’s critique of the uncritical use of the term “Chinese characters” as a translation of *mana*, as seen in Brown and Ishida’s translations. It is too reductive to say that Jien is choosing “Japanese over Chinese” here in his decision to use *katakana* over *mana*. See Erin Brightwell’s discussion of Jien’s writing in *kana* in “‘The Mirror of China’: Language Selection, Images of China, and Narrating Japan in the Kamakura Period (1185–1333)” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2014), 159–61. For further discussion on the multivalency and complexities of writing and literacy in “Chinese” and “Japanese” languages in premodern Japan, see Brian Steininger, *Chinese Literary Forms in Heian Japan: Poetics and Practice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asian Center, 2017), 1–17.

While *Gukanshō* can be understood as an admonition produced for Retired Emperor Go-Toba (who would have excelled in reading Sino-Japanese), it is important that Jien also indicates his desire to reach a broader audience by using *katakana*.

As Erin Brightwell, Fukazawa Tōru, and Kanda Tatsumi all point out, Jien himself was keenly aware of this linguistic choice and its effects beyond mere writing style. He claims that phonographic *kana* cannot be completely captured by the frame of *mana*—literally meaning, “true character” or “Chinese character” (倭詞ノ本体ニテ文字ヘカカラス).³⁸ Whether or not the text was widely circulated beyond courtier circles, Jien’s use of *katakana* phonograms as a medium to convey his thoughts may parallel his earlier involvement in providing a site for pacifying *onryō* by training *biwa hōshi*. These performers’ main medium was oral recitation, and they were often charged to reach to a broader audience. Unlike *The Tale of the Heike*, *Gukanshō* does not use many figures of speech or poetic words. Instead, Jien seems to pursue spontaneity and clarity of Japanese language, especially something resembling the vernacular. Scholars such as Fukazawa Tōru and Kanda Tatsumi further argue that in the late Heian period, *katakana* served as “transplant” phonographs. *Katakana* partially replaced the role of *hiragana* as a *parole* since written *hiragana* had been more valued for its aesthetic qualities.³⁹ In other words, Jien seems to try to mediate the essential meaning of words through *katakana* and their sounds.

While there is never any entirely “transparent” mediation in any communication, it is important that Jien consciously mediates the difference and significance of the use of characters

³⁸ *NKBT*, 86: 128.

³⁹ Fukazawa Tōru, *Gukanshō no uso to makoto: Rekishi gatari no jiko genkyusei o koete* (Tokyo: Shinwasha, 2006); Ishiguro Shiho, “Jien no gengokan to Inseiki no karon,” *Narashien*, vol. 55 (February 2010): 17–32, and Kanda Tatsumi, “Gukanshō to iu ‘gengo kōi,’” *Bungaku* 8, no.6 (November/December 2007): 14–24.

and an approximate orality through *kana*.⁴⁰ For Jien and many Buddhist practitioners, *katakana* was frequently employed in reading sutras and other Buddhist texts. Amino Yoshihiko and Fukazawa Tōru draw attention to the sacred efficacy of *katakana*, which was often used for making religious pledges such as *ganmon* and *kishōmon*.⁴¹ Amino contends that *katakana* was used to communicate oral messages from gods and buddhas, as seen in *takusenki* 託宣記 (records of divine messages) and *yumenoki* 夢記 (records of dreams). He suggests phonograms and orality were believed to be close to the essence of divine meaning. Notice how Jien regards himself as part of a chain of such mediation toward the end of *Gukanshō*:

What extraordinary things have I inscribed here! It was my body that wrote these [texts], however I have not been aware of what I have written. This is something beyond words that I can express. If we were in the time when gods and buddhas were speaking, I shall have asked them about this.

コハ以テノ外ノ事ドモカキツケ侍リヌル物カナ。コレカク人ノ身ナガラモ我ガスル事トハスコシモヲボエ侍ラヌ也。申スバカリナシ申スバカリナシ。アハレ神仏モノノ給フ世ナラバ、トイマイラセテマシ。⁴²

Jien suggests here the possibility of himself as a mediator of divine messages. He seems to use *katakana* to not only convey his messages to a potentially broad audience but also to hint at the divine origin of the messages he communicates, elevating himself as an authoritative mediator.

⁴⁰ Fukazawa Tōru discusses Jien's writings' performativity using Derrida's concept of *parole* and *écriture*. It is indeed tempting to discuss Jien's writings in term of Derrida's ideas and how these ideas might inform the discussion of *monogatari* vis-à-vis Jien's writing. However, since it is out of the scope of this current chapter, which focuses on Jien's rhetoric of *onryō*, I will not examine the issue further. See Fukazawa's analysis: "Ichijirushiki shutai kōchiku: *Gukanshō* ni miru 'katakana hyōki' no performative [*sic*]," *Kodaigaku kenkyū kiyō* no. 20 (March 2014): 63–80.

⁴¹ Amino Yoshihiko, "Moji ni tsuite," in *Nihon no rekishi o yominaosu* (Tokyo: Tsukuma Shobō, 1999), 19; and Fukazawa Tōru, "Ichijirushiki shutai kōchiku: *Gukanshō* ni miru 'katakana hyōki' no performative [*sic*]," 71.

⁴² Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 350.

The Meaning of *Dōri*

One of the most frequent terms used by Jien in *Gukanshō* is *dōri* 道理, which appears around one hundred forty times, with more than half of its uses in Chapter Seven. Jien explains that “all laws of phenomena can be explained by two Chinese characters, *dōri* 道理, and nothing else” (一切ノ法ハタゞ道理ト云ニ文字ガモツナリ。其外ニハナニモナキ也).⁴³ He thus feels compelled to clarify *dōri* in his work. This keyword in Jien’s writing, “reason,” often translated as “principle” in English, has generated much scholarly debate over its meaning. In general, previous scholarship has been unable to provide a unified definition except for noting its multivalency and fluidity, contrary to the general understanding of an unchangeable “principle.” Some of the meanings of the term that Jien seems to indicate include: 1) the righteous and moral path one should follow, 2) reason/logic, 3) the reason behind causes and effects, 4) a panoply of various reasons from which one must select the one that acts as the true foundation of the realm.⁴⁴ One of the most significant characteristics of *dōri* for Jien is its transiency and/or mutability over the course of time. As Jien admits, *dōri* has undergone many changes, and history can be understood as the change or deterioration of *dōri*.⁴⁵ Examining all usages or meanings of the term in Jien’s texts is out of scope of this project. However, I want to emphasize the word’s fluidity as I examine how Jien uses its rhetoric to explain the emergence of *onryō* and his family’s legitimacy.

⁴³ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 324.

⁴⁴ Ōsumi Kazuo, *Gukanshō o yomu*, 119–20.

⁴⁵ 物ノ道理ヲノミオモヒツヅケテ。老ノネザメヲモナグサメツツ。イトド年モカタブキマカルママニハ。世ノ中モヒサシクミテ侍レバ。ムカシヨリウツリマカル道理モアハレニオボエテ。 Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 129.

***Dōri* of the Unseen and the Seen**

Jien's views of history as marked by evidential changes in *dōri* is intertwined with his understanding of the relationship between the Unseen and the Seen. Many prominent scholars in the field of religion, including Ikemi Chōryū, Kuroda Toshio, and Sueki Fumihiko, among others, have discussed the binary concept of the Unseen and the Seen common to the medieval period.⁴⁶ The Unseen, *myōkai*, is the world inhabited by “super-natural beings” and commonly understood as absolute and unchanging. This Unseen world was thought also to exercise control over the world of the Seen, and together, these worlds constitute the whole universe. Humans in the Seen can be “seen” by the Unseen, but the opposite is generally not the case. While scholarship on the Unseen and the Seen commonly argues that the power relationship between these two worlds is hierarchical and unilateral from the Unseen to the Seen, Jien's writing, however, suggests otherwise. Jien's view unveils complexities of the exchanges of power and seemingly permeable thresholds between the two worlds. These thresholds particularly manifest when considering Jien's role as a mediator of language, *dōri*, and the mobility of vengeful spirits themselves.

In Chapter Seven of *Gukanshō*, Jien periodizes the history of Japan along a continuous deterioration of *dōri* into seven phases. Jien strongly believed in the One-Hundred Reigns theory (*hyakuō shisō* 百王思想), a type of eschatology in which the world would only last until the one-hundredth king, after whom the deterioration of society was inevitable. Important to note is that

⁴⁶ Ikemi Chōryū, “Jo ni kaete: Myōken ron no chihei,” in *Myōkenron: Nihonjin no seishinshi*, ed. Ikemi Chōryū (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2012), 5–54; Kuroda Toshio, “Chūsei teki chishiki taisei no keisei,” in his *Nihon chūsei no shakai to shūkyō* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1990), 157–89; Sato Hiroo, “Tennō zō no henyō: Ken no rekishigaku kara meiken no rekishigaku e,” in *Myōkenron: Nihonjin no seishinshi*, ed. Ikemi Chōryū (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2012), 85–104; and Sueki Fumihiko, “Bukkyō to chūsei shintōron: Kami, Hotoke, Tennōron no tenkai,” in *Kamakura bukkyō tenkairon*, (Tokyo: Toransubiyū, 2008), 272–306.

unlike many other Buddhist priests who commonly emphasized the Final Ages or *mappō* based on Buddhist cosmology in their writings, the term *mappō* can be seen only a few times in *Gukanshō*. Jien instead frequently suggests that the end of the world is tied to the number of emperors who have reigned. He delineated a world ordered by the imperial authority and their rule, within which the Fujiwara held a crucial position. With the eighty-fourth Emperor Juntoku's reign (r. 1210–21) having already occurred when he first wrote the passage, Jien's main concern was to understand and maintain the essence of *dōri* as much as possible despite an inevitable deterioration of society.⁴⁷

The Unseen plays a key role in the first three phases of Jien's conception of history. These initial phases provide him with crucial clues to maintain order by channeling the Unseen in order to delay the inescapable deterioration of the world. Jien's strong sense of the Fujiwara house and its legitimacy shape his understanding of the Unseen and Seen. Although Jien's historical view of the seven phases have been studied, most scholars have yet to consider how his understanding of history plays into the symbiotic and evolving relationship between the imperial family and the Fujiwara *setsuroku* house.

I would like to turn to analyze how Jien constructs his rhetoric of the relationship between the Unseen and Seen worlds and the transition of *dōri*, which facilitated the legitimacy of the Fujiwara/Kujō regency. The first three historical phases comprise the time when the Unseen harmoniously communicated with the Seen, and a time in which *dōri* was still viable to a certain degree. Jien explains:

1) The beginning of time, which is the ideal period, for the universe was in the time when the Unseen and the Seen were merged into one, was when *dōri* of the Unseen was understood as it was in the Seen world (冥顯和合シテ). This [phase] may have stretched

⁴⁷ 神ノ御代ハシラズ。人代トナリテ神武天皇ノ御後百王トキコユル。スデニノコリスクナク八十四代ニモナリニケル中ニ、Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 129.

from the beginning the reign of the Emperor Jinmu until the thirteenth reign [of Emperor Seimu].

2) In the second phase, people in the Seen could not understand the historical changes that had occurred in the Unseen. In that time, people did not comprehend how beginnings differ from conclusions and heads differ from tails. As such, good is not always good, and bad does necessarily continue to be entirely bad. This period may coincide with the period from the reign of Emperor Chūai to the end of Emperor Kinmei (r. ~571).

3) In the third phase, the *dōri* that people believed was right was in discord with the will of the Unseen beings (*myōshu* 冥衆); this would be the cause of regret later. People only later realized what they believed to be *dōri* was in fact wrong. This [phase] may have been from the reign of Emperor Bidatsu (r. 572–85) until the time of the Chancellor Fujiwara no Michinaga in the Go-Ichijō reign.

一、冥顯和合シテ道理ヲ道理ニテトラスヤウハハジメナリ。コレハ神武ヨリ十三代マデカ。

二、冥ノ道理ノユクユクトウツリユクヲ顯ノ人ハエ心得ヌ道理、コレハ前後首尾ノタガヒタガヒシテ、ヨキモヨクテモトヲラズ、ワロキモワロクテモハテヌヲ人ノエ心得ヌナリ。コレハ仲哀ヨリ欽明マデカ。

三、顯ニハ道理カナトミナ人ユルシテアレド、冥衆ノ御心ニハカナハヌ道理ナリ。コレハヨシト思テシツルコトノカナラズ後悔ノアルナリ。ソノ時道理ト思テスル人ノ、後ニヲモヒアハセテサトリ知也。コレハ敏達ヨリ後一条院ノ御堂ノ関白マデカ⁴⁸

In Chapter Three of *Gukanshō*, Jien explains that a crucial aspect of the first phase's ideal society when the Unseen and the Seen were in harmony was that the Emperor was succeeded by his own sons. This tradition changed when the fourteenth legendary Emperor Chūai 仲哀, a grandson of the twelfth Emperor Keikō 景行, was succeeded by Chūai's wife, Empress Jingū 神功.⁴⁹ Jien's periodization of the end of this first phase of history reveals how deeply connected

⁴⁸ Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 325. The three emperors, Jinmu, Seimu, and Chūai mentioned here are considered to be legendary, and thus I did not provide their periods of reign. Jien categorized his present day as the seventh phase where no one understood anything about *dōri* and simply let things run their own course without looking ahead to the future.

⁴⁹ Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 130–31. Michael Marra also summarizes these seven phases in his article, "The Conquest of Mappō: Jien and Kitabatake Chikafusa," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 12, no. 4 (December 1985): 319–41.

his understanding of the transition of history and *dōri* were with the unity of the Seen and Unseen and the manner of succession of the imperial family.

The second phrase ends with the reign of Emperor Kinmei 欽明 (?–571). In Chapter Three, Jien marks Emperor's Kinmei's era as the arrival of Buddhism in Japan, leading to Prince Shōtoku's 聖徳 (574–622) birth and Buddhism protecting the realm.⁵⁰ The introduction of Buddhism coincided with the period characterized by peaceful reigns and the smooth transition of imperial succession. However, power soon started to be interrupted with short-lived emperors, succession disputes within the imperial family, and the unimaginable assassination of Emperor Sushun 崇峻 by Soga no Umako 蘇我馬子 (?–626). Jien's explanation regarding these phenomena was that imperial law, *ōhō*, needed henceforth to be protected by Buddhist law, *buppō*.⁵¹ Disturbances of imperial succession happened in order to guide people to the *dōri* of Buddhist law because the imperial law could not stand alone. Jien describes Prince Shōtoku as an incarnation of Kannon Bodhisattva to guide people to the rightful path of *dōri*. Hence Jien continues to say that it was natural for Prince Shōtoku to take the role of regent to support Emperor Suiko 推古 (r. 592–628) in order to protect both imperial law and Buddhist law.⁵² With this rhetoric, Jien also legitimates the title of “regent,” by placing Prince Shōtoku as the first occupant for the role, a position that was eventually customarily held by the Fujiwara family.

⁵⁰ 欽明天皇ノ御時ハジメテ仏法コノ國ニワタリテ。聖徳太子スエニ御ムマゴニテムマレ給ヒシヨリ。コノ國ハ仏法ニマモラレテ。今マデタモテリトゾミエ侍ル。 *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 135.

⁵¹ コノ事ヲフカク案ズルニタダセンハ仏法ニテ王法ヲバママランズルゾ。仏法ナクテハ。仏法ワタリヌルウヘニハ王法ハエアルマジキゾト云コトハリヲアラハサンレウト。 *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 137.

⁵² 観音ノ化身聖徳太子ノアラハサセ給ベケレバカクアリケルヨトサダカニ心エラルル也。ソノユヘハイミジキ権者トハソノ人ウセ給テ後ニコソヲモヘ。聖徳太子イミジトハ申セドモ。 *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 139.

Jien then introduces the nature of a divine agreement between two ancestral *kami*—the Sun Goddess Amaterasu and Ama no koyane no mikoto—and Nakatomi/Fujiwara no Kamatari, the founder of the Fujiwara family.

Then the ministerial house of Fujiwara emerged to oversee the state based on the divine agreement made between the Sun Goddess and Ama no koyane no mikoto, who promised to work together to protect the imperial house. Because of this agreement, the time had come for the Fujiwara to support the Emperor. Fujiwara Kamatari was born to succeed Prince Shōtoku ... this state cannot be maintained by the power and authority of the Emperor alone. That would simply cause disorder. It was the first time that [the gods'/heaven's] will had shown us how to rule the state through the Fujiwara's administration and to cooperate with the power of Buddhist law. Therefore, this arrangement for governing the state has been in accordance with divine will and has continued down to the present day.

サテコノ後臣家ノ出デキテ。世ヲオサムベキ時代ニゾヨクナリ居ル時マデ。又天照大神アマノコヤネノ春日大明神ニ同侍殿内能為防護ト。御一諾ヲハリニシカバ。臣家ニテ王ヲタスケタテマツラルベキ期至リテ。大織冠ハ聖徳太子ニツヅキテムマレ給テ。<略>タダ國王ノ威勢バカリニテコノ日本國ノアルマジ。タダミダレニミダレナンズ。臣下ノハカライニ仏法ノカヲアハセテトヲボシメシケルコトノハジメハアラハニ心ヘラレタリ。サレバソノヲモムキノママニテケフマデモ侍ルニコソ。⁵³

Recall that according to Jien, people in the Seen could not understand the Unseen in the second phase. It is clear that Jien himself mediates between the Seen and the Unseen, narrating the past and presenting the will of the Unseen. Jien's writing history here serves to legitimize the current political arrangement. Notice that although this passage is in fact in the historical section of Emperor Suiko's reign in the third chapter of the imperial chronicles, Jien reminds us of the current political practice that has continued from the past. In other words, Jien's construction of the past is very much structured by his present. His formulation of *dōri* that mediates between the Unseen and Seen and the gradual degeneration of the Seen's understanding of the Unseen, all

⁵³ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 140–41.

serve to establish a complex interdependency involving various entities in the Seen and Unseen, including the court, various gods, Buddhist deities and Buddhist law, and the Fujiwara.

In addition to being a member of the Fujiwara, and a descendent of Fujiwara Kamatari, Jien considers his role as Tendai Abbot to play an important part in these complex relationships. He believes he was to serve as a rightful representative of the Buddhist law to conjointly support the ruler and imperial law. Jien explains the reason for this belief: “‘Jien’ was repeatedly appointed the post of Tendai Abbot four times because of the complementary relationship between Buddhist law and imperial law” (山座主之間ニ前大僧正慈円ノ四度マデ成テ。。。カヤウノ事ハ山門ノ仏法王法ト相對スル仏法ノマコト見エテ侍ル也).⁵⁴ The Buddhist law that his Enryaku-ji temple preserved truthfully served this relationship. By addressing himself in the third person here, Jien places himself as an objective mediator of *dōri* that harmonizes imperial and Buddhist law. He effectively places himself in the line of Prince Shōtoku and as a guardian of the realm. Reading Jien’s summary of the second phase along with other corresponding chapters reveals how Jien legitimizes not only the role of the Fujiwara *setsuroku* house but also the idea of a regency to assist emperors. Referring to Prince Shōtoku, an incarnation of Kannon, he also validates Buddhist law. Not coincidentally, Jien himself resided both philosophically and socially at the nexus of all of these structures.

Jien’s third phase demonstrates further discordance between Seen and Unseen beings. Jien marks this period from the reign of Emperor Bidatsu 敏達 to the time of Chancellor Fujiwara Michinaga in Emperor Go-Ichijo’s reign. Notice the subtle shift in how Jien categorizes

⁵⁴ 山座主之間ニ前大僧正慈円ノ四度マデ成テ。カク辞ケル事コソ心得ガタク浅マシキ様ナレ。カウ程辞申人ヲバ。上ヨリモイカニ成タビケルニ歟。又下ニモカウ辞申ベクバイカニシテ又ナリナリハセラレケルニ歟。イカニモイカニモ是ハ様有ベキ事也。カヤウノ事ハ山門ノ仏法王法ト相對スル仏法ノマコト見エテ侍ル也。 *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 122–23.

historical periods here. Generally, he employs the style of imperial chronicles and categorizes periods based on the emperors who reigned throughout his historical chapters, after listing Emperors Jinmu, Seimu, Chūai, Kinmei, and Bidatsu. However, Jien uses Fujiwara Michinaga to mark a period, as if to replace Emperor Go-Ichijō, whom Michinaga was serving. As the founder of the Midōryū Fujiwara, Fujiwara Michinaga is one of the most important figures for Jien. He names Michinaga to emphasize the authoritative power of this important family figure and the inseparable relationship generated through the intermarriage between the Fujiwara and the imperial family. Furthermore, Jien authorizes a member of the Fujiwara to demarcate a period, a privilege that only emperors possessed, nearly raising Michinaga to the level of emperors in terms of historical importance.

Unseen Beings in *Gukanshō*

I would now like to explore the diversity of the unseen beings (*myōshu* 冥衆) mentioned in Jien's third phase. Ōsumi Kazuo has categorized such unseen beings in *Gukanshō* into four categories:

- 1) The gods that exist beyond time and space
- 2) Manifestations of gods (the incarnations of Unseen beings that appear in the Seen)
- 3) *Onryō*
- 4) Evil spirits/goblins such as *tengu*, foxes, and raccoon dogs that bewitch people.⁵⁵

The first category of the gods was commonly held as the highest beings of the Unseen. In *Gukanshō*, Jien focuses on two ancestral gods: that of the imperial family, Amaterasu no ōmikami, and that of the Fujiwara family, Ame no koyane no mikoto, who built the foundation of the state and rule of government. As for the second category in Jien's work, there are four

⁵⁵ Ōsumi Kazuo, *Gukanshō o yomu*, 129–34.

specific manifestation of gods in particular: Prince Shōtoku, Fujiwara Kamatari, Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真 (845–903), and chief abbot Jie.⁵⁶ These are beings who appeared in the Seen to channel the will of the gods in very critical moments of history. Prince Shōtoku, for instance, revealed the principle of unity between Buddhist law and imperial law, and Fujiwara Kamatari presented the principle of joint rule between the Fujiwara and the imperial family.

Naming Jie as one of manifested gods is particularly significant given Jien's close connection to Jie in terms of Tendai lineage and Fujiwara affiliation. Chief abbot Jie settled a Fujiwara family dispute, which bestowed legitimacy to the Kujō line by granting the wish of Kujō Morosuke. In fact, Morosuke and his father, Fujiwara Tadahira, were Jie's main patrons.⁵⁷ Morosuke, following Tadahira's will, supported Jie with manors and the funding to rebuild Enryaku-ji (or Mount Hiei) into a prominent religious institution. In return, Jie provided religious services for the Fujiwara. During a period when marrying Fujiwara daughters into the imperial family to produce imperial successors was a crucial political practice, the Fujiwara highly valued powerful priests who could offer prayers and perform rituals at every major life event. The alliance between Morosuke (the Fujiwara) and Jie (Tendai and Enryaku-ji) was seen as mutually beneficial.⁵⁸ Hence, Jien's "unseen beings" highlights this history of the intermingling of the Fujiwara and Buddhist institutions that he himself embodies.

⁵⁶ コノ日本國觀音ノ利生方便ハ聖徳太子ヨリハジメテ大織冠。菅丞相。慈恵大僧正カクノゴトクノミ侍コトヲフカク思シル人ナシ。 Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 158.

⁵⁷ See Paul Groner, "Ryōgen and the Fujiwaras: Patronage and Esoteric Ritual," in *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 71–93; and Hirabayashi Moritoku, *Ryōgen* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987).

⁵⁸ There are numerous legendary anecdotes about Jie in *setsuwa* collections such as *Jikkinshō* 十訓 and *Shasekishū* 沙石集, both written in the middle of the Kamakura period after *Gukanshō* was completed. In these stories, Jie is depicted as a powerful sage who subjugated evil spirits. At the same time, other contemporary texts and images, including *Hirasan kojīn reitaku* 比良山古人霊託 and *Hōbutsushū* 宝物集, describe Jie himself as an evil *tengu* 天狗 or even as a devil king or *maō* 魔王. For more on the cult of Jie and depictions of Jie, see Wakabayashi Haruko, "Chūsei ni okeru Jie taishi shinkō: Ma no imēji o chūshin ni," in *Geinō no chūsei*, ed. Gomi Fumihiko (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000): 218–40.

Sugawara no Michizane, on the other hand, is deified as Tenjin 天神 in *Gukanshō* but does not fit well into Ōsumi's four categories as a simple manifestation of the Kannon. Michizane's position is special since he was considered one of the fiercest *onryō* in Japanese history. He was accused of plotting against Emperor Daigo in 901 (Shōtai no hen 昌泰の変) and exiled to Dazaifu 太宰府, present-day Kyūshū, where it is said he died of indignation. It was Fujiwara Tokihira (871–909), the Minister of the Left and rival of Michizane, who was active behind the scenes of these political incidents and Michizane's exile. After Michizane's death in 903, great storms of thunder and lightning frequently struck the capital and the Imperial Palace, killing seven people, including one Fujiwara. The fear-stricken people believed that Michizane's angry spirit caused the disaster. In Chapter Three of *Gukanshō*, Jien reflects upon this incident while admitting his own ancestor, Fujiwara Tokihira falsely accused Michizane, which naturally could cause Michizane to become an *onryō* and destroy all of the descendants of Fujiwara Tokihira.⁵⁹ Jien writes, however, that Michizane still corresponded with Fujiwara Tadahira, Tokihira's brother, while Michizane was in Dazaifu. Also, Jien points out that the Fujiwara *setsuroku* family began to surprisingly flourish after the incident. Jien explains this positive turn by claiming that there had already been a divine agreement to honor the Fujiwara administer. He then concludes that Michizane, as a manifestation of Kannon from the Unseen, appeared in the world of Seen to make the great sacrifice of his life to become a *kami* to protect Kamatari's descendants by purposefully allowing Tokihira to make false accusations against him.

⁵⁹ 今マデメデタクテスギラルルコトヲフカクアンズルニ。日本國小國內覧ノ臣二人ナラビテハ一定アシカルベキ。ソノ中ニ大神宮カシマノ御一諾ハスヘマデタガウベキコトニアラズ。大織冠ノ御アトヲフカクマモラムトテ。時平ノ讒口ニワザト入テ御身ヲウシナヒテ。シカモ摂籙ノ家ヲマモラセ玉フナリ。アザアザトハ時平コソカク心モアシケレ。 Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 154–56.

Here Jien's writing challenges common understandings of the relationship between the Unseen and the Seen worlds. First, we can see just how fluid *onryō*'s identity could be in the Unseen and the ways in which they could mobilize certain identities in the Seen world. Moreover, Jien's rhetoric suggests a tangible interaction between the Unseen and the Seen dependent upon predicaments in the Seen. Although we have previously seen how violent and vengeful *onryō* could turn into benevolent guardians, or *goryō*, Jien's theory adds a new dimension to this type of transformation. According to *Gukanshō*, an *onryō* with the power to destroy an entire family could also become the family guardian as a *goryō*. This radical shift in the nature of such a spirit reveals yet another close relationship between *onryō* and the concept of family. The more fierce and vengeful an *onryō* was, the more effectively they could validate the Fujiwara family's prosperity and longevity as *goryō*. Herein we see the interplay between the affirmation of family strengthened by domesticating and reasoning with *onryō* and the mutual dependency between *onryō* and family.

Jien's ideas regarding unseen beings are also embedded in his writings on various *onryō* in Chapter Seven. He lists many *onryō* figures throughout history, including Princess Ikami/Inoe 井上 (717–75), Fujiwara Motokata 藤原元方 (888–953), Fujiwara Akimitsu 藤原顕光 (944–1021), Retired Emperor Sutoku, and, most importantly, Jien's own grandfather Fujiwara Tadazane. Most of these vengeful spirits were members of either the imperial family or the Fujiwara family, and *onryō* status seems to be largely reserved for those in the upper echelons of power. Here, Jien provides a concrete definition of *onryō*:

'*Onryō*' are beings who held vindictive spirits during their lifetimes in this world and thus haunt their adversaries. The effects could befall one household or the whole land (小家ヨリ天下ニモヲヨビテ). *Onryō* use slander and falsehood to cause disturbance and destroy people in the same way [that living humans through hatred and resentment destroy each other]. *Onryō*, however, carry out their revenge, which could not have been achieved in the realm of the Seen, from the realm of the Unseen.

怨霊ト云フハ、センハタバ現世ナガラフカク意趣ヲムスビテカタキニトリテ、小家ヨリ天下ニモヲヨビテ<中略>讒言ソラ事ヲツクリニイダスニテ世ノミダレ又人ノ損ズル事ハタバヲナジ事ナリ。顯ニソノムクイヲハタサネバ冥ニナルバカリナリ。⁶⁰

Onryō are mobile beings who can carry over their grudges from the Seen to the Unseen to influence the Seen from the Unseen. They are strikingly different from the two ancestral gods in Jien's account who seem to require a Kannon to convey their messages. Jien's emphasis on their fluidity allows him to play the role of a mediator. As I have shown, Jien had described *onryō* as dangerous beings in his many writings and *ganmon* and had advocated for countrywide pacification of these vengeful spirits. Moreover, he prescribed the daily religious services required at Daisenpōin to pacify such restless souls. In *Gukanshō*, however, Jien describes *onryō* as manageable beings who emerged according to *dōri* and can thus be appeased with the proper reasoning and treatment.

Presenting *onryō* as controllable is significant. When Jien introduces the power struggle between the Kujō and the Konoe, he belittles Konoe Motomichi (1160–1233), who briefly held the position of Regent and Chancellor, and his son Iezane, saying that they lack *dōri* and thus Motomichi's *setsuroku* position was in name only. Jien claims that the Konoe family's brief prosperity was due to being purposefully guarded by the [Heike's] *onryō* without realizing that it would shorten their lives and destroy their family (怨霊ニワザトマモラレテワガ家ウシナワシレウニ久シクイキタルトゾ).⁶¹ What is surprising here is that Jien explains how *onryō* can now be controlled as they are without first transforming into *goryō*. Without specialized propitiatory knowledge and *dōri*, however, *onryō* are a double-edged-sword. They may

⁶⁰ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NBKT, 86: 339.

⁶¹ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NBKT vol. 86, 337.

temporarily help a family, but if one lacks a master of *dōri*, in the end they will only bring destruction.

Jien repeatedly suggests that *onryō* only truly respond to those who understand such *dōri*. He gives the prime example of chief abbot Jie, who not only granted Kujō Morosuke's wish but also protected his descendants afterwards.⁶² Using the Konoe episode, Jien characterizes *onryō* as something that can be mobilized and controlled while effectively distinguishing the Kujō family from the Konoe. At the same time, Jien strengthens his own position as one who possesses specialized knowledge and can understand *dōri* to mediate *onryō* who are able to pass between the Unseen and Seen worlds without proxies.

Onryō are not the only beings that are capable of wreaking havoc, however. Jien also makes reference to strange phenomena caused by foxes, badgers, and goblin-like beings (Ōsumi's fourth category). But he apparently differentiates these beings from *onryō*, which require special knowledge and skills and an understanding of *dōri* to control.

Around the first year of Ken'ei (1206), there was an incident in which the wife of priest Nakakuni, who had served the late Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa, was possessed by the soul of Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa. The wife screamed, 'Worship me!' ... so people reported to Emperor Go-Toba. A conference was held with the court nobles to examine the case, and they decided to honor the deceased Go-Shirakawa's soul in accordance with the wife's command. While everyone agreed, a priest 'Jien,' who had earned Emperor Go-Toba's trust, wrote a letter. The letter reads, '...there are many cases such as this in which possession is caused by *onryō* who have been destined to become such vengeful spirits [and this is not Emperor Go-Shirakawa's *onryō*] ...to me, it seems that this case is caused by a fox or *tengu*.' ... Emperor Go-Toba heard Jien's view and agreed, saying that Jien had spoken well. Later, Emperor Go-Toba asked Jien whether the couple should be exiled or not. High Priest Jien suggested that it was just caused by foxes or badgers and was not the couple's intension... the possession should be considered as a sickness and the couple should be placed in quiet place; they should not be punished.

建永元年ノコロヲヒ。仲國法師ハコトナル光遠法師ガ子ニテ故院ニハ朝夕ニ候シガ妻ニツカセ給テ又我イハヘト云事出キテ。<略> 院ヘ申テ公卿僉議ニ及テ。スデニイハハレントスル事アリケリ。万ノ人皆サ候ベシト申タリケルニ。<略> サ

⁶² Jien, *Gukanshō*, NBKT vol. 86, 338.

カシク慈円僧正院コトニタノミヲボシタリケレバニヤ。＜略＞カカル事聞へ候バコハイカニ候事哉。先如此ノ事ハ怨霊トサダメラレタル人ニトリテコソサル例ヲホク候へ＜略＞タダ野干天狗トテ人ニツキ候物ノ申事ヲ信ジテ。カカルコト出キ候ベシヤハ。＜略＞ヤガテ院キコシメシテ。我モサ思フメデタク申タル物カナトテ。ヤガテヒシトコノ事ヲ仰合テ仲國ガ夫妻流刑ニヲコナフベキカト仰合セラレタリケレバ。僧正又申ケルヤウハ。コノ事ハツヤトキツネ。タヌキモツキ候ハデ。我心ヨリ申イデタルニテ候ハバ。尤流刑ニモヲコナハレ候。＜略＞病ヒストテ上ヨリ罪ニ行ハルベキニテモ候ハネバタダ聞シメシ入ラレ候ハデ片角ナンドニヲイコメテ置レテ候ハバ。⁶³

Jien's description of this episode serves multiple purposes. First, it demonstrates his specialized knowledge regarding *onryō* in that he is able to distinguish *onryō* from foxes and badgers, something which no other courtiers could do. Second, he also successfully shows benevolence and kindness toward the possessed wife. In so doing, Jien presents himself as a real life medium beyond mere historical commentator. He continues to create the discourse of the Unseen and elevates himself as a mediator of the Unseen, conveying messages to the Emperor and people in the Seen. While this is not the only occasion in *Gukanshō* in which Jien refers to himself as “Priest Jien,” this episode particularly stands out since he depicts himself as the only knowledgeable person to discern the truth from deception. By objectifying himself, Jien successfully positions himself as a mediator/narrator who can transcend human experience and comprehension.

Recall the narrative technique in *Genji monogatari*, in which the narrators travel and personally witness events and retell stories. In Jien's episode, he narrates and retells historical events in a similar manner to the *Genji* narrators. For example, Jien states that “Emperor Go-Toba heard Jien's view and agreed” (ヤガテ院キコシメシテ。我モサ思フ) as if he were there

⁶³ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NBKT, 86: 291–93. This incident was also recorded in courtiers' diaries such as *Meigetsuki* and *Inokuma kanpakuki*.

as a third-party witness.⁶⁴ Today's scholarship in general considers *Gukanshō* to be an interpretive history or *shiron* in contrast to *monogatari* or narrative tales. There is certainly merit to this categorization since Jien's writing reflects an attempt to faithfully reproduce historical events based on changes in *dōri*. This attempt can be seen especially in his early chapters written in a mixture of Chinese models of history, such as the "chronicle" style (*hennen-tai* 編年体) and the "annals and biographies" style (*kiden-tai* 紀伝体). Jien's narrative technique here therefore may reflect a faithfulness of retelling events in a manner that meet the readers' expectations of what history should be. And yet it is notable that by narrating history as personally witnessed events, Jien himself resembles the "*mononoke*-like" narrator we have seen previously who can transcending time and place, while also successfully elevating himself as a mediator between the Seen and the Unseen.

Jien's possession of special *onryō* knowledge facilitates his personal and familial legitimacy. It is noteworthy that seventeen-years after his own death in 1225, Jien himself was said to have become an *onryō* and to have killed Emperor Shijō 四条 (1231–42).⁶⁵ It is not clear why Jien supposedly haunted Emperor Shijō and this topic requires further study. Nevertheless, the tension here is significant. Jien continued to be praised as an honorable priest after his death, while at the same time he was rumored to have become a vengeful spirit. Jien was so successful in his wielding of *onryō* discourse that he was later believed to have joined them, further contributing to the Fujiwara and imperial family's political and familial legitimacy.

⁶⁴ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NBKT, 86: 292.

⁶⁵ 仁治3年正月24日。。。去九日四條院俄崩御境節聊故慈鎮和尚成崇御之由。
Mon'yōki, in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, *Zuzōbu*, vol. 12, 439.

Conclusion

Focusing on Jien's written works has shed new light on the ideology and discourse of vengeful spirits during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. A prominent Tendai chief abbot intellectual, Jien's analysis of the history and rhetoric surrounding *onryō* also reflects his political ideology and profile as a member of the Fujiwara *setsuroku* house, the Kujō, and as a close ally of Kujō Kanezane. Examining Jien's rhetoric of *dōri* and his view of the Unseen and the Seen helps coordinate his ideas about *onryō* and other unseen beings by adding another layer of connections to political legitimacy, the Fujiwara family, and Buddhist law.

Resisting the simplistic one-way binary of the world of the Seen versus the Unseen, Jien's writing reveals the heterogeneous identities of entities in the two realms and the fluidity of the border between these Unseen and Seen worlds. Using narrative techniques, Jien positions himself as a mediator between these worlds, further strengthening his power of knowledge over these unseen beings. Jien's writing further shows how having *onryō* in the family genealogy empowers the imperial family and the Fujiwara family, legitimizing their political, religious, and intellectual status.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that all of Jien's rhetoric, rationalization of the haunting process, and his genealogies legitimizing the Fujiwara-imperial political alliance are made possible through his use of *katakana*. Jien's writing attempts to use an approximation of vernacular language, capturing oral sounds with *kana* and explicitly making connections between narration and mediating the divine. Equally important is his choice to objectify himself as a mediator of *dōri*, history, and divine messages. When taken together, these narrative techniques help Jien's text succeed in not only solidifying the Fujiwara's political and familial legitimacy but also elevating himself as a mediator of *dōri*, the Seen, and the Unseen. Positioning himself in

this way may even have given rise to the suggestion he himself became an *onryō*. Although *Gukanshō* may not be *monogatari per se*, using the vernacular and capturing oral sounds with *kana* exemplifies how such manner of writing can help to legitimize Jien as a mediator and even his eventual return as an *onryō*.

Chapter Four

Becoming the Fiercest *Mononoke*: Retired Emperor Sutoku's Genealogy Unnarrated

You all are not aware of this, but it is I, Retired Emperor Sutoku, who has been creating the recent disorder in the land. Ever since I was still alive, I devoted myself to the path of evil; I caused the Heiji disturbance. Ever since I died, I have haunted the imperial family. You will see! I will soon cause a great war to erupt upon the land.

—Ueda Akinari, “Shiramine,” in *Ugetsu monogatari*¹

Introduction

On the sixth day of the ninth month of 1868 (October 23 of the Gregorian calendar), just two days before the declaration of the Meiji era, the spirit of Retired Emperor Sutoku or Sutoku-in 崇徳院 (1119–64) was finally returned to Kyoto after seven-hundred years of exile in Sanuki province (present-day Kagawa prefecture). On the eve of Emperor Meiji's ascension to the political throne—the first time an emperor took a central role in the government since the Kamakura shogunate established a military government in 1192—the spirit of Sutoku-in was placed along with his portrait and his *sho* flute in a sacred palanquin and departed the imperial mausoleum in Sanuki.² Sutoku-in's return journey to Kyoto took seven days, and the parade was befitting a living emperor with the presence of imperial envoys. Upon arrival, Sutoku-in's spirit was enshrined at the newly established Shiramine 白峯 Shrine.³ A grand and solemn ceremony was held to pacify his spirit, to invoke the subjugation of last remaining shogunate resistance,

¹ Ueda Akinari, “Shiramine,” in *Ugetsu monogatari* (1776), in *Shipen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* (hereafter *SNKBZ*) (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1995), 280.

² One brief exception can be seen in Emperor Go-Daigo's three-year direct rule (1333–36).

³ Yamada Yūji, “Sutoku Tennō shinrei no kikan,” in *Kindai Nihon no rekishiteki isō: Kokka, minzoku, bunka*, ed. Ohama Tetsuya (Tokyo: Tōsui Shobō, 1999), 4–29.

and to usher in “the flourishing of the new government ruled by the authority and power of the Emperor whose fame shines worldwide,” thereby ending almost seven hundred years of military rule.⁴ Sutoku-in’s return and the pacification ritual for the deceased emperor were thus an important part of the enthronement ceremony of Emperor Meiji.⁵

This idea to usher in the modern Japanese nation under the reign of the imperial family with the blessing of the vengeful spirit of Sutoku-in was most likely based on a proposal to the throne made by thinker Naka Zuiunsai 中瑞雲齋 (1807–71). Zuiunsai believed that the Hōgen and Heiji Disturbances 保元・平治の乱 (1156 and 1159 respectively) were the beginning of a long downfall of royal authority undermined by military rulers due to a grudge held by the angry spirit of Sutoku-in, who was exiled and died of indignation in the aftermath of the Hōgen Disturbance. In his proposal to the imperial court (*Mato no hitorikoto* 窓廼独許登), Zuiunsai argued that the return to imperial rule under the Meiji emperor necessitated appeasing Sutoku-in by returning his spirit to Kyoto, thereby ensuring the august spirit would protect the imperial throne.⁶

This chapter explores the creation of the discourse surrounding the long-feared vengeful spirit of Sutoku-in. According to Zuiunsai and many other prominent early modern and modern intellectuals, including Hirata Atsutane 平田篤胤 (1776–1843) and Nakayama Tadayasu 中山忠能 (1809–88), Sutoku-in’s curse had brought about the decline of the imperial family’s political

⁴ “Sonryō goshukushi” 尊靈著御祝詞 自明治二巳年至午年白峯宮祭典記（宮内庁書陵部藏），quoted in Yamada, “Sutoku Tennō shinrei no kikan,” 24.

⁵ For more details of Sutoku-in’s return to Kyoto, see Nagayoshi Masao, “Meiji o hiraku Sutoku-in,” *Nihon bungaku* 51, no. 1 (January 2002): 18–28; and Yamada Yūji “Sutoku Tennō shinrei no kikan,” 4–29.

⁶ Naka Zuiunsai’s *Matono hitori koto* 窓廼独許登 was sent to the court in March, 1866, and the court took his advice. See Yamada Yūji, “Sutoku Tennō shinrei no kikan,” 7.

power and caused a host of disasters since the Hōgen Disturbance in 1156.⁷ As we have seen in the previous chapter, the widespread civil war that started with the Hōgen Disturbance was followed by various “strange” phenomena such as earthquakes, fires, epidemics, and famines. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw an increase in *onryō* discourse, a proliferation of new vengeful spirits, and a concerted effort to manage their wrath. During this zenith of *onryō* discourse, several prominent *onryō* figures emerged who remained central for centuries as the vengeful spirits that caused the majority of disasters. In particular, the *onryō* of Sutoku-in and Retired Emperor Gotoba 後鳥羽 repeatedly appeared in courtier diaries, literature, and prints throughout the medieval and early modern periods as the most feared vengeful spirits. Even today, Sutoku-in is considered one of the three most powerful *onryō* (*sandai onryō* 三大怨霊), a reputation he shares with Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真 (845–903) and Taira no Masakado 平将門 (?–940). While it is not unusual for a member of the imperial family, especially previous emperors, to become a powerful vengeful spirit, this chapter will question how and why Sutoku-in rose to the top of the *onryō* pyramid to such a degree that even Emperor Meiji was compelled to repose his spirit seven hundred years after his death.⁸

Despite the abundance of historical records and courtier diaries that deal with the spirit of Sutoku-in, modern scholarship has largely overlooked Sutoku-in as a historical figure—not to mention his status as a vengeful spirit. *Onryō* in general have not been considered to be valid subjects of academic pursuit until recently, and no articles or book-length studies on Sutoku-in

⁷ Hirata Atsutane, “Tamadasuki” 玉櫛 and “Tamadasuki sōron tsuika” 玉櫛総論追加, in *Shinshū Hirata Atsutane zenshū* vol. 6 (Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1977), 643–66.

⁸ For the 800th anniversary of Sutoku-in’s death, on September 21, 1964, which coincided with the Tokyo Olympics, Emperor Shōwa conducted a service for Sutoku-in at Kōrei den 皇霊殿 and sent Ōgimachi Kimidata as an imperial envoy to Sutoku-in’s mausoleum in Kagawa to conduct a ceremony there. See *Shōwa Tennō jitsuroku*, vol. 13 (Tokyo: Tōkyō Shoseki, 2017), 701.

yet exist in Anglophone scholarship. Within Japanese scholarship, except for articles written by few historians such as Haramizu Tamiki and Yamauchi Masujirō, there is only one book length study on Sutoku-in, written by historian Yamada Yūji.⁹ Yamada, a prominent historian of *onryō*, provides comprehensive and extensive studies of the development of vengeful spirits in his monographs *Sutoku-in onryō no kenkyū* (Study on the vengeful spirit of Sutoku-in) and *Onryō, kaiti, Ise Jingū* (Vengeful spirits, strange phenomenon, and Ise Shrine).¹⁰ Yamada draws upon a vast array of primary sources, such as official chronicles, courtier diaries, and temple documents from the eighth through the fourteenth centuries. My own approach complements much of Yamada's work by pursuing questions of literary analysis he leaves unanswered. In particular, I examine the question of narration and representation of *onryō* in both historical and literary sources, which share intermingled discourse.¹¹

While the vengeful spirit of Sutoku-in has remained largely unexamined in the field of history and religious history, some literary scholars in Japan, especially war-tale specialists, including Hirano Satsuki, Mizuhara Hajime, Nonaka Tesshō, Ōtsu Yūichi, Park Eun-Hee, and Takagi Makoto, have examined Sutoku-in's transformation into *onryō*, primarily focusing on an episode in *Hōgen monogatari* (thirteenth century). *Hōgen monogatari* is one of the earliest narratives that depicts Sutoku-in's exile in Shikoku, his transformation into *onryō*, and his

⁹ Haramizu Tamiki, "Sutoku-in no fukken," *Kokugakuin zasshi*, no. 87 (August 1986): 34–46; "Sutoku-in Shinkōshi kō," *Gengo bunka kenkyū*, no. 4 (February 1997): 1–25; and Yamauchi Masujirō, "Sutoku-in irei," in his *Imakagami no shūhen* (Osaka: Izumi Shoin, 1993), 2–38.

¹⁰ Yamada Yūji, *Sutoku-in onryō no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2001); and Yamada Yūji, *Onryō, kaiti, Ise Jingū* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2014).

¹¹ For an overview of early *kami* worship, nascent forms of *onryō*, and the development of writing, see Herman Ooms, *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650–800* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009); Michael Como, *Weaving and Binding: Immigrant Gods and Female Immortals in Ancient Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010); and David Lurie, *Realms of Literacy: Early Japan and the History of Writing* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2011).

cursing of political enemies in the aftermath of his rebellion and eventual death.¹² Ōtsu, Nonaka, and Takagi consider the genre of war tales to be an ideological and political apparatus to affirm royal authority (*ōken* 王権). They argue that Sutoku-in's *onryō* embodies the Other and facilitates a unity of the communal body (*kyōdōtai* 共同体) centering around the imperial court. While these scholars are primarily interested in political connotation of *onryō* in the genre of war tales, Hirano analyzes the significance of various family disputes and didactic rhetoric of hierarchical (and gendered) relationships within families that were divided into winners and losers.

My analysis of Sutoku-in resonates with these scholars' arguments that emphasize the function of war tales as an ideological apparatus to affirm and re-affirm the bonds of a communal body and royal authority. I hope to contribute to this scholarship through examining Sutoku-in's *onryō* as a rhetorical tool and social phenomenon beyond the ideology of *Hōgen monogatari* or *Heike monogatari* by situating Sutoku-in in a larger *onryō* discourse in historical records and other literature. As I have shown in previous chapters, the rhetoric of *onryō* was interdependent with a discourse of kinship as well as narrative-making that legitimizes the ideology of royal authority in various texts. In particular, the discourse of Sutoku-in's *onryō* and the rising popularity of the war-tale genre emerged in tandem in the aftermath of armed conflict that shook a society founded on a political system run by members of the imperial family and aristocratic

¹² Hirano Satsuki, "Nakarai-bon 'Hōgen monogatari' ni okeru kotsuniku sōkoku no mondaiten," *Kokubungaku kenkyū*, no. 122 (June 1997): 12–26; Mizuhara Hajime, "Sutoku-in setsuwa no kōsatsu," *Komazawa kokubun*, no. 7 (June 1969): 1–15; Nonaka Tesshō, "Hōgen monogatari gojitsu dan no hyōgen kōzō," in *Hōgen monogatari no seiritsu* (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2016), 304–23; Ōtsu Yūichi, "Tameyori, Sutoku-in kō," in *Gunki to ōken no ideorōji* (Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2005), 139–53; Park Eun-Hee, "Sutoku-in no onryō to Goshirakawa-in, soshite Kiyomori: Sutoku-in onryōtan no monogatarika no mondai o megutte," *Bungaku kenkyū ronshū*, no. 20 (March 2002): 258–242; and Takagi Makoto, "Mienai bōrei/ arawareru onryō: Kioku, bōrei, fukanōsei," in *Heike monogatari: Sōchi to shite no koten* (Yokohama: Shunpūsha, 2008), 179–223.

allies. In analyzing both historical accounts and literature, especially *Hōgen monogatari*, as a mutual and ideological process for constructing discourses of kinship, royal authority, and a communal body, this chapter will map out how Sutoku-in's *onryō* became one of the most powerful *onryō* in Japan.

Below, I examine three types of primary sources, roughly divided into two sections. In the first section, I lay out contemporary historical accounts and courtier diaries that provide details of Sutoku-in's life as well as later historical accounts written after his death. In the use of the word, "historical" here, as in "historical accounts" or "Sutoku-in as a historical figure," in contrast to the fictional figure of Sutoku-in in *Hōgen monogatari*, I do not intend to suggest that the historical Sutoku-in as a real person was somehow smoothly transplanted into historical accounts. I use contemporary courtier diaries such as *Hyōhanki* 兵範記, written by Taira Nobunori 平信範 (1112–82), and *Sankaiki* 山槐記, the diary of Fujiwara Tadachika 藤原忠親 (1131–95), to trace Sutoku-in's biography and the events that surrounded his life. I then turn to later historical accounts and diaries mostly written after Sutoku-in's death—including *Gukanshō* 愚管抄 (1220), written by Jien 慈円 (1155–1225), *Gyokuyō* 玉葉 (1164–1200) by Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149–1207), and *Kojidan* 古事談, a collection of *setsuwa* edited by Minamoto Akikane 源顕兼 (1160–1215). These later texts display both how people started to imagine Sutoku-in as an *onryō* and reflect nascent tropes that would be incorporated into later works of literature, such as *Hōgen monogatari*. While contemporary diarists do not write about Sutoku-in's grudge or seem to assume Sutoku-in's eventual transformation into *onryō*, both types of accounts exhibit an intense interest in genealogical relationships and power dynamics within the imperial family. These topics become a focal point in the discourse of Sutoku-in's "becoming *onryō*." Beyond this shared attention toward family matters, I also pay close attention

to gaps between contemporary accounts of Sutoku-in's life in exile and later constructed images of his vengeful spirit. Since no Anglophone scholarship delves into the complex disputes over succession and family rifts that are depicted as the primary reason for Sutoku's transformation into *onryō*, it is worth treating these family rifts in detail before turning to later literary accounts.

In the second half of the chapter, I will read *Hōgen monogatari* with a special focus on the concept of exile or displacement, genealogical relationships, along with the roles of narrators and narration, all of which facilitate the emergence of a fierce *onryō* that continually comes back. It is commonly understood that Sutoku-in's transformation into *onryō* was instigated by his dethronement as well as a loss of an opportunity to regain power as a Retired Emperor, as a consequence of losing a battle during the Hōgen Disturbance. However, by closely reading historical accounts and paying attention to narration and narrative voices, which often invoke the *mononoke*-like voices and gazes as I discussed in Chapter One, I will demonstrate the greater significance of genealogies, exile, and styles of narration that all contribute to the creation of Sutoku-in's *onryō* beyond the simple rationale of his losing the throne. There is a strong interplay between the significance of Sutoku-in's *onryō* in *Hōgen monogatari* and the ritualistic events and discursive representations in historical accounts that deal with Sutoku-in's emerging threat. By examining these texts together, I argue that while some aspects of Sutoku-in's *onryō* fit into typical discourse of authority, kinship, and familial and political legitimation, his case also deviates from such patterns in important ways, potentially threatening the concept of a stable imperial line and the succession of an absolute ruler.

Throughout this chapter, I consciously use the phrase "becoming *onryō*" in describing Sutoku-in's transformation into a vengeful spirit. I use this phrase to indicate two important and interrelated issues. First, *onryō* are in a continual state of becoming. They are neither fixed

entities nor ontological beings. Instead, they are constantly shifting and changing through the processes of mediation. Similarly, becoming *onryō* suggests a span of time, during which we can find the development of the transformation of a soul into a spirit, the official recognition of the dead's wrath through ceremonies, as well as periodic religious observations stretching into the future. It is impossible to pinpoint an exact moment that one transforms into an *onryō*. With this concept of "becoming," I will trace the multi-layered processes of Sutoku-in's metamorphosis into *onryō* through contemporary diaries, later historical accounts, and finally in *Hōgen monogatari*.

There is a great tension between conventional *onryō* rhetoric that revitalizes *onryō* as an imperial and political apparatus for demonstrating imperial authority and the narrative of Sutoku-in's own vengeful spirit. I will argue that the discourse of Sutoku-in's becoming an *onryō* signifies a moment of departure from the typical life-cycle of *onryō*. What had once helped to legitimize the imperial family and their reign for centuries, now threatened the imperial court's continuity. Sutoku-in's vengeful spirit challenged the very concept of *onryō* that been defined by a community built upon imperial authority.

Sutoku-in before the Hōgen Disturbance

Sutoku-in's status as the most powerful and frightening *onryō* throughout history is well known, marked by his repeated appearances in theatre and literature, including *Matsuyama tengu* 松山天狗 and *The Tale of Ugetsu* (1776) written by Ueda Akinari 上田秋成 (1734–1809). Yet, despite the popularity of his vengeful spirit in literature, comparatively little is known about the historical Sutoku-in. Scholars agree that the now standard motif of Sutoku-in as a vindictive emperor who lost a political battle and thus became a vengeful spirit was largely created in the

episode, “*Shin'in okyō shizume no koto: Tsuketari hōgyō no koto*” 新院お経沈めの事付けたり
崩御の事 (The story of the new Retired Emperor's sinking of the sutra he copied and his death)
seen in many variants of *Hōgen monogatari*, presumably written around a century after his death.

Although his character as *onryō* is ubiquitous in various pieces of literature, official accounts, and historical records, the very process of his becoming an *onryō* has remained largely unquestioned. To understand this transformation and the continuation of the emergence of *onryō* during the political transition from aristocratic/imperial rule to military rule, it is important to trace how the historical emperor lived and later became such a legendary *onryō*. The process of Sutoku-in's becoming *onryō* and being narrated as a character in *monogatari*, exemplifies several key aspects of *mononoke* rhetoric discussed in previous chapters, including the concept of the revenant, legitimation of genealogy, and narrative voices. I will first trace the life of the historical Sutoku-in from his birth to his last years in Sanuki, including accounts of the Hōgen Disturbance, paying special attention to family matters that potentially contributed to him becoming an *onryō*. Though scarce, there are a few extant records that allow us a glimpse of Sutoku-in's life in Sanuki, including his own poems. I will show how a different image of Sutoku-in, far from a vengeful and fierce spirit, can also serve as a root of creating *onryō* discourse that would last for centuries to come.

Retired Emperor Sutoku was born in the Sanjō Karasumi Palace on the twenty-eighth day of the fifth month of the second year of Gen'ei 元永 (1119) as the eldest son of Emperor Toba 鳥羽 (1103–56). Before ascending to the throne, his personal name was Akihito 顕仁. As I will explain shortly, the name “Sutoku 崇徳” was only given posthumously and never used while he was an emperor. Sutoku-in was the eldest son of the reigning Emperor Toba and the Empress Consort (or *Chūgū* 中宮) Fujiwara Shōshi 藤原璋子 (1101–45), a beloved step-daughter of

Retired Emperor Shirakawa 白河上皇 (1053–1129), who was also a grandfather of Emperor Toba. Sutoku-in's birth was a grand and festive affair attended by a large number of people and was one of the largest and most detailed birth scenes ever recorded during the Heian period along with that of Emperor Goichijō 後一条 (1008–36), Fujiwara Michinaga's grandson.¹³ Various courtier diaries, including *Chūyūki* 中右記 (1087–1138) by Fujiwara Munetada 藤原宗忠 (1062–1141) and *Chōshūki* 長秋記 (1105–36) by Minamoto Morotoki 源師時 (1077–1136), recorded this celebratory event in length. These diaries depicted the smooth birth of the eldest son, catalogued the gifts, and recorded the visitors, including many senior-ranking officials, prominent priests, and *onmyō* masters who performed prayers to ensure long-lasting peace to come.¹⁴ This joyful and well-recorded birth scene makes a considerable contrast with Sutoku-in's inglorious and scarcely recorded death.

Sutoku-in's celebrated birth was not without blemishes, however, which might have cast a shadow over his future. Officially, Sutoku-in was not only the first son of the reigning emperor Toba but also the first great-grandson of Retired Emperor Shirakawa, who was actually holding political power under the system of *insei* 院政, or cloistered rule, which allowed an abdicated emperor to actually govern and escape from the control of Fujiwara regents and their allies at court. According to the episode “Taikenmon-in judai no koto” 待賢門院入内事 (The matter of Lady Taikenmon-in's entry into the court) from *Kojidan* 古事談 (1212–15), a collection of *setsuwa* 説話 edited by Minamoto Akikane (1160–1215), Sutoku-in's father was not actually Emperor Toba but Retired Emperor Shirakawa. The episode relates that Retired Emperor

¹³ *Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo hō*, vol. 25, ed. Okada Takao, Ishii Masatoshi and Uesugi Kazuhiko (1990), 77.

¹⁴ *Sutoku Tennō jitsuroku*, ed. Fujii Jōji (Tokyo: Yumani Shobō, 2008), 2–7.

Shirakawa had affairs with Fujiwara Shōshi (later known by the honorific title of Taikenmon-in) before and after she married Emperor Toba.

Lady Taikenmon-in entered into Emperor Toba's court as an adopted daughter of Retired Emperor Shirakawa. During that time, Retired Emperor Shirakawa was having an affair with her. Everyone probably knew it; people gossiped that Sutoku-in was a biological son of Retired Emperor Shirakawa. Retired Emperor Toba also knew about it, calling Sutoku-in “*oji-ko*” (my uncle-son).¹⁵

待賢門院ハ、白川院御猶子之儀ニテ令入内給、其間法皇令密通給、人皆知之歟、崇徳院ハ白川院御胤子ト云々、鳥羽院モ其由ヲ知食テ「叔父子」トゾ申給ケル¹⁵

There are no other existing accounts to substantiate this episode. However, many later scholars and readers understand this complicated relationship to have contributed to the battle depicted in literature such as *Hōgen monogatari* and *Heike monogatari*. Historian Tsunoda Bun'ei has scrutinized various contemporaneous court records and courtier diaries, including *Chūyūki* 中右記 and *Denryaku* 殿暦 by Fujiwara Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078–1162), calculating Shōshi's most likely ovulation phases based on her menstruation periods recorded since she entered the court.¹⁶ Tsunoda then compares Shōshi's ovulation phases with Retired Emperor Shirakawa's frequent visitation to her inner palace and Emperor Toba's. Based on minute details of extant records of the members of the imperial house and courtiers, mostly of the Fujiwara, Tsunoda concludes that it would have been almost impossible for Shōshi to conceive Sutoku-in with Emperor Toba. The timing of Sutoku-in's conception more closely matches the Retired Emperor's visitation.¹⁷

Whether all parties involved, including Sutoku-in himself, were aware of this possibility at that time remains unknown, but many records suggest that Shōshi was indeed very well cared

¹⁵ *Kojidan*, in *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* (hereafter *SNKBT*), vol. 41 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2005), 189.

¹⁶ Tsunoda Bun'ei, *Taikenmon'in Tamako no shōgai: Shōtei hishō* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1985), 83–88.

¹⁷ For details of the data and analysis, see Tsunoda, 83–110.

for by Retired Emperor Shirakawa and he visited her palace frequently. Jien also recorded in his *Gukanshō* that before Shōshi married Emperor Toba she seemed to have had trouble marrying Fujiwara Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097–1164), a son of the prominent Fujiwara Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078–1162), despite an effort to make the arrangement by Retired Emperor Shirakawa himself. Jien noted that that people were aware of several rumors surrounding Shōshi's questionable behavior.¹⁸ Regardless of whether or not Sutoku-in was Emperor Toba's biological son, there was at least a discourse of family issues and potential illegitimacy surrounding Sutoku-in's birth. Jien, who was very interested in the genealogies of the imperial line and the Fujiwara surely noted this possibility. Indeed, the issue of concealed and complicated kinship relationships became a large part of the discourse surrounding the Hōgen Disturbance and eventually the emergence of Sutoku-in's *onryō*.

On the twenty-eighth day of the first month of the fourth year of Hōan 保安 (1123), the five-year-old Sutoku-in was named Crown Prince and ascended the throne on the nineteenth day of the second month of the same year. It should be noted that despite what rumors may have circulated or what people may have later suspected, no contemporary records suggested any particularly unusual relationship between Sutoku-in and Retired Emperor Toba. They lived under the same roof during Sutoku-in's childhood and seemed to have maintained a smooth relationship since then, even when Retired Emperor Toba held actual political power when Sutoku-in was on the throne.¹⁹ Within the *insei* system, although Sutoku-in himself did not hold

¹⁸ Jien, *Gukanshō*, in *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* (hereafter *NKBT*), ed. Okami Masao and Akamatsu Toshihide (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992), 207–208. Fujiwara Tadazane also wrote in his diary, *Denryaku*, on the nineteenth day of the eleven month of 1117, “how strange and incomprehensible of a lady she [Shōshi] is!” 奇怪不可思議女御歟。See Fujiwara Tadazane, *Denryaku*, vol. 5, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970), 57.

¹⁹ Yamada Yūji, *Sutoku-in onryō no kenkyū*, 65–66; and Mikawa Kei, *Insei* (Tokyo: Chūkō Shinsho, 2006), 101–106.

much real political influence as an emperor, he could anticipate eventually wielding political power after he himself became a Retired Emperor like his father.

This father-son (or potentially father-“uncle-son”) relationship took a different turn, however, when Fujiwara Tokushi 藤原得子 (later Bifukumon-in 美福門院, 1117–60), a daughter of the rather low-ranking official Fujiwara Nagazane 藤原長実 (1075–1133), started winning Retired Emperor Toba’s favor. According to *Imakagami* 今鏡 (1170), Retired Emperor Toba “visited [Tokushi] every night without any break,” and when Tokushi gave birth to a boy, Narihito 嵯仁, in 1139, Retired Emperor Toba rejoiced at the birth of his ninth son so much that “there was a full stir all over the land.”²⁰ Not surprisingly, Retired Emperor Toba wished that the newly-born Prince Narihito should succeed the throne after Sutoku-in. He thus arranged for Sutoku-in and Empress Fujiwara Seishi 藤原聖子 (1122–82) to adopt Narihito as their first son.²¹ This also helped solve a potential problem of Fujiwara Tokushi’s low rank. Partially because Fujiwara Tokushi was from Sueshige ryū 末茂流, a less powerful house of the Northern branch of the Fujiwara family, she only maintained Junior Third Rank (*ju-san-mi* 從三位) with no other title such as *kōi* 更衣 or *nyōgo* 女御, which were generally held by wives and mistresses of emperors (or occasionally retired emperors). There was no precedent for a son of such a low-ranking mother to become an emperor.²² Furthermore, her father, Fujiwara Nagazane had already

²⁰ 夜枯させ給ふことなかるべし...世の中もうごくまでよろこびあへるさまいはんかたなし。
Imakagami, in *Shintei zōho kokushi taikei*, vol. 21, ed. Kuroita Katsumi (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998), 57–59.

²¹ Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 213.

²² The author of *Imakagami*, who most scholars believe to be Fujiwara Tametsune or Jakuchō, speculates that there were already a couple of princes born of Empress Shōshi, mother of Sutoku-in. Hence, it would be very difficult to skip these eligible brothers of the present emperor to make Narihito Crown Prince. *Imakagami*, in *Shintei zōho kokushi taikei*, vol. 21, ed. Kuroita Katsumi (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998), 59.

passed away and she had no other patron, at least financially, for her or her son in the court.

Empress Seishi, on the other hand, whose father Fujiwara Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097–1164), was of the most powerful Midōryū 御堂流 branch and head of the Fujiwara family.

The adoption of Narihito at first seemed to be mutually beneficial for all parties involved. For Sutoku-in, who did not yet have a son with Empress Seishi, the adoption stabilized his status by giving him a potential successor to the throne. In particular, if Sutoku-in were to abdicate the throne and to exercise power as a “Retired Emperor” under the *insei* system, customarily he needed be the father of an emperor.²³ Narihito was named as Crown Prince on the seventeenth day of the eighth month of the same year, only three months after he was born.

These adoption practices were not unusual for Heian aristocrats, despite their complexity, but the political machinations behind this case might have become an underlying cause of family rupture and the Hōgen Disturbance. Urged by Retired Emperor Toba and his circle, Sutoku-in abdicated and ceded the throne to the three-year-old Narihito, who became Emperor Konoe on the seventh day of the twelfth month of 1141. In his *Gukanshō*, Jien explains that Sutoku-in gave up the throne with the understanding that Sutoku-in himself and Seishi’s father, Fujiwara Tadamichi, could eventually claim power as father of the emperor Narihito and “step” grandfather of the emperor respectively. Ultimately, however, the imperial edict clearly stated that the Emperor [Sutoku-in] abdicated the throne in favor of the Emperor’s younger brother, *kōtaitei* 皇太弟 [Narihito].²⁴ Jien describes Sutoku-in’s appalment: “Sutoku-in had believed that the imperial edict would state [he would give the throne to] the Crown Prince, but it stated the

²³ Mikawa, *Insei*, 95.

²⁴ 十二月七日 天皇讓位位於皇太弟以関白為摂政 *Hyakurenshō*, in *Kokushi taikei*, vol. 14 (Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1901), 83.

Emperor's brother instead. He was surprised and appalled at what happened, and he resented (*goisu ni komori* 御意趣ニコモリ) [being deceived].”²⁵

This seemingly small difference in language held profound implications for Sutoku-in's future. By custom, *insei* assumed strict patrilineal relationships; it would only have been possible for Sutoku-in to wield power as a retired emperor if he were the father, not the brother, of the new emperor. As a result, Retired Emperor Toba continued to have sole authority as the father of the current Emperor, his undoubtedly biological son. By using the word “resentment” (御意趣ニコモリ) for Sutoku-in's bitter feeling, Jien seems to suggest that this episode deepened the family discord between Retired Emperor Toba and Sutoku-in, especially since Jien wrote this episode already with an awareness of Sutoku-in's becoming an *onryō* following his death. In the end, Sutoku-in was often referred to as Shin-in 新院, literally “new retired emperor,” as well as *jōkō* 上皇, “ex-emperor,” but he no longer held any real political power.²⁶

Texts written after Sutoku-in's death, such as *Gukanshō* and *Hōgen monogatari* imagine this abdication to have caused a rift between father and son, leading to their increasing estrangement. However, it should be noted that contemporary documents also recorded that Sutoku-in sometimes visited his father's residence and they attended official activities together. For example, the year following his abdication, Sutoku-in and Retired Emperor Toba shared the same palanquin when they visited a temple and attended horse racing together.²⁷ In 1153 and 1154, Sutoku-in often enjoyed horse racing at official festivals with his father and Bifukumon-in,

²⁵ 宣命二皇太子トゾアランズラントラボシケルヲ、皇大弟トカカセラレケルトキ、コハイカニト、又崇徳ノ御意趣ニコモリ Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 214.

²⁶ Officially, Sutoku-in was given the title of *Dajō Tennō* 太上天皇, or Retired Emperor.

²⁷ [本朝世紀] 康治元年九月廿三日壬子鳥羽城南寺祭成両院臨幸有競馬事。... [台記] 康治元年二月九日法勝寺千僧、因両院幸有聰禮。。。法皇上皇同車。 *Sutoku Tennō jitsuroku*, 468 and 476.

the mother of Emperor Konoe who was often depicted in literature as one of the backstage manipulators of the political machinations that lead to Sutoku-in's loss of power.²⁸ We cannot conclude whether the frequency of their meetings, which were recorded as often as two or three times per year during Emperor Konoe's reign, proves their intimate or discordant relationship. However, the pace of their meetings remained consistent from the time of Sutoku-in's abdication until the year before Retired Emperor Toba's death.²⁹

From contemporary accounts and courtier diaries, we can assume that at least in public, the father and son kept their relationship intact and official. Furthermore, since they often appeared at official occasions together, Sutoku-in's abdication did not necessarily mean he was completely excluded or removed from the political stage. As I will show below, here we can see a potential discrepancy between contemporary documents and later literature including Jien's *Gukanshō* and *Hōgen monogatari*. These texts emphasize Sutoku-in's deeply rooted grudge and family discord between father and son as cause for the Hōgen Disturbance as well as Sutoku-in's transformation into *onryō*. We can see how certain aspects of historical events, and family relationships in particular, seeded later discourse that sought to explain Sutoku-in's becoming *onryō*.

²⁸ For example, according to Taira Nobuhira's *Hyōhanki* (or *Heihanki*) 兵範記, "On the twenty-sixth day of the fourth year of Ninpei (1151), at the Jōnan-ji Temple Festival, [Sutoku-in] went to a racecourse and watched horse racing with the Retired Emperor and Bifukumon-in as well as other members of imperial family." [兵範記]仁平四年九月廿六日丙子今日鳥羽城南寺祭成法皇上皇美福門院并宮々渡馬場殿有御見物。 Three days later, they also repeated the same activities. *Sutoku Tennō jitsuroku*, 505, and Taira Nobunori, *Hyōhanki*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Nihon Shiseki Hozonkai, 1918), 272.

²⁹ Between 1151 and 1154, the two met more frequently than in other years, meeting on at least ten occasions. See *Sutoku Tennō jitsuroku*, 465–506.

The Hōgen Disturbance and Its Aftermath

In this section, I trace the events and issues surrounding another imperial succession from Emperor Konoe to Emperor Go-Shirakawa, a transfer of power that is often considered to be one of the crucial political machinations that caused further family friction. In *Hōgen monogatari*, this succession and the subsequent family feud is often narrated through Sutoku-in's (or Sutoku-in's allies') perspective and emphasized as one of the reasons Sutoku-in decided to rebel against Go-Shirakawa. However, in order to understand the complexities of the relevant genealogical relationships and the political succession in a more comprehensive picture, I will lay out a historical timeline, starting with Emperor Konoe, who took the throne when he was only three years old.

Emperor Konoe tended to have a weak constitution since his birth. In 1154, his health continued to deteriorate, and he developed a severe eye disease.³⁰ Medicine and religious prayers seemed to be ineffective, and he quickly went blind.³¹ The seventeen-year-old emperor passed away on the twenty-third day of the ninth month in 1155 without leaving any heir to the throne. As there was no Crown Prince or Princess yet on the night of his death, Retired Emperor Toba summoned senior ranking courtiers, Minamoto Masazane 源雅実 (1094–1162) and Fujiwara Kiminori 藤原公教 (1103–60), a cousin of Bifukumon-in and the council for the throne (*ōjia gijō* 王者議定), to the private residence of Retired Emperor Toba and Bifukumon-in instead of the Imperial Palace.³² During the meeting, several messengers were sent to Fujiwara Tadamichi

³⁰ Taira Nobunori, *Hyōhanki*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Nihon Shiseki Hozonkai, 1918), 326–27.

³¹ *Imakagami*, ed. Kawakita Noboru, *Imakagami zenchūshaku* (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2013), 168–71.

³² Many historians have debated this unprecedented succession of the throne in the aftermath of Emperor Konoe's sudden death. See, for example, Kōchi Shōsuke, *Hōgen no ran, Heiji no ran* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002); Maki Michio, "Toba insei ron," in *Insei jidaishi ronshū* (Tokyo: Yagi Shoten, 1993), 175–94; and Saeki Tomohiro, *Chūsei zenki no seiji kōzō to ōke* (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2015), 75–106.

regarding the decision to appoint a new emperor and to secure the location for a new palace.³³

The very next day, Retired Emperor Toba announced that his son, the Fourth Prince Masahito, who was Sutoku-in's younger brother from the same mother, would take the throne. Prince Masahito, later known as Emperor Go-Shirakawa (1127–92), was already twenty-nine-years old at his appointment and had up until this point remained outside of the succession. Thus, there was a great deal of speculation regarding Go-Shirakawa's succession, especially since he skipped the process of becoming a Crown Prince.

Jien's account gives us a glimpse of later understandings of the decision-making process at the meeting. According to Jien's *Gukanshō*:

Retired Emperor Toba struggled to decide who should be the next emperor. The Fourth Prince Masahito was born to Fujiwara Shōshi, or Taikenmon-in, and he lived in the same palace with Sutoku-in. He was well-known for having indulged himself too much in music and singing and may have lacked the capability to reign. Hence [Retired Emperor Toba was wondering] whether the throne should go to the Hachijō Palace Princess—who was an older sister of Emperor Konoe—Prince Shigehito, the First Prince of Sutoku-in, or the Fourth Prince Masahito's son, Prince Morihito 守仁 (later Emperor Nijō, who was raised by Retired Emperor Toba and Bifukumon-in at that time).³⁴

It should be noted that Jien was born in 1155, the same year that the meeting took place, and his *Gukanshō* was written in 1220, sixty-five years after the event. Hence, we cannot fully rely on Jien's account as a firsthand record. Nevertheless, Kōchi Shōsuke points out in his evaluation of *Gukanshō* that Jien had conducted extensive interviews and research when he composed the text. He took particular advantage of his privileged access (as a son of Fujiwara Tadamichi and an abbot of a Tendai Buddhist sect) to various official accounts and courtier diaries kept by high-

³³ *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 327.

³⁴ 院ハコノ次ノ位ノコトヲヲボシメシワヅラヒケリ。四宮ニテ後白河院、待賢門院ノ御ハラニテ、新院ニ同宿シテヲハシマシケルガ、イタクサタメシク御アソビナドアリトテ、即位ノ御器量ニアラズトヲボシメシテ、近衛院ノ姉ノ八条院姫宮ナルヲ女帝カ、新院ノ一宮カ、コノ四宮ノ御子ニ条院・・云々。Jien, *Gukanshō*, *NKBT*, 86: 216.

ranking aristocrats, mostly among his extended Fujiwara family.³⁵ Hence Jien's inside knowledge regarding the meeting is likely reliable to a certain degree, especially since the matter directly involved the Fujiwara family's interests and opinions. The list of the names here requires further examination since it reflects Retired Emperor Toba's thinking as well as the Fujiwara family's favor.

Since my interest lies in the relationships between Sutoku-in, Emperor Toba, and Emperor Go-Shirakawa, I will not go into the political divisions and disputes within the Fujiwara family. However, it should be noted that there were not only divisions between the different Fujiwara branches but also between biological siblings and fathers and sons, which were historically uncommon and thus remain one of the major topics of research regarding the political climate surrounding the Hōgen Disturbance and Genpei War. While the Hōgen Disturbance split the imperial family members into political rivalries, so too did it divide the Fujiwara members, as well as the Minamoto and the Taira. The candidates for the next emperor after Emperor Konoe seem to particularly reflect the Fujiwara and Bifukumon-in's favor, although no extant record relates what Bifukumon-in said except for the possibility that she may have been present at the council since it took place at her residence.³⁶

As many historians point out, Prince Masahito seemed an unlikely choice at the time. The natural and strongest successor among the available princes and princesses was the fifteen-year-old Prince Shigehito, who was from the direct line of the former emperor, Sutoku-in.³⁷ As much as Bifukumon-in and Retired Emperor Toba might have wanted, the enthronement of the Hachijō Palace Princess was least likely when there were other legitimate male successors available.

³⁵ Kōchi, *Hōgen no ran, Heiji no ran*, 3–4.

³⁶ *Hyōhanki*, vol. 1, 327.

³⁷ Motoki Yasuo, *Hōgen, Heiji no ran o yominaosu* (Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai, 2005), 69.

Twelve-year-old Prince Morihito, who was apparently Bifukumon-in's favorite step son was an unlikely candidate since he was already about to receive his tonsure and Prince Shigehito was a stronger candidate.

Much to the surprise to many, in the end, Masahito, or Go-Shirakawa ascended the throne. At the time, many interpreted the initial decision for Go-Shirakawa's enthronement as a temporary appointment in order to eventually make Go-Shirakawa's son, Prince Morihito emperor. According to *Sankaiki* 山槐記, the diary of Fujiwara Tadachika (1131–95),

Retired Emperor Toba considered appointing him [Prince Morihito], who was raised by Bifukumon-in, but there was no precedent for any prince whose father had not been an emperor to take the throne. There was, however, precedent for a father to abdicate the throne in favor of his son.³⁸

Assuredly, on the twenty-third day of the ninth month of 1155, just two months after Emperor Konoe passed away, Prince Morihito was proclaimed to be Crown Prince. This decision consequently ruled out the possibility for Prince Shigehito, a direct descendent of Sutoku-in, to take the throne. Moreover, this decision also denied Sutoku-in's chance to practice power as father of an emperor. Jien and Tadachika's descriptions of the complicated succession procedure were seized upon as narrative elements in later works like *Hogen monogatari* not only for the potential accumulation of Sutoku-in's grudge that lead to his becoming *onryō* but also for genealogical discourse and questions of legitimacy.

The events after Retired Emperor Toba's death played an equally important part in narratives of Sutoku-in's *onryō* discourse. Less than a year after Prince Morihito became Crown Prince, on the second day of the seventh month of the first year of Hōgen (1156), Retired

³⁸ 而當今即位事故鳥羽院思食立者、女院自襁褓中被奉養育、依思食彼院事也、而父不即位事雖有先例、無乍置見存父其子即位例、仍當院有踐祚、相繼當今有即位、云院云內、Fujiwara Tadachika, *Sankaiki*, ed. Sagawa Rinpū, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Nihon Shiseki Hozonkai, 1916), 157.

Emperor Toba fell severely ill. Sutoku-in's relationship with his ailing father seemed to worsen at this time. Diarist Taira Nobunori (1112–82), a household superintendent for Fujiwara Tadamichi and Motozane, kept especially detailed records of Retired Emperor Toba's illness as well as the later Hōgen Disturbance in his *Hyōhanki*. Nobunori wrote that around a month before Retired Emperor Toba's death, Sutoku-in visited his sick father at Toba Palace. For some reason, however, they did not see each other.³⁹ He also indicated that, as Retired Emperor Toba passed away, Sutoku-in came to pay respects at the Palace, but oddly remained outside of the bamboo blinds and did not go inside to see his father.⁴⁰ Such entries seem to invite speculation over their father-son relationship.

Jien's later account expanded upon the notion that Sutoku-in may have had reasons to resent his father on his sickbed. Jien described how as Retired Emperor Toba was about to die, Sutoku-in tried to visit him at Toba Palace, but no one there was expecting him.⁴¹ Jien continues that without anyone to guide Sutoku-in to his father's bedside, as he was left in the back of a residence empty of people at the moment his father passed away.⁴² Such an episode dramatizes

³⁹ 久寿三年六月三日癸酉入夜新院御幸鳥羽殿、即還御或人云、御幸成田中殿、被申事由不幸院御所何況及御對面云々。 *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 108.

⁴⁰ 保元元年七月二日辛丑今日御暝之間新院臨幸而自簾外還御云々。 *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 113.

⁴¹ Jien recorded an even more dramatic episode regarding Sutoku-in's last visit and Retired Emperor Toba's death scene. During the chaos as everyone was gathering at Toba Palace, somehow Sutoku-in's attendant attacked Taira Chikanori, who was a vice *kageyui* officer, and eventually blinded him. In Jien's account, this was last thing Retired Emperor Toba heard before his death. 鳥羽殿ニ安樂壽院トテ御終焉ノ御堂御所シオカセ給タリケルニテウセサセ給ニケリ。ソノ時新院〔崇徳〕マイラセ給タリケレドモ。内へ入レマイラスル人ダニモナカリケレバ。ハラダチテ鳥羽ノ南殿人モナキ所へ御幸ノ御車チラシテヲハシマシケルニ。マサシキ法皇ノ御閑眼ノ時ナレバ。馬車サハギアフニ。勝光明院ノ前ノホドニテチカノリガ十七八ノ程ノリ家ガ子ニテ。勘解由次官ニナサレテ召仕イケルガ。参リアイタリケルヲウタセ給イケル程ニ。目ヲウチツブサレタリトノノジリケルヲ。既ニ今ハカウニテヲハシマシケルニ参リテ。最後ノ御ヲモイ人ニテ候ケル光安ガムスメノ土佐殿トイヒケル女房ノ。新院ノチカノリガ目ヲウチツブサセ給タルト申アイ候ト申タリケルヲ聞セヲハシマシテ。御目ヲキラリト見アゲテヲハシマシタリケルガ。マサシキ最後ニテヒキイラセ給ニケルトゾ人ハカタリ侍シ。 Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 217–18.

⁴² Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 217–18.

the father-son friction and further contributes to the narrative that Sutoku-in's resentment toward an estranged father was a reason for his becoming *onryō*.

Minamoto Akikane's *setsuwa* collection, *Kojidan*, provides similar anecdotes involving Retired Emperor Toba's death and suggests that the father-son pair never reconciled before Retired Emperor Toba's passing. According to *Kojidan*, when Retired Emperor Toba found himself in grave condition on the verge of death, he left a message to his close aid Fujiwara Koretaka (1125–?). As his dying wish, the ailing retired emperor stated, “after I die, do not show my corpse to Sutoku-in.” In this version of events, Koretaka prevented Sutoku-in from seeing his dead father, stating that he was just following the will of Retired Emperor Toba.⁴³ No other records indicate Sutoku-in's reaction over facing his father's death, and these anecdotes remain uncorroborated. However, as we will see later, historical records and literary accounts are intertwined in their emphasis on unsolved family discord, even at the deathbed.

Sutoku-in's name appears in *Hyōhanki* and other contemporary records three days later. On the fifth day of the seventh month, Emperor Go-Shirakawa issued an imperial order to summon police, judicial chiefs (*kebiishi* 検非違使), and soldiers to protect both the new Imperial Palace (Takamatsu Palace) and Toba Palace.⁴⁴ This order came in response to a rumor that Sutoku-in was plotting a coup against the court.⁴⁵ Whether the rumor was true or not, Sutoku-in seemed to have stayed in Tanaka Mansion within Toba Palace and did not appear in public even for his father's funeral on the third day following the death; nor did he attend the *shonanoka*

⁴³ 鳥羽院最後ニモ惟方ヲ召テ汝ソト思被仰成、閉眼之後アナ賢新院ニミスナト仰事アリケリ、如案新院ハ奉見ト被仰ケレト、御遺言旨候トテ、懸廻不奉入云々。 *Kojidan*, *SNKBT*, 41: 189.

⁴⁴ At that time, the Imperial Palace was rather mobile and Go-Shirakawa used Takamatsu Palace as his Imperial Palace. See Kōchi, *Hōgen no ran*, 50–51.

⁴⁵ 蓋是法皇崩御後、上皇左府同心発軍、欲奉傾国家。。。 *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 115.

memorial service on the eighth day.⁴⁶ On the ninth day, to everyone's surprise, Sutoku-in suddenly and secretly moved to Shirakawa Palace, a residence for his sister, Princess Tōshi who was visiting Toba Palace at that time for her father's memorial services.⁴⁷ Jien's later account describes how Sutoku-in and his attendants forced themselves into Shirakawa Palace.⁴⁸ *Hyōhanki* details the events of the subsequent two days, especially the movements of Go-Shirakawa's circle at Toba Palace. It details how, on the tenth, courtiers at Toba Palace believed that Sutoku-in's moving in to Shirakawa Palace was in preparation for rebellion (上皇於白川殿被整軍兵、是日来風聞、已所露顯也).⁴⁹

To this day, scholars continue to debate whether or not Sutoku-in had in fact decided to rebel at this early stage. Historians, including Kōchi Shōhei and Motoki Yasuo, have traced records leading up to and in the aftermath of the Hōgen Disturbance in order to try to determine the intentions of both sides, including whether Sutoku-in was conspiring to retake the throne or simply defending himself. Although the Disturbance's details fall outside of this chapter's scope, I would like to highlight the rhetoric used to describe Shirakawa Palace, Sutoku-in, and his allies, especially the term *Keikoku* 傾国. *Keikoku*, or “ruin the realm,” is a word which repeatedly appears in *Hyōhanki* and other contemporary texts, most typically when discussing so-called treason or revolts against authority. In particular, plots to “ruin the realm” were often “committed” by high ranking officials. One of the figures most notably described by this term was Prince Nagaya 長屋 (684–729), who supposedly “plotted the rebellion” (and was implicated

⁴⁶ *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 114–15.

⁴⁷ *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 116.

⁴⁸ 俄ニ七月九日鳥羽ヲ出テ白河ノ中御門河原ニテ千躰ノ阿弥陀堂ノ御所トキコユルサシキ殿ト云御所ヘワタラセ給ニケリ。ソレモワガ御所ニテモナキヲオシアケテヲハシマシケリ。 Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 219.

⁴⁹ 十日己酉上皇於白川殿被整軍兵、是日来風聞、已所露顯也。 *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 116–17.

in a political plot by the Fujiwara) and died in 729. Prince Nagaya became a famous early *onryō* as a result of this ignominious death.⁵⁰ This word choice in *Hyōhanki*, which was generally recorded through the perspective of Go-Shirakawa, Fujiwara Tadamichi, and their allies, suggests subjugating political opponents as well as the potential of eventually producing *onryō* as a result.⁵¹

The actual battle against Sutoku-in ended within a day, or to be precise, within a couple of hours. Despite the brevity, the Hōgen Disturbance split many families from the Imperial family to the Fujiwara, the Taira, and the Minamoto. The Go-Shirakawa force included Fujiwara Tadamichi, Fujiwara Michinori 藤原通憲 (or Shinzei 信西, 1106–60), Taira Kiyomori 平清盛 (1118–81), and Minamoto Yoshitomo 源義朝 (1123–60). The Sutoku-in force included Fujiwara Yorinaga (1120–56), a brother of Tadamichi; Minamoto Tameyoshi 源為義 (1096–56), the father of Yoshitomo; and Taira Tadamasa 平忠正 (?–1156), an uncle of Kiyomori. As often noted, in addition to the numerous forces that gathered for Go-Shirakawa, two major factors in Go-Shirakawa's quick victory lay in a highly-trained group of warriors led by Kiyomori and

⁵⁰ See, for example, the account in *Fusō ryakki* 扶桑略記, which states: 同月七日辛未、左京人從七位下漆部造君足、無位中臣宮虎連東人等密称、左大臣長屋王、私学左道。欲傾国家。 *Fusō ryakki*, in *Shintei zōho kokushi taikēi*, vol. 12, ed. Kuroita Katsumi (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998), 88. See also an account in *Shoku Nihongi*: [続日本紀] (聖武)天平元年 (729 年)二月十日、左京人從七位下漆部造君足、無位中臣宮處連東人等、告密称、左大臣正三位長屋王、私学左道、欲傾国家。 *Shoku Nihongi*, in *Shintei zōho kokushi taikēi*, vol. 2, ed. Kuroita Katsumi (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998) 115; and finally, a third account in *Nihon kiryaku*: [日本紀略] 延暦四年九月庚申条。式部卿藤原朝臣朝廷傾奉早良王乎為君止謀氣利。 *Nihon kiryaku*, *Shintei zōho kokushi taikēi*, vol. 10, ed. Kuroita Katsumi (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998), 260.

⁵¹ Motoki Yasuo rightly points out that courtier diaries were often edited later, adding some details as well as deleting some entries. In particular, *Hyōhanki* records specific events and meetings that took place at Shirakawa Palace during the preparation for the disturbance. These specific details were probably added later using accounts from courtiers who had surrendered, including Fujiwara Norinaga. See Motoki, *Hōgen, Heiji no ran o yominaosu*, 97–98.

Yoshitomo and ambush tactics they used in the early morning hours.⁵² Shirakawa Palace was burned down, and Sutoku-in and Yōrinaga decamped and disappeared for the next two days.⁵³ On the thirteenth day of the seventh month, Sutoku-in reappeared at Nin'na-ji Temple having already taken the tonsure a day before, a traditional gesture of surrender by renouncing the world and any political ambition.⁵⁴ Many of Sutoku-in's followers also surrendered⁵⁵ and more than twenty warriors were sentenced to death, including Minamoto Tameyoshi and Taira Tadamasa. This was the first time official capital punishment was ordered by the court since Fujiwara Nakanari's execution in aftermath of the Kusuko 薬子 Incident of 809.⁵⁶ For some victims, decapitations were executed by a member of their own family. For example, Minamoto Yoshitomo beheaded his father, Tameyoshi, and Taira Kiyomori beheaded his uncle, Tadamasa.⁵⁷ Most non-warrior aristocrats who surrendered were condemned to exile, a punishment considered to be a close equivalent to execution. On the twenty-third day of the seven month, just ten days after Sutoku-in's capture, Emperor Go-Shirakawa ordered the exile of

⁵² 七月十一日庚辰、鶏鳴清盛朝臣、義朝、義康等、軍兵都六百余騎發向白河 清盛三百余騎自二条方、義朝二百余騎自大炊御門方、義康百余騎自近衛方。 *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 117.

⁵³ 辰剋、東方起煙炎、御方軍已責寄懸火了云々、清盛等乘勝逐逃、上皇左府晦跡逐電、白川御所等焼失畢、齋院御所并院北殿也、御方軍向法勝寺檢知、又焼為義円覺寺住所了。 *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 118.

⁵⁴ *Sutoku Tennō jitsuroku*, 512.

⁵⁵ 七月十四日癸丑 皇后宮權亮成隆朝臣出来、去十一日随順左府、被追散御方軍、日来逃隱於仁和寺辺、一昨日出家、即日向別当亭、大理奏聞了、入道歸住八条家、今日志兼成、依勅定、奉別当宣、向八条相具参内、入道乗車、随兵下部圍繞、於内陣陣頭、西御藏町、藏人判官俊成志兼成等召問云々、次下給兼成、兼成相具向私宅、付郎從云々、又右京大夫教長卿、同於広隆寺辺出来、今同参上、左衛門尉季実召具之、其儀如成隆、但不被召問、可有議定云々。 *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 123.

⁵⁶ 保元元年七月廿九日条 源為義已下被行斬罪。嵯峨天皇以降所不行之刑也。信西之謀也。 *Hyakurenshō*, in *Kaitei zōho Kokushi taikei*, vol. 11, ed. Kuroita Katsumi (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000), 72; and Kōchi, *Hōgen no ran, Heiji no ran*, 98–99.

⁵⁷ 為義、頼方 [賢]、頼中、為成、為宗、九郎 [為仲] 已上左馬頭義朝、於船岡辺斬之、但為義、檢非違使季実、依 勅定実験云々。 *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 126.

his brother, Sutoku-in, to Sanuki Province, present-day Kagawa Prefecture in Shikoku.⁵⁸ While the revival of execution as a punishment was a shocking affair for the aristocrats of the time, exiling the ex-Emperor, who still held the Dajō Tennō title was an earth-shaking event. Sutoku-in became only the second emperor to be exiled since Emperor Jun'nin in 764. Sutoku-in spent the next eight years in exile, passing away in 1164.

Sutoku-in in Exile

While retrospective historical accounts invoke a certain *onryō* discourse when discussing Sutoku-in's rebellion, few "official" contemporary records or courtier diaries document Sutoku-in's life in Sanuki province, except for works such as *Hōgen monogatari* and *Shiraminadera engi* 白峯寺縁起 (1406).⁵⁹ This section briefly examines Sutoku-in's time in exile and eventual death to explore a gap between what seems to be a relatively peaceful life in Sanuki from the image of a fierce, vengeful figure that appears in later literature.

The emergence and wide dissemination of Sutoku-in's *onryō* narratives involving episodes in Sanuki province owe much to *Hōgen monogatari*, which describes Sutoku-in's growing grudge. According to the Konpira-bon variant of *Hōgen monogatari*, the exiled Sutoku-in copied a manuscript of the Five Volumes of the Mahayana Sutra and wrote that he would devote the virtues of these sutras to the world of the Hell Realm (Jigoku-dō), the Realm of the Hungry Ghosts (Gakidō) and/or the Realm of Beasts (Chikushodō). In a written oath, Sutoku-in declares: "I will become an evil spirit of Japan, and I will turn emperors into commoners and

⁵⁸ 保元元年七月廿三日壬戌 今夕入道太上天皇被奉移讃岐國。。。参向仁和寺御在所奉出之晩頭出、網代御車、御乳母子保成車召之、女房同車。。。鳥羽邊乗船、乗船後一向讃岐國司沙汰殊可奉守護、被仰下了重成歸参了。 *Hyōhanki*, vol. 2, 125.

⁵⁹ See *Naoshima chōshi*, vol. 1, ed. Naoshima Chōshi Hensan Iinkai (Naoshima: Naoshima-chō Yakuba, 1990), 144–47 and 189; and Yamada, *Onryō, kaii, Ise Jingū*, 126 and 140.

commoners into emperors.”⁶⁰ While the details differ depending on the variants and manuscripts, most versions describe him writing the oath with his own blood after biting off his own tongue. This scene gives a visceral intensity to Sutoku-in’s deep-seated grudge against his own imperial family.

Contrary to such violent depictions of Sutoku-in in *Hōgen monogatari*, *Imakagami* 今鏡, written around 1170 and less than ten years after Sutoku-in’s death, describes Sutoku-in’s quiet and lonesome life in exile. *Imakagami* was most likely written by Fujiwara Tametsune 藤原為経 (later Jakuchō 寂超), an ex-chamberlain for Sutoku-in, who visited his former master in Sanuki.⁶¹ As Yamada Yūji explains, *Imakagami* is a valuable and credible contemporary text that depicts Sutoku-in’s life before and after exile.⁶² This account is especially important because it allows a glimpse at an alternative discourse in which Sutoku-in is not presupposed to be an *onryō* figure. One key difference between *Imakagami* and latter texts is that it always refers to the exiled Emperor as “Shin’in” 新院, or “Sanuki-in” 讃岐院, and never as “Sutoku-in 崇徳院,” the posthumous title given to him in 1184. These titles indicate a relatively early date (or at least a faithful representation of contemporary naming conventions) for the text’s composition.

Although lacking the rage of later accounts, *Imakagami* repeatedly depicts the isolation and loneliness that Sutoku-in endured in exile. Initially during his journey there, Sutoku-in was accompanied by several ladies-in-waiting and one of his consorts, Hyōe no suke 兵衛の佐,

⁶⁰ 吾深罪に行われ、秋鬱浅からず、速やかに此功力をもって、彼の科を救わんと思ふ、莫大の行業を、併（しかしながら）三悪道になげこみ、その力をもって、日本国の大魔縁となり、皇をとって民となし、民を皇となさん。 *Hōgen monogatari*, ed. Shida Itaru and Inui Yoshihisa, *SNKBZ*, vol. 41 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 2002), 400–401.

⁶¹ See Yamada, *Sutoku-in onryō no kenkyū*, 65–66; and Mikawa, *Insei*, 71.

⁶² Yamada, 71.

mother of Prince Shigemori.⁶³ Despite this company, the text repeatedly emphasizes how uneasy and helpless (*kokorobosoku* 心細く) Sutoku-in must have felt every day as the families of servants helping him were torn apart, and those who were lucky enough to stay in the capital were too afraid to dare to visit him.⁶⁴

According to *Imakagami*, on the twenty-sixth day of the eighth month of 1164, the forty-six-year-old Sutoku-in passed away due to the heavy stress and loneliness of exile without any hope of setting foot in capital again. Remarkably, the text records rumors that someone had a dream in which Sutoku-in was actually a reincarnation of the sacred Buddhist Ajari 阿闍梨 Shiramine no Hijiri, who was exiled to Sanuki in the past. As Yamada Yūji discusses, when *Imakagami* was written around 1170, the author of the text was still unaware of Sutoku-in's later status as *onryō*.⁶⁵ Sutoku-in's life and death in Sanuki may have invoked a degree of pity, but it was so tranquil that he was even believed to have been an Ajari in his previous life—a remote existence from the vengeful figure who would soon emerge.⁶⁶

⁶³ 兄の院と争はせ給けるやうなること出で来て、新院御髪おろさせ給て、御弟の仁和寺の宮におはしましければ、しばしはさやうに聞へし程に八重の潮路を分けて、遠くおはしまして、上達部、殿上人ひとり参るもなく、一宮の御母兵衛の佐と聞へ給し、さらぬ女房、ひとりふたりばかりにて、男もなき御旅住みも、いかに心細く朝夕にをぼしめしけむ、親しく召し使ひし人ども、みな浦々に都別れて、おのづから留まれるも、世の恐しさに、あからさまに参ることだになかるべし。皇嘉門の院よりも、仁和寺の宮よりも、しのびたる御とぶらひなどばかりやありけむ、たとふる方なき御すまゐ也。あさましき鄙のあたりに、九年ばかりおはしまして、憂き世のあまりにや、御病も年に添えて重らせ給ければ、都へ帰らせ給こともなくて、秋八月二十六日に、かの国にて失せさせ給にけりとなむ。白峯の聖といひて、かの国に流されたる阿闍梨とて昔ありけるが、この院に生れさせ給へるとぞ、人の夢に見たりける。その墓のかたはらによき方あたりたりければとてぞおはしますなる。八重の潮路を掻き分けて、遙々とおはしましけむ、いと悲しく心地よきだにあはれなべき道を、人もなくて、いかばかりの御心地せさせ給ひけむ。 *Imakagami*, in *Imakagami zenchūshaku*, ed. Kawakita Noboru (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2013), 149–54.

⁶⁴ *Imakagami*, 150.

⁶⁵ Yamada, *Sutoku-in onryō no kenkyū*, 73.

⁶⁶ *Imakagami*, 153.

Sutoku-in's own poems also display a lonely but quiet life. Among his poems, the most well-known are those he exchanged with Jakuzen 寂然 (1118?-?), one of his few visitors:

Think of my feelings, of helplessness,
far away from the capital set apart by waves in the offing

思ひやれ都はるかにおきつ波立ちへだてたるころぼそさを.⁶⁷

The word helpless ころぼそさ, here, echoes *Imakagami*'s description of Sutoku-in's feeble mentality and nostalgia for his home capital. Similarly, in *Chōshū eisō* 長秋詠藻 (1178), a private waka poem collection by Fujiwara Shunzei 藤原俊成 (1114–1204), we can find Sutoku-in's *chōka* poem that he composed before passing away. The poem expresses his dedication to Buddhism, praying for atonement of for his sins from his previous life. The poem ends with a sentiment of friendship toward Shunzei:

Life was like dream, yet our ties and vows will never decay,
I wish to see you again in the morning when we are awakened [in the Pure Land].

夢の世になれこし契り朽ちずして醒めむ朝に逢ふこともがな.⁶⁸

In this context, the word *chigiri* 契り refers to both friendship with Shunzei and a pledge to the path toward the Pure Land. The poem indicates Sutoku-in's hope of attaining Buddhahood and meeting with his longtime friend as they reach salvation in the Pure Land. There is notably no suggestion of his resentment or desire to return as *onryō* and retaliate for the wrongs committed against him. Sutoku-in's exile poems can be contrasted with the later exiled Emperor Go-Toba in aftermath of Jōkyū Disturbance 承久の乱 in 1221, who left several poems expressing his rage

⁶⁷ 松山へおはしまして後、都なる人のもとにつかわせ給ひける 崇徳院御歌
思ひやれ都はるかにおきつ波立ちへだてたるころぼそさを See "Sutoku-in," in *Fūga wakashū*,
ed. Ichiko Teiji and Jun Kubota (Tokyo: Kichōbon Kankōkai, 1984), 265.

⁶⁸ Iwasa Miyoko, *Gyokuyō wakashū zenchūshaku*, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1996), 356.

and indignation, often directly using such words as *urami* (grudge/resentment).⁶⁹ Compared to Emperor Go-Toba's well-known display of anger and bitterness in his poetry, what few extant records exist suggest that the voice of Sutoku-in, regardless of anger, resentment, or atonement, had not circulated widely in capital while he was alive. Most of Sutoku-in's poems composed in exile were compiled after his death and show Sutoku-in's rather quiet, though lonely, life devoted to Buddhist practice.

Sutoku-in's Onryō in the Making

The exact location, time, and condition of Sutoku-in's death remain surprisingly unknown. Historical accounts and records, such as *Imakagami*, *Hyakurenshō*, *Kōdaiki*, and *Rekidai hen'nen shūsei*, do not provide much information beyond the bare minimum: "Sanuki-in passed away in Sanuki Province on the twenty-sixth day of the eighth month in the second year of Chōkan 長寛 (1164)."⁷⁰ According to *Hyakurenshō*, Go-Shirakawa did not observe any mourning rituals at the time.⁷¹ The lack of records for an ex-emperor is unusual and suggests a cruel indifference toward the former emperor, even though he was considered to be a criminal in exile. This non-mentioning or unnarrated past, however, can tell us a great deal about various perspectives toward Sutoku-in's *onryō* discourse in later periods.

While we can perhaps detect a degree of negligence over Sutoku-in's death, the failure to conduct a proper funeral also indicates that neither Go-Shirakawa nor the court were concerned

⁶⁹ For example, 我こそは新島守よ隠岐の海のあらき浪風心して吹け; いかにせむ葛はふ松のときのまもうらみてふかぬあき風ぞなき。 Gotoba-in, *Gotoba-in entō hyakushu on'uta*, quoted in Seki Yukihiro, "Jōkyū no ran to Gotoba-in," in *Haisha no nihonshi*, vol. 6 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2013), 230–39.

⁷⁰ See *Imakagami*, 153; and *Sutoku Tennō jitsuroku*, 515.

⁷¹ 讃岐院崩于配所四十六、太上皇(後白河)無服仮之儀。 *Hyakurenshō*, in *Kokushi taikei*, vol. 14 (Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1901), 102.

with the threat of any vengeful spirit. Due to the concise, laconic nature of the historical record, we cannot know exactly what *Hyakurenshō* implies by this brief statement of Go-Shirakwa's indifference. This depiction sharply contrasts with the description in *Hōgen monogatari* in which the court was aware of the possibility of Sutoku-in's turning into a grudge-holding monstrous figure even while he was alive.

It would take more than ten years for Sutoku-in's name to surface again in historical accounts or courtier diaries. Towards the end of the 1170s, people in the capital experienced increasingly tumultuous social conditions. Following the Heiji Disturbance, Heian-kyō witnessed spates of chaotic events, including warriors assuming greater political prominence and priests making violent displays. Direct petitions to the court, such as *Kaō no gōso* 嘉応の強訴 (1169–70) and the Shishigatani Incident (*Shishigatani jiken* 鹿ヶ谷事件, 1177), led to the further exiles and executions of several high-ranking aristocrats and priests. According to *Gumaiki* 愚昧記, written by Sanjō Sanefusa 三条実房 (1147–1225), on the ninth day of the fifth month in the third year of Angen (1177), the Minister of the Left, Fujiwara Tsunemune 藤原経宗 (1119–89) shared his suspicion with the Minister of the Right, Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149–1207), that the recent slew of disasters and strange events were caused by the vengeful spirits of Sutoku-in and Fujiwara Yorinaga, who was killed during the Hōgen Disturbance. He suggested the court urgently needed to pacify their spirits.⁷²

One of the direct causes for the court to discover and “recognize” Sutoku-in's vengeful spirit was the Great Fire of Angen (*Angen no taika* 安元の大火) which burned down one third of

⁷² 讃岐院并宇治左府事、可有沙汰云々、是近日天下悪事彼人等所為之由疑、仍為被鎮彼事也、無極大事也云々。Sanjō Sanefusa, *Gumaiki* vol. 2, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2013), 222.

the Heian capital on the twenty-eighth day of the fourth month of the third year of Angen (1177). The fire was unprecedented in scale and destroyed part of the Imperial Palace compound and the Great Audience Hall (Daigokuden 大極殿), one of the most important and sacred symbols of the imperial government. In his *Gyokuyō*, Kujō Kanezane partially accused Go-Shirakawa's rule without virtue to be one of the causes of the Great Fire.⁷³ The rhetoric to connect the ruler's lack of virtue to disastrous and chaotic events relates to traditional beliefs of divine punishment and the acts of vengeful spirits. Fire and destruction inside the Imperial Palace in particular were believed to be divine punishment or the will of vengeful spirits, such as the famous case of Sugawara Michizane's *onryō*'s destroying Seiryōden Palace and killing at least five people in 930.⁷⁴ For several decades after the Great Fire of Angen, the name of Sutoku-in often came up as the vengeful spirit who wrought his wrath upon the capital and required pacification.

We can see how Sutoku-in started to emerge as *onryō* in historical accounts and official narratives in discussions of how to pacify his soul. On the thirteenth day of fifth month of 1177, Sanjō Sanefusa wrote about procedures to propitiate Yorinaga and Sutoku-in, giving specific details for how to pacify Sutoku-in's spirit in particular. The entry reveals that there were, in fact, some pacification plans for Sutoku-in that had been discussed a year earlier but that had now become more urgent after the Great Fire.⁷⁵ On the seventeenth day of fifth month of 1177, the court finally decided to take five actions for the repose of Sutoku-in, largely following the

⁷³ 火災盜賊、大衆兵乱、上下騒動、緇素奔走、誠是乱世之至也、非人力之及所天變雖頻呈、法令敢不改、致殃招災。。。華洛成灰燼、變異之驗、可謂揭焉歟。。。是不致化不行德之所致成云々。Kujō Kanezane, *Kundoku Gyokuyō*, ed. Takahashi Sadaichi, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Takashina Shoten, 1989), 198.

⁷⁴ Yamada Yūji also explains several incidents in which fires were blamed on vengeful spirits. See *Sutokuin onryō no kenkyū*, 114.

⁷⁵ Sanjō Sanefusa, *Gumaiki*, vol. 2, 223.

precedent of Emperor Sudō (750–785).⁷⁶ Among the five acts, two especially stand out. The official articles state that Sutoku-in's tomb (*bo* 墓) would be called an Imperial Mausoleum (*ryō* 陵) and surrounded with a purified moat with gates to protect the mausoleum (以彼御墓所勅称山陵、其辺掘埴不令汚穢...令守御陵事). The order continues that *onmyō* masters would be sent there along with Buddhist priests to appease his spirit (遣陰陽師令鎮山陵、同遣僧侶令轉經事).⁷⁷ As Inaba Yōko's study shows, the laws and codes for imperial mausoleums and tombs were hierarchical and complicated under the Ritsuryō Code. The difference between a mausoleum (*ryō* 陵) and a tomb (*bo* 墓) were strictly defined and categorized, though there were always controversial changes depending on the political climate. Such controversial issues include who can be buried in a *ryō* (typically the Emperor, Empress, Empress Consort and often direct decedents of the Emperor) and whether sites required gates, moats, and guards.⁷⁸ Following the example of the pacification of vengeful spirits of Emperor Sudō and Princess Inoe/Inoue (717–775) whose tombs were renamed as Imperial Mausoleums, Sutoku-in's tomb also officially became an Imperial Mausoleum.⁷⁹ At the same time, this decision by the court to worship Sutoku-in's soul meant that his name was now proverbially on the “vengeful spirit” list, which meant he was to be feared and required appeasement by Buddhist priests and *onmyō* masters who frequently practiced such pacification rituals.

⁷⁶ 讃岐院并宇治左府事、明日可令進云々、今日已清書了、院五个事。。。院御事崇道天王之例多之載。Sanjō Sanefusa, *Gumaiki*, vol. 2, 226. Haramizu Tamiki has discussed a few aristocrats' calls for the reinstatement of Sutoku-in's status even before the Great Fire of Angen. See his “Sutoku-in no fukken,” *Kokugakuin zasshi* 87, no. 8 (August 1986): 34–46.

⁷⁷ Sanjō Sanefusa, *Gumaiki*, vol. 2, 226.

⁷⁸ See Inaba Yōko, “Engi shoryōryōshiki ryōbo rekimei ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu,” *Shikan*, no. 166 (March 2012): 1–21.

⁷⁹ 日本紀略 延暦19年(800)七月己未条 詔曰。云々。宣故皇太子早良親王追稱崇道天皇。故廢皇后井上内親王追腹稱皇后。其墓並山稱山陵。令近衛少将大伴是也。率陰陽師衆僧。鎮謝在淡路國崇道天皇山陵。 *Nihon kiryaku*, vol. 10, 275.

Further confirmation of Sutoku-in's "onryō status" can be seen in his new posthumous title, Sutoku Tennō 崇徳天皇, changed from the rather disgraceful name, Sanuki-in 讃岐院, based on the location of his exile. *Hyakurenshō* clearly uses the word "onryō 怨霊" when detailing the court's decision to call him Sutoku-in instead of Sanuki-in, explaining that "since his onryō has unsettled all the land, Sanuki-in was given title of Sutoku-in."⁸⁰ According to *Gyokueiki shō* 玉英記抄, written by Ichijō Kanera 一条兼良 (1402–81), the character, *toku* 徳, (literary meaning virtuous, moral, and good), was traditionally used for posthumous titles to placate restless and angry souls of emperors who died of indignation while in exile outside of the capital, including Emperors Sutoku 崇徳, Antoku 安德 (1178–85), Kentoku 顕徳 (or Go-Toba), and Juntoku 順徳 (1197–1242).⁸¹

While the official pacification service was performed, Kujō Kanezane made some interesting remarks regarding the court-led pacification service that reveal the nature of *onryō* as deeply rooted in kinship. On the twenty-ninth day of the seventh month in the midst of the Minister of the Left, Fujiwara Tsunemune, leading the effort to deal with Sutoku-in's *onryō*, Kanezane wrote that the matter of giving posthumous titles and conducting other services was especially important for the imperial family (*chōke* 朝家) and required careful deliberation. At the same time, this process was a private [family] matter for the Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa and not for "others" to interfere.⁸²

⁸⁰ 讃岐院奉号崇徳院。。。事宣下、天下不静、依有彼怨霊也。 *Hyakurenshō*, in *Kokushi taikei*, vol. 14 (Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1901), 126.

⁸¹ 先院被奉号後醍醐院云々、代々如此之院、被用徳字（崇—安—顕—順—等也）、今度御号殊勝珍重也、可叶尊霊叡情歟、Ichijō Kanera, *Gyokueiki shō*, in *Zoku shiryō taisei*, vol. 18, ed. Takeuchi Rizō (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1979), 79.

⁸² 已是朝家大事也、尤可有議、而無左右被行之、如何之由、世人傾奇云々、余案此事、偏可在叡慮、他人不可申是非事也、Kujō Kanezane, *Kundoku Gyokyō*, ed. Takahashi Sadaichi, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Takashina Shoten, 1989), 260.

Kanezane's emphasis on dealing with *onryō* as a family matter, especially as Go-Shirakawa's personal business, exposes many unspoken assumptions. For one, Kanezane reinforced the rhetoric that the dead, especially angry and vengeful spirits, must be properly reposed and worshipped by the descendants of the dead. In case of a member of the imperial family, it was even more important that those who held the highest power, such as the current Emperor or Retired Emperor, also take part in the pacification rituals. Since Go-Shirakawa held power as a Retired Emperor at this point, it was perhaps natural to assume that, as the power holder, Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa's personal involvement in Sutoku-in's service was essential. However, since *onryō* were believed to haunt political enemies who brought the tragedy upon them, it was the responsibility of these "enemies" to bring justice and to pacify the restless spirit. Kanezane's words, thus, also subtly pointed out Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa's responsibility for Sutoku-in's becoming *onryō* and the disastrous events caused by Sutoku-in's spirit.

The narrative of blaming disasters, whether political or natural, on the rampancy of Sutoku-in's *onryō* persisted even after attempts to restore Sutoku-in's honor and status. Various unprecedented incidents caused by the rise of the Taira family drew the whole capital into a maelstrom of upheaval. On the fourteenth day of the eleventh month of the third year of Jishō (1179), Taira Kiyomori launched a coup d'état and confined Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa inside his Toba residence, which effectively incapacitated his cloistered government. The Taira's prosperity did not last, however; they soon suffered losses in battles, executions, and further tragedies one after another. In 1183, the Taira family went to ruin and the eight-year-old Emperor Antoku drowned and died at Dan no ura.

In the midst of such political and social disorder, the Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa, instead of praying for the Heike, proposed to build a shrine (*shinshi* 神祠) to worship Sutoku-in on the fifteenth day of eighth month of 1183. Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa proposed to build a shrine in Seishō-ji temple because the rebellion, chaos, and confusion that reigned over the realm was caused by Sutoku-in's vengeful spirit, according to Kanezane. Another issue was whether the shrine be called *sha* 社 or *byō* 廟. Since Hachiman Shrine and Kitano Shrine were called *bō*, it was decided that Sutoku-in's shrine should follow their example.⁸³ This explanation helps identify Sutoku-in as a legendary powerful *onryō* and to deify him as an august spirit (*goryō*) since both Kitano Shrine and Hachiman Shrine worshipped and deified gods who were once human beings. As Hachiman Shrine and Kitano Shrine enshrined legendary Emperor Ōjin and the most famous *onryō*/ *goryō* Sugawara Michizane respectively, Sutoku-in officially gained not only powerful *onryō* and *goryō* status equivalent to the most feared Sugawara Michizane but also became the first historical human emperor to be deified as a god (legendary emperors such as Emperor Ōjin notwithstanding). In the end, it was decided that the shrine should be called Sutoku-in *byō*, and on the fifteenth day of the fourth month of the following year, Sutoku-in *byō* was built at Kasuga Gawara 春日河原, the site where the battles during the Hōgen Disturbance were fought and where Sutoku-in once resided.⁸⁴

While elevating Sutoku-in's *onryō* status to one of the most powerful vengeful spirits surely demonstrated the anxiety and concern of Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa towards his brother whom he exiled in the past, this act also displayed the Retired Emperor's power. Go-

⁸³ 寿永二年八月十五日 [藤原]光長来、伝院宣云、成勝寺之内、可被立神祠之由所思食也、其故者、近曾以来乱逆連綿、天下不静、依彼冤霊、有此災難之由、世之所思也、仍為令蕩其靈魂、立神祠、可待影降之由。。。此事社敷廟敷、准八幡宮、及北野宮例等者、可為廟敷云々。

Kujō Kanezane, *Kundoku Gyokyō*, ed. Takahashi Sadaichi, vol. 5 (Tokyo: Takashina Shoten 1989), 191.

⁸⁴ Yoshida Tsunefusa, *Kikki*, edited by Takahashi Hideki, vol. 3 (Osaka: Izumi Shoin, 2006), 143.

Shirakawa successfully housed an enraged, rampant, and invisible spirit drifting in exile into a small shrine inside the capital where people could now worship and pray for him. After all, fear towards Sutoku-in could also represent awe and fear toward the imperial family who generated these vengeful spirits and possessed the means and power to suppress them. Yoshida Tsunefusa 吉田経房 (1142–1200) wrote in his *Kikki* 吉記 that, despite all of the rebellions and upheavals caused by Sutoku-in's vengeful spirit, "Amaterasu no Ōmikami's protection possibly does not come due to [Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa's] karma from his previous life" (天照太神不令奉守給、雖先世御果報).⁸⁵

Nearly all the actors here, victim, aggressor, or guardian, were members of the imperial family. This narrative thus reinforced the rhetoric that the imperial family's power could both destroy and save the land. In this context, Kanezane's claim that the pacification of Sutoku-in was Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa's "family" matter unveils multilayered meanings, reinforcing the cycle of *onryō*, which not only was systematically mediated through the political predicaments of the time but also capable of being domesticated, providing family legitimacy and political authority for the imperial family.

Eight years seem to have quietly passed after Sutoku-in's *byō* was initially built. The next time his name began to appear frequently in historical records was in 1191 when Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa became seriously ill.⁸⁶ The court again started to consider the possibility

⁸⁵ 今年鬭諍堅固、当百卅三年、而保元已後連々雖有逆乱、何時可及今度哉、於根本者、故不記是、偏是讃岐院怨靈之所為歟、天照太神不令奉守給、雖先世御果報、可悲可嘆、筆端雖及、後代有恐。Yoshida, *Kikki*, vol. 3, 115.

⁸⁶ Since my study focuses on the reception of Sutoku-in and his vengeful spirit primarily in the capital and within court culture, I have not included various sources found in Sanuki province where he was worshipped in a local context. See Yamada Yūji, *Onryō, kiai, Ise Jingū*, 126; Yamauchi Masujirō, "Sutoku-in iryō," in his *Imakagami no shūhen* (Ōsaka: Izumi Shoin, 1993), 2–38; and Haramizu Tamiki, "Sutoku-in shinkō shi," *Gengo bunka kenkyū*, vol. 4 (February 1997): 1–25.

of the return of Sutoku-in's *onryō*, and perhaps, Emperor Antoku's *onryō*'s return as well. Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa ordered the building of shrines in Sanuki Province and Nagato Province where they each passed away. At his sickbed, Go-Shirakawa also ordered that the shrines should be dedicated for the dead who lost their lives during battle.⁸⁷ Three months after he ordered the shrines be built, Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa passed away on the thirteenth day of the third month of 1192, and the general fear towards Sutoku-in seemed to gradually decrease. However, as the country was constantly experiencing political upheavals and instability after Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa's passing and Minamoto Yoritomo's (1147–99) establishment of the so-called first military shogunate in Kamakura in 1192, the chaos and bloodshed that accompanied the rise of the military were often linked to the restless and angry dead, especially Sutoku-in. In 1204, Jien wrote the following in his *Daisenpōin jōjō kishō no koto* 大饑法院条々起請事:

[A]fter the Hōgen disturbance, vengeful spirits are all over the realm...only the law of Buddha can placate these restless spirits ... including the sacred soul of Sutoku-in and the vengeful spirit of Chisoku-in [Fujiwara Tadazane] and thus guard the imperial family... [The law of Buddha] will pacify these vengeful and restless spirits, rectifying their evil to righteousness and bestowing peace instead of suffering.”⁸⁸

Sutoku-in, who died quietly in exile far away from the capital, was imagined repeatedly to return to wreak havoc as a vengeful spirit so often so that his restless vengeful spirit reigned over the

⁸⁷ 建久二年閏十二月十四日 今日、頗御痢病有隙之由所示也、崇徳院并安德天皇等崩御之所建一堂、可資彼御菩提并亡命之士卒滅罪之勝因事、可申沙汰之由、仰泰經了。Kujō Kanezane, *Kundoku gyokyō*, vol. 8, 119.

⁸⁸ 然保元以後乱世之今、怨靈満一天亡卒在四海、雖然未聞拔濟之徳政、濟度彼怨靈扶助此朝家、唯在仏法之法力、＜略＞就中崇徳院聖霊・知足院怨霊＜略＞然則怨霊亡卒之満国、依作善之廻向、捨邪正、拔苦与楽、仏法王法之告時、以仏神之冥助転禍為福、安穩太平祈願。Takakusu Junjirō and Kaigyoku Watanabe ed. “Monyōki,” in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō zuzōbu*, vol. 12 (Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924), 12.

land. He was even believed to be behind the military shogunate, aiming to ruin his very own family—the imperial family.

Narrating *Hōgen Monogatari*

This section explores how Sutoku-in is narrated (and/or unnarrated) in *Hōgen monogatari*, which played a large role in recreating Sutoku-in's furious *onryō*. I will first briefly introduce *Hōgen monogatari* and then analyze its opening to see how Sutoku-in is excluded from the imperial genealogy. I will then consider the role of the narrator in reading the episode in which Sutoku-in swears to become an evil spirit that would destroy the imperial family and the realm. In total, I will argue that it was not necessarily losing a battle or throne that made Sutoku-in one of the most powerful *onryō* but his being exiled and displaced from his genealogy, history, and temporality that enabled him to escape from the imperial system's domestication and control.

The collection of texts that we label as *Hōgen monogatari* can be listed along other so-called war-tales, including early works such as *Shōmon-ki* 将門記 and *Mutsuwa-ki* 陸奥話記, as a text that deals primarily with wars, warriors, and the dead. Yet, the famous series of medieval texts that we tend to categorize as war-tales or what Japanese scholars call *gunki monogatari* 軍記物語, including *Heiji monogatari* 平治物語 and *Heike monogatari* 平家物語, were not always titled as they are today.⁸⁹ *Heike monogatari* was believed to have once been called *Jishō monogatari* 治承物語, meaning “the tale of the period of Jishō,” rather than the “tale of the Heike family.” Similarly, *Hōgen monogatari* and *Heiji monogatari* were also variously called

⁸⁹ Yamashita Hiroaki, “Katarimono ni okeru ‘katar’ no kōzō: Gunki monogatari o chūshin ni,” *Bungaku* vol. 27, no. 11 (November 1978): 17.

Records of Hōgen (*Hōgen-ki* 保元記) and *Records of Heiji* (*Heiji-ki* 平治記). In other words, these “tales” were not always so clearly labeled as such in earlier periods.

Until the late nineteenth century, these war-tales tended to be considered works of history rather than literature.⁹⁰ The series of three war tales mentioned above, followed by later works such as *Taiheiki* 太平記 written in late fourteenth century, were an important part of a historical and ethical discourse which legitimized the rise and rule of warrior governments from the Kamakura bakufu to the Tokugawa regime. The eventual solidification of the title of “*monogatari*” did not seem to conflict with the concept of “history,” as there are many Edo-period books entitled “*Heike monogatari*.” During the Meiji restoration, which scrambled to “modernize” the nation from politics, military, and society to education and art, *gunki* emerged as a genre of literature, which itself was also a newly invented concept.⁹¹ Meiji literary scholars such as Haga Yaichi (1867–1927) and Fujiwara Sakutarō (1870–1910), effectively diverted a sort of anti-imperial tilt to present these *gunki monogatari*, especially *The Tale of the Heike*, as court-centered, aestheticized, and religionized classic pieces of literature, all while continuing to dwell on the epic-like qualities of warrior narratives focusing on self-sacrifice, loyalty, and tragedies. *Gunki monogatari*, therefore, historically and politically oscillate between history and literature while maintaining the title *monogatari*, or “tales.”

⁹⁰ For a detailed study on the canonization of *Heike monogatari*, or *gunki monogatari* in general, see David Bialock, “Nation and Epic: *The Tale of the Heike* as Modern Classic,” in *Inventing the Classics: Modernity, National Identity, and Japanese Literature*, ed. Haruo Shirane and Tomi Suzuki (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 151–78.

⁹¹ In the early years of the Meiji period, *gunki monogatari*, including *Hōgen*, *Heiji*, *Genpei Seisuiiki*, *Heike*, and *Taiheiki*, were still required “history” textbooks. In 1868, a curriculum for history classes for Shōhei Gakkō 昌平学校, one of the first public schools established by the Meiji government, separated reading for the Shintō canon or *shinten* 神典, such as *Rikkokushi* 六国史 and *Eiga monogatari*, and history. This reflects an early transition of *gunki* from history to literature. See Tochigi Yoshitada, “Sōseiki Hōgen monogatari kenkysūshi no kōsatsu,” in *Hōgen monogatari no keisei*, ed. Kajiwarra Masaaki and Tochigi Yoshitada (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1997), 10–12.

Whether these texts were considered “history” or “literature,” one of the important aspects for *monogatari* to be *monogatari*, which I discussed in Chapter One, is they must be told by a narrator or narrators. For instance, in *Genji monogatari*, the narrator(s) identified themselves as a ladies-in-waiting who are re-telling stories that they have heard and/or witnessed. As I have argued, the narrators of *Genji monogatari* embody the voices and perspectives of *mononoke* and are similar to the ambiguous nature of *mononoke* in that they can never be reduced to a single identity. The similarity between *mononoke* and the narrator is not only their perspective but their presence and absence, as well as their ability to merge with the characters, as if characters are possessed or inhabited by *mononoke*.

It is in this style of narration that we can see a connection between war tales and earlier *monogatari*. Prominent *gunki monogatari* specialist, Hyōdō Hiromi, argues that the word *monogatari* モノ語り (literally the telling of stories of/by *mono*) was motivated by and derived from the concept of stories that are narrated by *mononoke* モノノケ, an idea that especially resonates with medieval war-tales since the stories and narrators mediate the voices of the losers of battles and the dead.⁹² Hyōdō’s work further explores the ritualistic performances of *biwa hōshi*, mediums who pacify the restless souls of the dead by retelling these narratives. The earliest record that indicates *Hōgen monogatari* was performed by *biwa hōshi* is an instruction for oral performance, *Futsū shōdōshū* 普通唱導集, written in 1297.⁹³ As many scholars agree, the nascent form of these war-tales were recorded by priests or people associated with Buddhist temples, such as Jien’s *Daipōhōin* 大懺法院. Accompanied by a Japanese lute (*biwa*), war-tales

⁹² Hyōdō Hiromi, *Ōken to monogatari* (Tokyo: Seikyūsha, 1989), 49.

⁹³ 琵琶法師 伏惟 々々々々勾當 平治保元平家之物語 何皆暗而無滯 音響気色容儀之鉢骨 共是麗而有興。 *Futsū shōdōshū: Honkoku, kaisetsu*, ed. Murayama Shūichi (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2006), 42–43.

further evolved as they were recited and performed over generations. In Kyoto, in particular, *biwa hōshi* mainly recited war-tales at shrines, temples, and places of worship; elsewhere, they stood at crossroads under oiled parasols, whose shadows represented a sacred space.⁹⁴ Hyōdō asserts that since the *biwa hōshi* were engaged in rituals to placate unsettled spirits attached to this world by mediating their voices, *gunki monogatari* are inseparable not only from the act of spirit placation but also from the very essence of “*mono 霊 gatari*,” which captures the voices of the dead and *mononoke/onryō* in its narration⁹⁵

I will now explore how *Hōgen monogatari* narrates Sutoku-in and mediates his *onryō*. This focus shows how the text destabilizes our comprehension of meanings and our certainty of existence (presence/absence), time (past/present/future), and identities, including kinship. This narrative style contributes to elevating Sutoku-in’s *onryō* as the fiercest revenant spirit who repeatedly comes back to haunt us.

Before turning to the *Hōgen* text, recall that in reading historical accounts that formed the basis of the first half of this chapter, I used the term *onryō* rather than *mononoke*, following linguistic cues from the sources. In addition to the increased usage of *onryō* in medieval texts compared to the early Heian official records, as I discussed in my introduction, simply put, the main difference between the term *mononoke* and *onryō* is whether the identities of the spirits were determined or not. Since the historical documents here clearly and consistently identify the troublesome “spirit” who had been causing trouble as Sutoku-in, I used the term *onryō* to

⁹⁴ Pierre-François Souyri, *The World Turned Upside Down: Medieval Japanese Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 82. For more on *biwa hōshi* and their performances, see David Bialock, *Eccentric Spaces, Hidden Histories: Narrative, Ritual, and Royal Authority from The Chronicles of Japan to The Tale of the Heike* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007); and Bialock, “Biwa Masters and Musical Hierophanies in the *Heike monogatari* and Other Medieval Texts,” *Journal of Religion in Japan*, no. 2 (2013): 119–51.

⁹⁵ Hyōdō Hiromi, *Biwa hōshi: Ikai o kataru hitobito* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2009), 52–90.

describe the attributed spirit. Hyōdō's use of the term *mononoke* does not seem to differentiate this point, and he uses *mononoke* as a broader word to include dead spirits and living vengeful spirits (*ikiryō*) regardless of whether or not they had been identified. However, in reading *Hōgen monogatari*, I will use the term *mononoke* for ambiguous and unidentified spirit(s) while keeping *onryō* for identified spirits unless noted otherwise.

Revisiting Voices from the Past and Nowhere: The Revenant Beginnings of *Monogatari*

Hōgen monogatari is a haunted text in similar way that all *monogatari* are haunted by voices and textual traces from the past—these are stories that begin by coming back. Recall how the famous opening phrase, *Izure no ontoki ni ka* いづれの御時にか, which is commonly interpreted as “which emperor's/whose reign was it (we are not quite sure)?” and sets up temporal ambiguity as well as spatial uncertainty. In contrast, *Hōgen monogatari* actually is very conscious about the spacio-temporal location of the story in its opening.⁹⁶ In fact, the title itself, whether *Hōgen monogatari* or *Hōgenki*, specifies the time of the Hōgen era which lasted for about three years between the twenty-seventh day of the fourth month of 1156 and the twentieth day of the fourth month of 1159 under Emperor Toba's reign. More often than not, *Hōgen monogatari* is understood as the tale of the “Hōgen Disturbance” as seen in the title of such work as *Hōgen monogatari: Tale of the Disorder in Hōgen* translated by William R. Wilson.⁹⁷ Yet, as Nonaka Tesshō rightly points out, *Hōgen monogatari* should not be understood as thematically or temporally confined to the Hōgen Disturbance itself and must be read as a text that narrates the *monogatari* of the Hōgen time period including the events well before and after the Hōgen

⁹⁶ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, SNKBZ, 20: 17.

⁹⁷ *Tale of the Disorder in Hōgen: Hōgen monogatari*, trans. William R. Wilson (Ithaca, NY: East Asian Program, Cornell University, 2001).

Disturbance, which occurred on the tenth day of seventh month of 1156.⁹⁸ As Jien famously claims,

When Retired Emperor Toba died on the second day of the seven month of 1156, the rebellions of the realm of Japan (*Nihonkoku no rangyaku* 日本國ノ乱逆) broke out and Japan's Military Age (*musa no yo* 武者ノ世) had begun.

保元々年七月二日鳥羽院ウセサセ給ヒテ後。日本國ノ乱逆ト云コトハヲコリテ後。ムサノ世ニナリニケル也ケリ。⁹⁹

Hōgen monogatari, therefore, is a narrative of this transition that affected society long after. The text chooses to go back to the birth of Retired Emperor Toba and even reminds readers of his genealogy stretching far off to antiquity to frame the events leading up to the Hōgen Disturbance. The opening of *Hōgen monogatari* starts with the description of Retired Emperor Toba's reign:

In recent times, there was an emperor by the name Retired Cloistered Zenjō Emperor Toba. He was the seventy-fourth in succession from Emperor Jinmu, the forty-sixth descendant of Tenshō Daijin [or Amaterasu no Ōmikami]. He was the first son of the Emperor Horikawa, and his mother was the late Empress Consort Dowager, who was a daughter of the Major Counselor Lord Fujiwara Sanesuke, the third-generation of a grandson of the Grand Minister. Born on the sixteenth day of the first month in the fifth year of Kōwa (1103), he was made the heir apparent to the throne. On the ninth day of the seventh month of the second year of Kashō (1107), Emperor Horikawa passed away and [Emperor Toba] took the throne at five years of age on the same year. During his reign for sixteen years, the land was very quiet and peaceful as the weather followed the seasons, the rain and the wind as well as the cold and the heat. On the twentieth day of the first month of the year of Hōan (1124), at the age of twenty-one, he abdicated the throne to his first prince, who was later called Sanuki-in after his exile. After the Retired Emperor Shirakawa passed away on the seventh day of the seventh month of the fourth year of Daiji (1129), the Retired Emperor reigned and ruled the realm. By not only rewarding those who were loyal but also treating those criminals who were guilty with benevolence, he did not deviate from the precedents of the sage and sacred sovereigns of the imperial reign, and he followed the fundamental sword of great compassion and mercy. Therefore, illuminated by his warm and benevolent light, the whole land was fertile. The land was enriched, and everyone was at ease and peace.

近曾、帝王御座キ。御名ヲバ鳥羽ノ禪定法皇トゾ申ス。天照大神四捨六世ノ御末、神武天皇ヨリ七十四代の御門帝ナリ。堀河ノ天皇ノ第一ノ皇子、御母ハ贈皇太后宮トテ、閑院ノ太政大臣仁義三世孫大納言実季卿ノ御娘。康和五年正月十六

⁹⁸ Nonaka Tesshō, *Hōgen monogatari no seiritsu* (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2016), 4–5.

⁹⁹ Jien, *Gukanshō*, NKBT, 86: 206.

日ニ御誕生、同年秋八月十七日、皇太子ニ立セ給フ。嘉承二年七月九日、堀河天皇カクレサセ給シカバ、則、五歳ニテ踐祚、踐祚御在位十六ヶ年ノ間、海内シヅカニシテ天下ヲダヤカナリキ。風雨時ニシタガヒ、寒暑ヲリヲアヤマタズ。御年廿一ニシテ保安四年正月廿八日、御位ヲノガレテ、第一ノ親王ニ讓奉ラセ給ヒケリ。配流ノ後讃岐院是也。大治四年七月七日、白河院カクレサセ給テヨリ以来、天下ノ事ヲ知食ス。忠アル者ヲバ賞シ給、聖代聖皇ノ先規ニモタガハズ、罪アル者ヲバナダメ給、大慈大悲ノ本誓ニモ叶ヘリ。サレバニヤ恩光ニテラサレ、徳沢ニルルヲヒテ、国富ミ、民安カリキ。¹⁰⁰

Unlike *Genji monogatari*, the narrator does not reveal his/her identity. Not much study has been done analyzing the narrator(s) and narrative voices in *Hōgen monogatari* compared to the vast scholarship available on *Genji monogatari*. However, the basic structure and function of narration in *Hōgen monogatari* seems to be a single narrator who tells the stories to imagined listeners.¹⁰¹ The narrator's gender is unspecified, but he is commonly assumed to be a man. This conjuncture is based on the expressions and language the narrator uses, especially in the gruesome descriptions of battles and executions. The narrator often indicates that these details were learned as common historical knowledge, and yet we can still find a *mononoke*-like narrator, one who can travel with characters to witness the events firsthand, whose mind is able

¹⁰⁰ *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 4–5. Variants of *Hōgen monogatari* include the oldest Nakarai-bon, Bunpō-bon, Kamakura-bon, Kyōzu-hon, Konpira-bon, and Rufu-bon. There are slight differences in the opening phrases as well as texts as a whole. For example, some variants published during the Edo period as well as the modern period include a Preface that changes the very first word of the opening phrase. I primarily use *Naikakubunkozō Nakarai-bon* in *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* (SNKBT) and Yōmei-bon kei in *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* (SNKBZ) unless otherwise noted. For further studies on variants, see Haramizu Tamiki, *Hōgen monogatari keitō, denpō kō* (Osaka: Izumi Shoin, 2016) and *Hōgen monogatari no keisei*. ed. Tochigi Toshitada, Kajihara Masaaki, Yamashita Hiroaki, and Hasegawa Tadashi (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1997).

¹⁰¹ For more on narrators and narrative voices in *Hōgen monogatari*, see Andō Yoshie, “Nakarai-bon *Hōgen monogatari* ni okeru Sutoku-in no rekihizuke kara no sogai ni tsuite,” *Gunki to katarimono*, vol. 28 (March 1992): 1–12; Nonaka Tesshō, *Hōgen monogatari no seiritsu* (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2016); Tochigi Yoshitada, “Bungaku no hōhō to shitenō ‘katarī’: Nakarai-bon, Kamakura-bon, Konpira-bon *Hōgen monogatari* o taishō to shite,” in his *Gunki monogatari keisei josetsu* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002), 278–316; and Yamashita Hiroaki, “Katarimono ni okeru ‘katarī’ no kōzō: Gunki monogatari o chūshin ni,” *Bungaku*, 27, no. 11 (November 1978): 17–26.

to enter those of the characters they are narrating. But first, let us go back to closely read the opening.

The narrator of the text begins with a record of the emperor and his family tree, called *teiki* 帝紀. This style was commonly used in historical records such as *Nihon shoki* and *rekishi monogatari*, including *Ōkagami* and *Imakagami*. In this family tree, however, we can immediately find Sutoku-in's ghost-like “unbelonging” in his genealogy and timeline. As mentioned, *Hōgen monogatari* is typically very conscious about time. In the opening line that states “there was an emperor” (*teiō owashimashiki* 帝王御座キ), the *ki* キ clearly implies that this happened in the past. In a similar way, the opening also emphasizes that the events took place “in recent times” (*chikakikoro* 近曾). Compared to many earlier *monogatari*, which usually start with phrases stating that the narrative happened in the distant past, such as “once there was a man...” (*mukashi otoko arikeri*) or “now it is a long time ago” (*ima wa mukashi*), which indicate a far distant past, the *Hōgen* narrator reminds the listener that the stories happened in the near past of the time that the listeners/readers reside in. At the same time, the very statement, “in recent times, there was an emperor 近曾、帝王御座キ” also foregrounds the ultimate and timeless “truth” and universal “fact” of society under imperial rule, recent or not.

Following the *teiki* style, the narrator relates Retired Emperor Toba's genealogy. He provides a detailed life history starting with ancestral gods Tenshō Daijin and Emperor Jimmu, his emperor father, mothers, and the dates of his birth, his becoming Crown Prince, accession to the throne, abdication of the throne (establishing a cloistered government) and taking the tonsure. Needless to say, narrating one's genealogy and genealogical roots is not limited to historical records or war-tales. *Monogatari* in general provide characters' genealogical records as seen in *Genji monogatari*, which introduces Emperor Kiritsubo and Kiritsubo consort, the mother of

Genji. With clichéd rhetoric and praise, *Hōgen monogatari* evidently locates the Retired Emperor Toba's life and legitimizes his reign by placing him within the imperial line and its rule. The significance of this imperial genealogy of reign and rulership is further emphasized as the text continues to extol his achievements. As the narrator puts it, he followed the path of the “precedents of the sage and sacred sovereigns of the imperial reign” 聖代聖皇ノ先規.

Following this paragraph, the text introduces Emperor Konoe's biography in the same manner of his father, detailing his mother, (Bifukumon-in), his birth date, his ascension to Crown Prince and Emperor, as well as the date of his death.

This almost indiscriminate praise for Retired Emperor Toba and the genealogical details provided for both Retired Emperor Toba and Emperor Konoe sharply contrast with the description of Sutoku-in. The narrator does not provide any genealogical details about Sutoku-in and only mentions him within the context of Toba's life story. More precisely, within genealogical sections of the text, Sutoku-in is only referred to as supplemental to Retired Emperor Toba's abdication. Sutoku-in's mother's name, his date of birth, and his abdication remain unnarrated. The narrator provides only the fact that Sutoku-in was exiled and disgracefully called Sanuki-in. Sutoku-in's exile and death far away from the capital are already foreshadowed even before the *monogatari* begins, and the story that follows already invokes the voices of the dead.

Despite Sutoku-in being a major character in *Hōgen monogatari*, his genealogy or biography go unnarrated. In stark contrast, even the members of the Fujiwara in the tale are given genealogical and biographical introductions when they first enter the tale—a common narrative technique seen in many premodern texts. This absence of an introduction, namely his genealogy and biography, in Sutoku-in's case is palpable. We see that from beginning, through

the lack of narration of his genealogical and ancestral associations, in addition to being called “Sanuki-in,” Sutoku-in’s existence floats away from the imperial genealogy, imperial rule, and Heian-kyō.

The text displaces Sutoku-in from the imperial genealogy and the realm structured by the Imperial system. Recall that we have seen how hauntings can help create genealogies, legitimize familial ties, and elevate the family status. Here we see a sort of inverse, another force of haunting—removal from genealogy. This kind of haunting through initial removal was one of the elements that created an ungovernable *onryō*, whose being was not confined to his family line.

Sutoku-in is temporally located somewhere within the narrative of Retired Emperor Toba’s past, an oddity given the typically time-conscious *Hōgen monogatari*. Sutoku-in is consciously “displaced” in the story. This displacement contributes to generate the haunting figure of Sutoku-in’s vengeful spirit. However, I should point out that this attempt to remove him from the imperial genealogy and imperial rule ironically comes back to haunt the imperial house even more when they fail to domesticate his vengeful and angry spirit. In this sense, *Hōgen monogatari* greatly contributes to the emergence of the most monstrous and haunting vengeful spirit in Japanese history that even the imperial family could not entirely control.

Sutoku-in’s displacement in *monogatari* is not limited to the legitimate imperial genealogy, its reign, or physical site of the ruling, but also to chronology and the imperial calendar, which was a major part of the court’s power and control.¹⁰² Andō Yoshie compares how Retired Emperor Toba and Sutoku-in are narrated in terms of timelines of events, and with only a few exceptions, the text does not provide exact dates or times for Sutoku-in’s actions. The

¹⁰² For a more detailed study on imperial rule, power, and time/calendar management under the Ritsuryō system, see Hosoi Hiroshi, “Jikan, koyomi to tennō.” In *Tennō to ōken o kangaeru*, vol. 8 *Kosumorojii to karada*, ed. Amino Yoshihiko, 127–50.

readers can only learn the dates and timing of Sutoku-in's movements based on Retired Emperor Toba, Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa, and their allies' actions and affairs despite the normal *teiki* and chronicle style that *Hōgen monogatari* employs.¹⁰³ This removal of the dates and timeline from Sutoku-in's narrative cannot be due to a lack of historical information or confusion since many historical accounts and courtier diaries provide the dates, occasionally based on the sexagenary cycle, to reconstruct Sutoku-in's life even during the Hōgen Disturbance and his exile. I contend that the text's choice of removal of the dates and times for Sutoku-in's episodes generates a great tension. On the one hand, this absence reaffirms Sutoku-in's being ousted from the imperial system and family. On the other hand, this absence further dehumanizes Sutoku-in and displaces him from the spatial and temporal realm into an incorporeal space beyond control of imperial rule.

Particularly for the first couple of episodes beyond the introduction, the narrator provides detailed dates tracing Retired Emperor Toba and Emperor Konoe's actions while keeping Sutoku-in's ambiguous timeline.¹⁰⁴ For example, after providing details and dates of Emperor Konoe's birth, his becoming a Crown Prince and taking throne, Sutoku-in suddenly appears, in

¹⁰³ Andō Yoshie, "Nakarai-bon *Hōgen monogatari* ni okeru Sutoku-in no rekihizuke kara no sogai ni tsuite," *Gunki to katarimono*, vol. 28 (March 1992): 1–12.

¹⁰⁴ Just listing the dates and associated events below, we can see how Sutoku-in does not appear as a subject of action.

「保延五年五月十八日、美福門院。。。御腹近衛院御誕生、」
「同年八月十七日、東宮ニ立奉ラセ給テ、」
「永治元年十二月七日、三歳ニテ御即位アリ。」
「先帝ヲバ新院トゾ申ス。。。カカリケレバ、御恨残ケルニヤ一院 [鳥羽]・新院父子ノ御中、不快ト聞エシ。」
「永治七月十日、[鳥羽]一院御グシヲロサセ給ヒケリ。。。」
「久寿二年七月廿三日ハカラザルニ近衛院カクレサセ給ヌ。」
「久寿二年冬頃、[鳥羽]法皇熊野へ御参詣アリケリ。」
「保元元年春ノ頃ヨリ[鳥羽]法皇、ツネニ御悩有リ。」
「同七月二日法皇終ニ隠サセヒケリ。」 *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBZ, 41: 214–23.

an ambiguous sentence: “Therefore (カカリケレバ), I heard that the relationship between the father (Retired Emperor Toba) and the son (Sutoku-in) was not going well.”¹⁰⁵ Conventionally, the date of Sutoku-in’s his own abdication should have been recorded given its importance in the tale. In addition, between Sutoku-in’s taking throne, depicted in the context of Retired Emperor Toba’s biography, and Emperor Konoe’s ascension, there is no mention of Sutoku-in’s rule either. The text seems to remove the significance of Sutoku-in’s reign, his sovereign legitimacy, and achievements. Sutoku-in’s existence in time and space is ambiguous if not entirely absent from the calendrical and imperial discourse. This echoes Derrida’s statement that “haunting is historical ... but it is not dated, it is never docilely given a date in the chain of presents, day after day, according to the institute order of a calendar”¹⁰⁶ The time of the “spectre,” the revenant *onryō* is always already disjoined from itself and time, that is a kind of “non-contemporaneity of present time with itself.”¹⁰⁷ Sutoku-in’s unbelonging to the present/contemporary time as well as historical calendar in the narrative ultimately may represent his revenant status as an *onryō* that repeatedly comes back to haunt the present.

Interestingly, however, Sutoku-in is finally given a date for his actions only after he lost the battle and was exiled. After the text states the date of the battle as the eleventh day of the seventh month, it continues: “Go-Shirakawa’s warriors arrived at Sutoku-in’s palace around 5 am (寅剋).”¹⁰⁸ During the battle, the approximate time of day is only depicted using the words like “in the evening 夜.” The actual battle only lasted a couple of hours, and the text seems to focus on actions rather than chronological order. As the battle is underway, sometime in the

¹⁰⁵ 一院 [鳥羽]・新院父子ノ御中、不快ト聞エシ。 *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 43: 5.

¹⁰⁶ Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (New York: Routledge, 1994), 4.

¹⁰⁷ Derrida, 25.

¹⁰⁸ *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 43: 44.

midst of the chaos, Sutoku-in's flight to Mt. Nyoï, eventual surrender, and the sentence of his exile are carried out. In the meantime, many of his other followers are executed—a punishment carried out for the first time in almost 350 years since the Kusuko Incident. It is therefore significant that Sutoku-in is finally given an exact date of his arrival at Sanuki province. The narrator speaks:

It is recorded that on the tenth day of the eighth month (of 1156), Sutoku-in arrived at Sanuki, but since his mansion had not been built, he was guided to live in a residence in the Matsuyama area by a provincial officer, Takatō.¹⁰⁹

Considering the severity of exile as a punishment, Sutoku-in's arrival in Sanuki is almost a metaphorical death. For aristocrats and the members of the imperial family who only lived in the capital throughout their life, Sanuki province was far removed from the normal realm of daily life. The date provided for Sutoku-in was, in a manner of speaking, the date of his death. It signifies his exile from the real world and his transition to an incorporeal figure beyond the scope of imperial court's control.

Narrating and Haunting: Revisiting the Mononoke-like Narrator

The narrator of *Hōgen monogatari* primarily narrates in a single voice, retelling stories that were either overheard or witnessed. Taking the position of “retelling” the stories, the narrator's knowledge can travel across the both sides of battle lines, allowing him to trace the journey of Sutoku-in's retreat to the temple and eventually exile to Sanuki province. The narrator uses honorific words strictly for members of the imperial family (the Dowager Bifukumon-in is included, but not lower ranking consorts), and not even for the highest-ranking Fujiwara such as

¹⁰⁹ 八月十日、新院讃岐国ニ付セ給タリト請取ヲ進タリ。御所ハ未造出、当国ニ二ノ在庁散位高遠ガ松山ノ堂ニ渡ラセ給フ、ト申タリ。 *Hōgen monogatari*, *SNKBT*, 43: 129.

the Minister of the Right or the Left. Occasionally, the narrator also gives his own opinion on matters and sometimes adds his critiques of the actors in the tale.

Some scholars have pointed out that unlike early Heian literature, such as *Genji monogatari*, *Hōgen monogatari* does not use the technique of *sōshiji* 草子地 that allows a text to merge the narrator's voice or the descriptive narration (*ji no bun* 地の文) and the characters' voices or innermost thoughts, which we have seen in *Genji monogatari*.¹¹⁰

Rather, the narrator in *Hōgen monogatari* maintains distance from all factions—Retired Emperor Toba/Emperor Go-Shirakawa and Sutoku-in alike. In general, when the narrator speaks the characters' innermost thoughts, he accordingly uses such words as “I heard” (*kikoeshi...tokaya* 聞コエシ、トカヤ),” or “I understand” (*uekamawaru* 承ル), and “I witness” (*miekeri* 見エケリ). This positioning as an outside observer is evident in the opening paragraphs when he narrates Sutoku-in's thoughts. For example, when Sutoku-in cedes the throne to Emperor Konoe, the narrator is clear that he is speculating about Sutoku-in's feelings, saying that “this must leave him with hard feelings” (御恨残ケルニヤ).¹¹¹ The narrator continues to clarify his limited ability to read the characters' minds as seen in statements such as “Sutoku-in was hoping for his first son, Prince Shigehito to take the throne, and [since it did not happened], it is very difficult to know how he must feel now” (又、新院ノ一宮重仁新王ヲ位ニ付奉ラセ給ハントヲボシメシケルニヤ、御心中難知).¹¹²

¹¹⁰ See Murakami Manabu, “Nakarai-bon *Hōgen monogatari* ni kansuru ichikōsatsu: Sono katari to honbun no keisei ni kanshite,” *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 71, no. 2 (February 1994): 1–11; Tochigi Yoshitada, “Bungaku no hōhō to shitenō ‘katari’: Nakarai-bon, Kamakura-bon, Konpira-bon *Hōgen monogatari* o taishō to shite,” in his *Gunki monogatari keisei josetsu* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002), 278–316; and Yamashita Hiroaki, “Katarimono ni okeru ‘katari’ no kōzō,” 17–26.

¹¹¹ *Hōgen monogatari*, *SNKBT*, 43: 5.

¹¹² *Hōgen Monogatari*, *SNKBT*, 43: 5. Occasionally, when the narrator narrates someone's words or thoughts, he uses reporting techniques such as “to” と and “tozo” とぞ. For example, the narrator states,

In retelling of battles, *gunki* narrators tend to switch from “I heard” to “I see,” or even place themselves as a witness of the battle. This shift effectively dramatizes the actions and physical engagements of the fighting.¹¹³ In *Hōgen monogatari*, the narrator’s status as a distant observer for both sides, changes, however, as the narrator starts focusing on the events and characters of Sutoku-in’s side once they start losing. Although the narrator can relate to both sides of events that are simultaneously happening in multiple locations, he carefully tracks Sutoku-in’s flight in detail in the aftermath of the battle, which most historical accounts leave blank. In doing so, the narrator is willing to travel along with the exiled “criminal,” to the land far away from the capital and becomes the sole mediator of the Sutoku-in’s voices, actions, and life in the aftermath of the Hōgen Disturbance.

As I have argued, one of the crucial aspects that made Sutoku-in’s *onryō* so feared was his exile from his genealogy and imperial chronology. Here, I will also argue that the fluidity of the narrator’s perspectives and voices adds to his status as a revenant spirit. In a particular episode entitled “The Matter of Shin’in [New Retired Emperor]’s Blood Written Oath in the Sutra and His Death,” this narration plays a significant role in intensifying the inability to domesticate Sutoku-in’s *onryō*. As I have briefly mentioned, the text seems to suggest the otherworldliness of Sanuki as outside of imperial purview as seen in the arrival of Sutoku-in. Here, again we can see the effect of the otherworldliness more drastically in the slight changes of the narrator’s perspectives and narrative voice. The chapter “The Matter of Shin’in [New Retired

“recently, Sutoku-in has been thinking that ‘... the Fourth Prince went ahead of us [taking the throne]; how regrettable,’ he thought.” 新院日頃思食ケルハ「。。。又四ノ宮ニコサレヌル事口ヲシ」トヲボシメサレケル。 *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 43: 11–12.

¹¹³ Shitate Masakazu, “Katarite no kōsatsu: *Hōgen monogatari*: Kii tekusuto o megutte,” in *Hōgen monogatari no keisei*. ed. Tochigi Toshitada, Kajihara Masaaki, Yamashita Hiroaki, and Hasegawa Tadashi (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1997), 317.

Emperor]’s Blood Written Oath in the Sutra and His Death,” starts with the narrator’s asking us “how can we imagine the feelings of Retired Emperor [Sutoku-in] bearing with a useless life in such countryside after he arrived in Sanuki” (院ハ讃岐ニ付セ給テ、習ヌ鄙ノ御住、只推量リ奉ルベシ), inviting us to guess Sutoku-in’s feeling along with him.¹¹⁴ Here, the narrator remains an observer at this point. As he continues, however, there is a moment that he starts to merge with Sutoku-in’s mind, a move unseen in earlier episodes of *Hōgen monogatari*.

Either officials or private individuals, there is no one to pay him a visit. Only a few ladies-in-waiting serve him, and they are also heavyhearted and cannot help but cry. As the autumn deepens, *a feeling of extreme sorrow intensifies*. The sighing of the wind through the pines becomes stronger and the singing of insects in the grasses weakens. At any moment as time passes, wet sleeves are soaked with *the tears of longing* for the capital that was cold toward him [emphasis added]

公家、私、言問人モナカリケリ。僅ニ候フ祇候ノ女房共モ臥沈泣ヨリ外ノ事ゾナキ。秋夜モ深ク成行バ、イトド物ゾ悲キ。松ヲ払フ音モハゲ敷テ、叢毎ニ鳴虫ノ音弱リ、折ニ触レ時ニ随テハ只ウカリシ都ノミシノバルル涙ニ袖ハ朽ヌベシ。¹¹⁵

In the very opening of the episode that recounts Sutoku-in’s becoming *onryō*, the narrator not only empathizes with Sutoku-in but identifies his feelings and voices his sadness as his own (イトド物ゾ悲キ), demonstrating his sudden ability to enter Sutoku-in’s mind and speak for him. Loneliness, sorrow, and helplessness in exile were elements in Sutoku-in’s actual historical poems we’ve read earlier.¹¹⁶ The text echoes Sutoku-in’s feelings that were historically imagined. Incorporating this rhetoric and narrating Sutoku-in’s feelings as his own, the narrator identifies himself with Sutoku-in’s voice. On the one hand, merging with Sutoku-in’s mind allows the narrator to faithfully inform the capital about Sutoku-in’s life that would be otherwise

¹¹⁴ *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 43: 131.

¹¹⁵ *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 43: 131.

¹¹⁶ “Think of my feelings, of helplessness, far away from capital set apart by waves in the offing.” See *Fūga wakashū*, ed. Ichiko Teiji and Jun Kubota (Tokyo: Kichōbon Kankōkai, 1984), 265.

unknown. On the other hand, this intermingled voice also enables Sutoku-in to enter the narrator, whose perspective is capable of traveling back to the capital. In other words, this merging allows Sutoku-in to displace the narrator's voice and perspectives and travel beyond his confinement.

After Sutoku-in writes an oath to become an evil spirit with his own blood, which I will discuss in more detail shortly, he indeed turns into such a spirit. The narrator then suddenly travels to the capital to witness the Heiji Disturbance that occurred the capital in 1159:

After writing the oath, he neither shaves his hair, nor cuts his nails; he becomes a living evil spirit (*tengu*).¹¹⁷ Two years later, around one in the morning on the ninth day of the twelfth month of the first year of Heiji (1159), Lord Fujiwara Noriyori, sided with Minamoto Yoshitomo and attacked the Cloistered office of Sanjō Palace. They burned down the palace and defeated the Lesser Councilor Shinzei, ... then they executed the investiture of appointment and promotion. The Lesser Councilor Shinzei was found while hiding under the ground and was beheaded, with his head displayed on the main street. This must be a punishment for his wrongdoing including beheading many people during the Hōgen Disturbance and digging up the Minister of the Left Fujiwara Yorinaga's corpse.

其後ハ御グシモ剃ズ、御爪モ切ラセ給ハデ、生キナガラ天狗ノ御姿ニ成セ給テ、中二年有リテ、平治元年十二月九日夜丑刻ニ右衛門督信頼ガ左馬頭義朝ヲ嘩テ院ノ御所三条殿ヘ夜討ニ入テ火ヲ懸テ、少納言入道信西ヲ亡ボシ、。。。叙位除目行フ。少納言入道ハ山ノ奥ニ埋レタルヲ掘リ興サレテ首ヲ被切、大路渡サレ獄門ノ木ニ被懸レシ事保元ノ乱多ノ人ノ頸ヲ切セ、宇治ノ左府ノ死骸ヲ掘リ興シタリケル其ノ報トゾ覺ヘタル。。。¹¹⁸

Notice that the narrator here no longer uses the words “I hear” or “I witness” to describe Sutoku-in's transformation into a living evil spirit. While the narrator still uses an honorific word, *tamafu* 給, which suggests some distance from Sutoku-in, the narrator directly declares Sutoku-in's transformation. The transition in the text between Sutoku-in “becomes a living evil spirit *tengu*,” and “two years later,” seems somewhat sudden and odd. However, this ambiguous transition in

¹¹⁷ For further discussion on *tengu* in the Buddhism context, see Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls: Evil and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy in Medieval Japanese Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2012).

¹¹⁸ *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 43: 131.

one sentence implies that Sutoku-in's transformation continues into Yoshimoto's rebellion, suggesting some sort of causal relationship. The narrator, and Sutoku-in, who has now turned into an evil spirit, travel together to witness and exact revenge. In fact, the idea that Sutoku-in's vengeful spirit caused chaos and the military disturbances had already been circulating in other texts at the time.

Soon after the Heiji Disturbance episode, Sutoku-in proves his ability to exact revenge as an evil spirit. The text introduces the priest Ren'nyo 蓮如, who had served Sutoku-in as a musician. Ren'nyo visits Sutoku-in and exchanges poems with him. After Sutoku-in passes away, Ren'nyo soon sees a vision in a dream.

Sanuki-in [Sutoku-in] rode in a palanquin, with six of Minamoto Tameyoshi's family (father-son), five of Taira Tadamasa's family, and four of Taira Iehiro's family in an attempt to enter Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa's palace. However, they were repelled. Tameyoshi got off his horse and proceeded in front of the palanquin, saying, "Since the palace is guarded by Fudō Myōō and Daiitoku Myōō, we are not able to enter." Sanuki-in [Sutoku-in], then ordered "Enter Kiyomori's residence, then." Accordingly, they followed his order and entered Kiyomori's place with Sanuki-in [Sutoku-in]. Thereafter, Kiyomori undeservedly became arrogant, rising up to the Grand Minister. Kiyomori's attitude became too much that he exiled Major Councilor Lord Fujiwara Narichika's family (father and son), beheaded Priest Saikō, and forced himself into the Toba Palace [and imprisoned Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa and suspended his *insei*]. All of Kiyomori's doings were caused by Sanuki-in [Sutoku-in]'s vengeful spirit.

讃岐院ノ四方輿ニメシテ、為義父子六人先人ニテ、平家忠正父子五人、家弘父子四人御陣ニテ、院の御所へ打ち入ラントスルガ、追帰レテ、為義御輿ノ御前ニ馬ヨリ降りテ、「院ノ御所ニハ不動明王、大威徳ノフセカケ給候間、エ参リ候ズ」ト申ケレバ、「サラバ清盛ガ許へ昇キ入レヨ」ト被仰ケレバ、無相違打入レテ、院ヲモ入進セツト見タリケレバ、ソノ後、清盛、次第ニ過分ニナリ、太政大臣ニ至リ。。。ヲゴレル余リ。。。新大納言成親卿父子ヲ流シ失ヒ、西光父子ガ首ヲ切り。。。終ニ院ヲ鳥羽殿へ押シ込メ進ルモ、只讃岐院ニ御崇ト申シケル。¹¹⁹

¹¹⁹ *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 43: 134–35.

The passage echoes the historical events that happened during the Genpei war. The text attributes all of Taira Kiyomori's wrongdoings to the force of Sutoku-in's evil and vengeful spirit. As I discussed earlier, the timing of these incidents, including the Shishigatani incident in 1177 in which Fujiwara Narichika 藤原成親 (1138–77) and Saikō 西光 (?–1177) were exiled and killed, reflect when Sutoku-in had historically started to be rumored as an *onryō*. Sutoku-in, as well as the narrator, were both able to travel to the capital possibly through the passage of Ren'nyo's dream. The incidents and threats of Sutoku-in's *onryō* were mediated through the dream but directly witnessed both by the narrator and Ren'nyo across the time and location. This fluidity of narrative voices in this particular chapter effectively reinforces the mobility of Sutoku-in's *onryō* that can endanger the land from afar whether dead or alive, mediated by the narrator.

Despite the narrator's intimate presence in the events both in the capital and Sanuki, even merging into Sutoku-in's mind at points, there are other issues that significantly remain unnarrated. As Nonaka Tesshō discusses, the Nakarai-bon 半井本 text only addresses Sutoku-in as Sanuki-in (or Shin-in) and never uses his posthumous title, Sutoku-in 崇徳院.¹²⁰ From the very opening passage, Sutoku-in is named as Sanuki-in 讃岐院 and remains so until the very end when he enters Kiyomori's mansion to turn the capital upside down, exacting his revenge. As we recall, historically, Sutoku-in's title was given in the seventh month of 1177, just a month after the Shishigatani incident. By the time the text was created, this newly given title would have been known to many. This naming makes an interesting contrast with *Imakagami*'s choice of "Sanuki-in," suggesting that his *onryō* was not yet born and thus his posthumous title was not given when *Imakagami* was written. Whereas *Imakagami* depicts a quiet lonesome life of

¹²⁰ Nonaka Tesshō, *Hōgen monogatari no seiritsu*, 312–13.

“Sanuki-in,” Nakarai-bon uses “Sanuki-in” to signal his unpacified and unabated spirit throughout the text.

Hōgen monogatari is also silent about the pacification efforts made by the imperial court at the capital. The narrator’s unnarrating the pacification events and the decision to refer to him as Sanuki-in, emphasizes Sutoku-in/Sanuki-in’s ever unappeased vengeful spirit and his revenant existence beyond the imperial system, chronology, and history. Nakarai-bon is often considered to be one of the oldest versions of *Hōgen monogatari* variants, possibly composed in the early thirteenth century. Thus, many scholars evaluate Nakarai-bon as useful for understanding the overall picture and perspective of the disturbance and aftermath.¹²¹ I primarily use this version because I want to understand the work within the timeframe of the medieval period when the fear of *onryō* was an important motivation for the emergence of such texts. Therefore, the text’s denying the efforts made by the imperial house to domesticate Sutoku-in and reclaim the control over his *onryō* signal a characteristic of the imperial reign and family that continued to be threatened by the unsettled rage of *onryō*. I contend that the text highlights the failure and ineffectiveness of the imperial attempts to control Sutoku-in’s wrathful spirit. At the same time, as I will discuss below, by empathizing with this unappeased spirit and suggesting he caused the Heiji Disturbance and Taira Kiyomori’s tyrannical actions, which unquestionably led to the rise of aristocratic military rule and eventual decline of imperial power, the text demonstrates the effect of Sutoku-in’s curse that haunted his own bloodline, the imperial family.

¹²¹ Andō Yoshie, “*Hōgen monogatari* kenkyū no genzai to kadai,” in *Hōgen monogatari no keisei*, ed. Tochigi Toshitada, Kajihara Masaaki, Yamashita Hiroaki, and Hasegawa Tadashi (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1997), 47–65.

A Vengeful Oath: What is in Blood?

We have just read the account of Sutoku-in's becoming *onryō* and a few of the actions he took as a vengeful spirit. However, we have not yet closely examined what exactly his curse was. Let us briefly examine the episode in which Sutoku-in turns into an evil living spirit and leaves an oath written in his own blood. This graphic episode played a large part in creating this ferocious *onryō* figure who would threaten the imperial family and its land for centuries to come. Sutoku-in's historical poems mostly expressed loneliness, uncertainty, and nostalgia for the home and the capital. In contrast, the literary character of Sutoku-in is much more vocal about his resentment and his reasons for becoming an *onryō*. In contrast to common assumptions, Sutoku-in's grudge is not necessarily restricted to giving up the throne and/or losing the battle as in fact historical records suggest Sutoku-in may never have expressed overt bitterness over such losses. Rather, according to *Hōgen monogatari* it was his exile, and longing for the capital, as well as his being unable to reconcile with his brother, Go-Shirakawa, that turned him into an *onryō* and led him to curse his own genealogy, declaring his intention to haunt the realm.

In the episode, "The Matter of Shin'in [New Retired Emperor]'s Blood Written Oath in the Sutra and His Death," the narrator states:

Newly Retired Emperor continues to believe that "*I was born as a descendent of Amaterasu no ōmikami and made an emperor. I then received the title of the Retired Emperor and resided in the Palace. Since it was still Retired Emperor Toba's reign, I did not exercise governance on all matters. I was proud to enjoy residing in the Cloistered Imperial Palace for a long time.... When I come to think of the time that has passed, it is just like a yesterday's dream. What kind of sin I have committed to deserve to be exiled to the remote island and to live a life like this? I cannot bear the sorrow of being in a foreign land; I am to become a ghost that yearns for my home... How sad that Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa forgot about the past goodness [that I have shown him].*" As he was saying this, he spent the next three years copying the Five Volumes of the Mahayana Sutra, and [upon finishing this task] he told his younger brother, Priest Omuro, saying "I copied these sutras with ink for salvation in the afterlife, but it is pitiful to leave them in such a remote land where no sounds of conch horn resonate. If permitted, I wish to place them at Yawata, or Late Retired Emperor Toba's grave, or anywhere near the capital."

Priest Omuro then passed his word on to the Chancellor. The Chancellor then tried to act as an intermediary, passing the messages to Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa, but his heart was not eased and did not give permission. Upon learning the news, Sutoku-in said, “What a pity! Not only in this country, but in India and China, as well as in Silla and Paekche, there were struggles for power and disputes over realms. Battles were fought between uncles and nephews as well as between older brothers and younger ones. Due to fortune, uncles can be defeated and older brothers defeated. When one regrets what he has done, folding his hands and kneeling on his knees, one should be forgiven. If you do not allow my copied sutra, through which I pray for my salvation in the afterlife, to be placed in the capital, you will be my enemy. I will now devote the virtues of these sutras to the world of the Hell Realm (Jigoku-dō), the Realm of the Hungry Ghosts (Gakidō) and/or the Realm of Beasts (Chikushodō), and I will become an evil spirit of the realm.” Then he bit off the tip of his tongue and wrote the oath on the back of the sutra with his own blood. [Emphasis Added]

「我天照御神ノ苗王裔ヲ請テ、天子ノ位ヲフミ、太上天皇ノ尊号ヲ被テ、粉楡ノ居ヲシメキ。先院御在世ノ間成シカバ、万機ノ政事ヲ取行ズト云共、久ク仙洞ノ樂ミニ誇キ。。。過ニシ事ヲ思バ、昨日ノ夢ノ如シ。何ナル罪ノ報ニテ、遠キ島ニ被放テ、カカル住ヲスラム。。。外土ノ悲ニ堪ズ、望郷ノ鬼トゾ成ンズラメ。。。昔ノ志ヲ忘レ給テ辛罪ニ当給ハ心憂シ」トテ御自筆ニ五部大乘教ヲ三年ニ遊バシテ御室ニ申サセ給ケルハ、「後生菩提ノ為ニ、五部大乘教ヲ墨ニテ如形書集テ候ガ、貝鐘の音モセヌ遠国ニ捨置カン事ノ不憫ニ候。御免候ハバ、八幡ノ辺ニテモ候ヘ、鳥羽カナサクハ長谷ノ辺ニテモ候ヘ、都ノ頭ニ送置候ハバヤ」
<中略>御室ヨリ関白殿ニ申サセ給フ。急テ、関白殿能様ニ取申サセ給ヘ共、主上御クツロギ無カリケリ。。。終ニ不叶。此由ヲ新院被聞食テ、「口惜事ゴサンナレ。我朝ニモ不限、天竺震旦ニモ、新羅百濟ニモ、位ヲ争ヒ、国ヲ論ジテ、伯父甥合戦ヲ成シ、兄弟軍ス。果報ノ勝劣ニ随テ、伯父モ負ケ、兄モ負。其事悔環テ、手ヲ合せ、膝ヲカガメテ嘆時ハ免ズ事ゾカシ。今者後生菩提ノ為ニ書タル御經ノ置所ヲダニモ免サレザランニハ、後生迄ノ敵ゴサンナレ。我願ハ五部大乘教ノ大善根ヲ三惡道ニ抛テ、日本国ノ大惡魔ト成ラム」ト誓ハセ給テ、御舌ノ崎ヲ食切セ座テ、其血ヲ以テ、御經ノ奥ニ此御誓狀ヲゾアソバシタル。¹²²

¹²² *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 43: 131–33. The existence of the Five Volumes of Mahayana Sutra has been much debated. Some *Hōgen* and *Heike* variants claim that Sutoku-in copied all sutras with his blood and sunk the sutras into the sea. Whether this event took place requires further study. However, the episode of the blood oath may come from the following account on the sixteenth day of the seventh month of 1184 written by Yoshida Tsunefusa in his *Kikki*:

寿永二年七月十六日条

(崇徳院自筆五部大乘經、可有供養之由、沙汰事)、崇徳院於讃岐、御自筆以血令書五部大乘經給、件經奥書令書、(可被滅—亡天下之由書く給事)件經奥、非理世後生料、可被滅—亡天下之趣、被注置、件經伝在元性法印許、依被申此旨於成勝寺可被供養之由、以右大弁(平親宗)被仰左少弁光長(藤原)、為令得一道彼怨靈歟、但尤可被予議歟、未供養之以以前猶果其願況於開題之後哉、能々可有沙汰事也、可恐々々。 See Yoshida Tsunefusa, *Kikki*, vol. 3 (Osaka: Izumi Shoin, 2006), 83–84.

This passage greatly reflects the tensions between the “rules” of *onryō* that were created within a communal body under imperial authority (kingship and kinship alike) and the resistance against the existing discourse and communal body led by the imperial family that cause a rupture. As I have emphasized in my introduction as well as in Chapter Three, the politics of *onryō* (for example, who could become *onryō* and who could placate them), and *onryō* familial relationships with members of the imperial family, the Fujiwara, and some other strong aristocrat families had been used to legitimate and elevate genealogy and ruling power. Along with the rise of aristocratic military classes, subsequent political and cultural changes inevitably affected the court, which still symbolized imperial authority. In a way, Jien’s *Gukanshō*, written in 1220, was an attempt to bring back the Imperial-Fujiwara ruling power using *onryō* discourse. This particular passage in *Hōgen monogatari*, most likely written around 1220 or perhaps a little later, exhibits a similar rhetoric and motive to restore the imperial/aristocratic order and authority. At the same time, as I have suggested, the narrative of Sutoku-in’s *onryō*, however, reveals a moment of departure from the system and life-cycle of *onryō* that had helped legitimize the

One can argue that Sutoku-in’s use of his own blood could perhaps invoke incantatory effects, eliciting “bloodline” connections. During the Heian period, blood was commonly understood as a source of *kegaré* 穢れ and to be avoided at all cost. Hence the word, blood (*chi* 血) is rarely seen in Heian *monogatari* texts except for some common phrases such as *chi no namida* 血の涙 (tears of blood). According to Nishida Tomomi, the association of blood with kinship emerged during Edo period. Instead, the term “bone and flesh” (*kotsuniku* 骨肉) was commonly used to signify a family who shared biological connections. For further studies on blood in Japanese literature and history, see Nishida Tomomi, *Chi no shisō* (Tokyo: Kenseisha, 1995); and Sakai Kōichi, “‘Chi no jojutsu’ to gunki monogatari,” in *Chūsei no gunki monogatari to rekishi jujutsu*, ed. Saeki Shinichi (Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2011), 529–55.

Imperial family and, in this oscillation, exposes where the fiercest and uncontrollable Sutoku-in *onryō* emerges.

Let us read this passage more closely. First, notice how the rhetoric legitimizing kinship and genealogy is repeatedly highlighted in the first couple of lines. We find a dramatic shift and tension between the erasure of Sutoku-in's name from the imperial genealogy and the imperial family's legitimate reign in the opening paragraph we have seen earlier. The text reminds the reader that Sutoku-in is a descendent of the ancestral god, Amaterasu no ōmikami, placing back him into the imperial genealogy and tells of his reign and life at the palace. Sutoku-in can, thus, speak as a legitimate member of the imperial family, the genealogical line that historically was considered to possess power to become powerful *onryō* when they died in indignation as a result of political struggles. Notice also how Sutoku-in only mentions the most powerful ancestral goddess, Amaterasu no ōmikami, to establish his legitimacy: "I was born as a descendent of Amaterasu no ōmikami and made an emperor." In this move, Sutoku-in, who was once removed from the imperial genealogy, now becomes one who skips and erases the all other generations of the emperors and descendants, foreshadowing the destruction of the imperial line, and its long-legitimized reign and realm. At the same time, using *onryō* to legitimate one's genealogy is ironically one way to domesticate a wandering vengeful spirit and control them. Hence, the text can also be read as reminding Sutoku-in of his genealogy within the imperial family.

Sutoku-in's reference to uncles, nephews, and brothers reinforces the concept of kinship while simultaneously and significantly leaving out a particular father-son pair. Sutoku-in's utterance confirms that the battles were fought within close families, namely, uncles, nephews and brothers. Reflecting on the Hōgen Disturbance, Sutoku-in seems to identify Taira Tadamasa and Kiyomori as the uncle-nephew pair, and Fujiwara Tadamichi and Yorinaga, as well as Go-

Shirakawa and himself as brothers. Yet, historically, the battle also involved a father, Minamoto Tameyoshi, and his son, Yoshitomo, who in the end beheaded his father himself. The shocking outcome of the battle and unforgettable tragic father-son episode remains unspoken by Sutoku-in. Likewise, although many contemporary accounts emphasize Sutoku-in's estranged relationship with his father, which was often attributed as a cause of the Hōgen Disturbance, Sutoku-in does not mention his father, Retired Emperor Toba, at all. In fact, as Nonaka Tesshō and Hirano Satsuki argue, the friction between Retired Emperor Toba and Sutoku-in is notably missing in *Hōgen monogatari*.¹²³ Sutoku-in's utterance emphasizes both the father's absence and the unnarrated relationship between them.

Sutoku-in's words develop a significant contrast with the ending of *Hōgen monogatari*.

At the tale's conclusion, the narrator states:

It was in this, the Hōgen Disturbance, that a son beheaded his father, a nephew beheaded his uncle, a younger brother exiled his older brother, and a woman threw herself to her death being consumed by grief. This is something unthinkable in Japan.

保元ノ乱ニコソ、親ノ頸ヲ切ル子モ有リケレ、伯父ガ頸ヲ切甥モアレ兄流ス弟モアレ思ニ身ヲ投ゲル女性モアレ、是コソ日本ノ不思儀也シ事共ナリ。¹²⁴

The text demonstrates a clear awareness of the Minamoto father-son tragedy. It concludes that the Hōgen Disturbance was an incredible familial catastrophe. One of the possible readings for the absence of Sutoku-in's father in the context of Sutoku-in's utterance compared to this ending phrase is that *Hōgen monogatari* does not have to remind the readers of Sutoku-in's potentially illegitimate and estranged relationship with his father. His cursing can be most powerful when

¹²³ Hirano Satsuki, "Nakaraibon 'Hōgen monogatari' ni okeru kotsuniku sōkoku no mondaiten," *Kokubungaku kenkyū*, no. 122 (June 1997): 12–26; and Nonaka Tesshō, "Hōgen monogatari bōtōbu ni okeru Toba-in seidai no enshutsu: Bifukumon-in no kinō o megutte," in his *Hōgen monogatari no seiritsu* (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2016), 4–17.

¹²⁴ *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBT, 43: 142.

Sutoku-in is a legitimate male heir and ruler of the realm, who was also the eldest son and older brother of Go-Shirakawa. By un-narrating Sutoku-in's father-son relationship, the text more strongly authorizes Sutoku-in's vengeful spirit as a descendent of the ancestral goddess to haunt his brother and the realm that he rules.

Returning to the passage above, after establishing Sutoku-in's genealogical legitimacy from Amaterasu and reminding both the readers and Sutoku-in of his family and his life in the Imperial Palace in the capital, the text uses the words "foreign land," (*gaido* 外土) to describe the exiled land Sanuki. The use of the word, *gaido* makes a great contrast to the glorified palace, which Sutoku-in recalls like a dream. This contrast reinforces the concept of binary space between the capital and land outside of the capital border. Ōtsu Yūichi and other scholars argue that *onryō* as well as tragic heroes in *gunki monogatari* symbolize a rebellion against kingship and wreak havoc in the imperial community. Ōtsu argues that these tragic heroes follow a given discourse. They challenge kingship, invite disorder from the outside, and they are eventually suppressed, surrendering to kingship and community. Thus, this literary trope functions to legitimize the highest imperial power and restore unity within the community.¹²⁵ In this *ōken-ron* reading, therefore, *onryō* are always already a part of the imperial and communal system, and they must be "excluded" and "exiled" in order to attack the community from outside. We have seen this phenomenon repeatedly in *Hōgen monogatari* which emphasizes Sutoku-in's exile far away from the capital, and the logic of Sutoku-in's claim confirms this position. From this perspective, the usage of the alarming word to identify himself as a ghost longing for the home

¹²⁵ Ōtsu Yūichi, "Tameyori, Sutoku-in kō," in his *Gunki to ōken no ideoroji* (Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2005): 139–53.

(*bōkyō no oni* 望郷ノ鬼) further bolsters the glorified “capital/ home.” It is worth becoming a ghost over one’s longing for the “capital/home.”

Sutoku-in’s being in a foreign land accentuates his claim when he declares he will become an evil spirit of Japan 日本国ノ大悪魔ト成ラム. This claim is commonly understood as his determination to become a vengeful spirit who would undermine the realm and a communal body led by the imperial authority.¹²⁶ The expression again suggests an awareness of a distance between the space where Sutoku-in stands in Sanuki province and a community that is now declared as “Japan.” At the same time, as I translate “an evil spirit of Japan,” the propositional word “of” or “*no* の” in *Nihonkoku no daiakuma* can be ambiguous. It could also mean “Japan’s evil spirit,” which indicates that Sutoku-in’s *onryō* is still a being “of” Japan. In either case, from the *ōken-ron* perspective, Sutoku-in still functions as a tragic hero/rebel who threatens the capital and country in order to eventually restore order.

However, I argue that Sutoku-in’s *onryō* narrative in *Hōgen monogatari* may deviate from the tragic heroic archetype. The moments of Sutoku-in’s resistance to being a tragic hero/rebel lie in the very narrative voices and the role of *mononoke*-like narrator I have examined earlier. The ambiguity and fluidity of Sutoku-in and the narrator in *Hōgen monogatari* allow them to travel in and out of the capital, and Sutoku-in claims that he caused both the Heiji Disturbance and subsequent upheavals by controlling Taira Kiyomori beyond physical boundaries. *Hōgen monogatari* encapsulates these conflicts and oscillations that expelled Sutoku-in from his community and genealogy while including him within the imperial *onryō* discourse. It is in this very *monogatari* narration that such narrative voices give Sutoku-in’s *onryō* the possibility to displace either system and discourse, providing him mobility to not-

¹²⁶ Nonaka, *Hōgen monogatari no seiritsu*, 326–27.

belong in time and space. In these tensions, the fiercest and the most monstrous *onryō* in history emerges.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the fiercest and most-feared vengeful spirit of Sutoku-in both in historical accounts and literature. I focused on *Hōgen monogatari* written in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a period of severe political and social turmoil. In analyzing both historical accounts and *Hōgen monogatari* as a symbiotic ideological process of constructing discourse of kinship, imperial legitimacy, and a communal body, this chapter has demonstrated how Sutoku-in's *onryō* became one of the most powerful *onryō* in Japan.

I traced Sutoku-in as a “historical” figure from his life in the capital to his exile in Sanuki, where he lived a relatively quiet life. This historical account conflicts with Sutoku-in presented in later historical accounts and literature. The discourse of Sutoku-in's becoming a vengeful *onryō* circulated when social upheavals and natural disasters were attributed to his restless soul almost ten years after his death. In the process of making Sutoku-in's *onryō* and attempts to pacify him, however, we have seen how the rhetoric emphasizes his genealogy, familial relationships, and complex succession disputes, which were also important motifs in *Hōgen monogatari*. Reading *Hōgen monogatari*, paying close attention to the themes of exile/displacement and genealogical relationships, as well as the roles of narrators and narration, shows how Sutoku-in's *onryō* both fit and deviated from the archetypal *onryō*. Through these deviations, Sutoku-in's *onryō* shook a society founded on a political system run by members of the imperial family and aristocratic allies. *Monogatari*'s ability to shift narrative perspectives and voices, merging into that of *mononoke*, gave voice and mobility to Sutoku-in's *onryō*, as well as

the capacity to threaten the foundation of the imperial family.

By way of conclusion, consider again one of most important quotes from Sutoku-in found in the Konpira-bon variant: “I will become an evil spirit of Japan, and I will turn emperors into commoners and commoners into emperors” 日本国の大魔縁となり、皇をとって民となし、民を皇となさん.¹²⁷ I did not provide a detailed analysis of this quote unique to the Konpira-bon variants because of my primary focus remains on Nakarai-bon, one of the oldest versions of *Hōgen monogatari*. Further critical intertextual studies are necessary to examine various motivations, difference in time periods, and agendas that underlie each variant. However, considering that Konpira-bon probably came after Nakarai-bon, we can see that Sutoku-in’s power continued to grow. It is true that the political power of the imperial family was sometimes challenged throughout Japanese history. Yet, the kingship and legitimacy of the imperial institution as the bedrock and symbol of the state was rarely questioned or overturned. While Sutoku-in had repeatedly insisted on his legitimacy and longing for the capital/ home, by cursing his own genealogy and legitimate reign—his own *raison d’etre*—he abandoned the rule of the imperial family and its community. In this moment, *monogatari* potentially allowed *mononoke* to speak, and with this voice, Sutoku-in turned himself into a monstrous Other that kept coming back throughout history.

¹²⁷ 吾深罪に行われ、秋鬱浅からず、速やかに此功力をもって、彼の科を救わんと思ふ、莫大の行業を、併（しかしながら）三悪道になげこみ、その力をもって、日本国の大魔縁となり、皇をとって民となし、民を皇となさん。 *Hōgen monogatari*, SNKBZ, 41: 400–401.

Epilogue: Beginning by Coming Back

The realm of the dead does not exist unless there are those who live.

If there are no living, there are no dead.

「死者の世界は...生者がいなければ成立しない。生きている人類が全員いなくなれば、死者もいないんだ」

You are saddened through me [my dead body].

「わたしを通してあなたは悲しむ」

—Itō Seikō, *Sōzō rajio*.¹

...any beyond of narrating can only be more narrating.

—H. Richard Okada, *The Tale of Genji: Japanese Literature in English*.²

At 2:46 pm on March 11, 2011, Japan was shaken—literally and metaphorically. Living in Yokohama, I experienced the largest and longest-lasting earthquake I had ever known. Even more shocking and troubling was to witness the live television shots of the subsequent tsunami sweeping away houses, rice fields, schools, convenience stores, and ramen shops. As I watched, bridges and roads were swallowed up by dark, dirty water. A man just barely holding onto a pole, cars and bikes confusedly trying to escape, a policeman futilely directing traffic. The Japan Broadcasting Corporation (NHK) cameras quickly panned away to avoid actually showing any human bodies being engulfed. Yet, people were there. When the cameras returned to the same areas hours later, a black sludge covered the previous scenes. The people were gone.

As a graduate student specializing in premodern Japanese literature, I was already interested in pursuing the topic of *mononoke* and the voices of the dead. In addition to my

¹ Itō Seikō, *Sōzō rajio* (Tokyo: Kawaide Shobō Shinsho, 2013), 137 and 140.

² H. Richard Okada, “Introduction,” in *The Tale of Genji: Japanese Literature in English*, vol. 1 (New York: Routledge, 2011), 17.

personal experience of that day in March 2011, two subsequent events in particular spurred me to this project.

On March 14, 2011, just three days into the catastrophe, the governor of Tokyo, Ishihara Shintarō, claimed the disaster was “*tenbatsu*” 天罰 or “divine punishment,” to wash away the “egoism” (*gayoku* 我欲) afflicting the Japanese people. Ishihara therefore felt “sorry for the dead who sacrificed their lives.”³ Ishihara’s comments met severe condemnation, with many demanding a public apology. However, the main criticism directed at his comments was the not the inaccuracy or outdatedness of such a notion but rather the perceived indiscretion (*fukinshin* 不謹慎) of making a statement so soon after so many people lost their lives. Divine punishment and the fear that human wrongdoing may engender the wrath of deities remains a way of understanding natural disasters in Japan in the twenty-first century. In facing such extraordinary calamity, the texts I was reading and the worlds they captured from the past did not seem to be far removed from contemporary Japanese society.

Another continuity lay in Ishihara’s identification of the cause and mechanism of the disaster as tied to his political power and agenda. In the wake of the one of the biggest tragedies in contemporary Japan, one of the country’s most powerful officials could invoke the notion of *tenbatsu*, linking his own political position with an understanding of the divine. Although strictly speaking, there are differences between divine punishment and revenge wrought by *onryō*, Ishihara’s remarks subtly exposed various aspects of Japanese history, politics, and language imbedded in discourse surrounding natural disasters.

³ Ishihara’s comments as well as religious responses to the earthquake can be found in Levi McLaughlin, “In the Wake of the Tsunami: Religious Responses to the Great East Japan Earthquake,” *Cross Currents* 61, no. 3 (September 2011): 290–97.

The second event was the rise in popularity of disaster literature (*shinsai bungaku* 震災文学) and of what Kimura Saeko names *shinsai-go bungaku* 震災後文学, or “post-disaster literature.”⁴ In the aftermath of one of the worst disasters in Japan in decades, narrating memories in the form of literature seemed to become crucial for many of those who survived to cope with the loss of loved ones and with the destruction of communities and local cultures that they had built and embraced. Spirits of the dead are common protagonists and characters in much of this literature, such as Itō Seikō’s *Sōzō rajio* 想像ラジオ, Ishiguro Hisato’s *Chō kyūjō ken rīpu* 超救助犬リープ, as well as in the anthology of essays, *Yobisamasareru reisei no shinsaigaku* 呼び覚まされる霊性の震災学.⁵ These stories of survivors seeking the missing bodies of their loved ones and seeing and speaking with ghosts were important themes in documentary accounts and fictional stories alike. Within these tales, survivors as well as the dead seek answers behind the deaths. The dead in these texts often act and speak through the living. *Shinsai-go bungaku* frequently suggests the realization that although the dead will not return to a living state, they will continue to exist through those who survived. At the same time, such stories also suggest that death is ultimately inconsolable. What survivors and readers are left with is an attempt to seek the voices and unnarrated stories of the dead.

In recalling the 3.11 Tōhoku Earthquake, I by no means wish to cursorily equate the tragedies of people in twenty-first century with those of the imperial family and elite aristocrats in the eleven to fourteenth centuries. Rather, I hope to reflect on two points: first, to reiterate my

⁴ Kimura Saeko, *Shinsai-go no bungakuron: Atarashii bungaku no tame ni* (Tokyo: Seidosha, 2013, and idem., *Sonogo no shinsai-go bungakuron* (Tokyo: Seidosha, 2018).

⁵ Ishiguro Hisato, *Chō kyūjōken Rīpu* (Tokyo: Gakugei Miraisha, 2014); Itō Seikō, *Sōzō rajio*; and Kanebishi Kiyoshi, ed., *Yobisamasareru reisei no shinsaigaku: 3.11, sei to shi no hazama de* (Tokyo: Shinyōsha, 2017).

own positionality as I trying to engage with the dead and their representation as *mononoke/onryō* in premodern literature; and second, to consider the ways in which we deal with tragedies and how the dead seem to necessitate mediation. In particular, the ways in which disaster literature depicts families dealing with death—retelling stories that no longer narratable by the dead—echo my three major inquiries into *mononoke* phenomenon: mediation, genealogy, and *monogatari*. While the dead may not speak for themselves, the dead return in literature, often in the form of *mononoke*, and speak for the living.

I began this dissertation by arguing for the ambiguous and undecidable quality of *mononoke* and *monogatari*. Reading texts through *mononoke* perspectives and paying attention to the narration of *mononoke*-like narrators allows us to challenge stable readings, meanings, and identities. In other words, readers constantly face the indeterminable in the text, but this indeterminacy itself may be a constructive force. In discussing mourning, Derrida suggests that the so-called “successful/normal” mourning of the dead other is destined to fail since it would “interiorize within us the images, idol, or ideal of others.”⁶ This form of mourning is a short-cut to assimilate the other in ourselves and erase the dead’s genuine alterity. When one reconciles oneself with death, it means to deny death and the alterity of the dead other. On the other hand, to fail in this “mourning of incorporation” may adhere to a greater fidelity to the other because the presence of the dead other in their exteriority is prolonged and unassimilated. Mourning and death is interminable, inconsolable, and irreconcilable, according to Derrida.⁷ Failed mourning is more faithful to the dead because it does not annihilate, nor reduce someone’s death.

⁶ Jacques Derrida, *Memories for Paul de Man*, trans. Cecile Lindsay, Jonathan Culler, Eduardo Cadava, and Peggy Kamuf (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 6.

⁷ Jacques Derrida, *The Work of Mourning*, trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001), 143.

This type of failed mourning echoes the irreducible quality of *mononoke* in *monogatari*, and, to an extent, the essence of *monogatari*. Failed mourning informs how we should understand *mononoke* and read *monogatari*, both of which are interminable, inconsolable, and irreconcilable. *Mononoke* speak for *monogatari*, and *monogatari* speak for *mononoke*, (in)forming and un(in)forming each other. By acknowledging and recognizing the unidentifiable *mononoke* other narrated in *monogatari*, we may be able to faithfully read the voices of contained therein.

In concluding this dissertation, I wish to return to H. Richard Okada's words: "the Genji tale continually refuses closure and suggests that any beyond of narrating can only be more narrating."⁸ *Monogatari* is revenant—*mononoke* and *onryō* embody this beyond and the potential for ever more narration and mediation. And both begin by coming back.

... or so, it seems to be in the text.

とぞ、本に侍める

—Murasaki Shikibu, "Yume no Ukihashi," *Genji monogatari*.⁹

⁸ H. Richard Okada, "Introduction," in idem, ed., *The Tale of Genji: Japanese Literature in English*, vol. 1 (New York: Routledge, 2011), 17.

⁹ *Genji monogatari*, vol. 6, *SNKZ*, 25: 395.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Eiga monogatari*. 3 vols. Edited by Yamanaka Yutaka, Akiyama Ken, Ikeda Naotaka, and Fukunaga Susumu. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vols. 31–33. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1995–98.
- Fūga wakashū*. Edited by Ichiko Teiji and Jun Kubota. Tokyo: Kichōbon Kankōkai, 1984.
- Fujiwara Tadachika. *Sankaiki*. 3 vols. Edited by Sagawa Rinpū. Tokyo: Nihon Shiseki Hozonkai, 1916.
- Fujiwara Tadazane. *Denryaku*. 5 vols. In *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, edited by Shiryō Hensanjo. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970.
- Fusō ryakki*. In *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai*, vol. 12, edited by Kuroita Katsumi. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998.
- Futsū shōdōshū: Honkoku, kaisetsu*. Edited by Murayama Shūichi. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2006.
- Hirata Atsutane. *Shinshū Hirata Atsutane zenshū*. Edited by Hirata Atsutane Zenshū Kankōkai. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1977.
- Hōgen monogatari*. Edited by Shida Itaru and Inui Yoshihisa. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vol. 41. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 2002.
- Hōgen monogatari*. Edited by Tochigi Yoshitada. In *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikai*, vol. 43. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992.
- Hyakurenshō*. In *Kokushi taikai*, vol. 14. Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1901.
- Hyakurenshō*. In *Kaitei zōho Kokushi taikai*, vol. 11, edited by Kuroita Katsumi. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000.
- Ichijō Kanera. *Kachō yosei*. In *Genji monogatari kochūshaku taisei*, vol. 6, edited by Muromatsu Iwao. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1978.
- . *Gyokueiki shō*. In *Zoku shiryō taisei*, vol. 18, edited by Takeuchi Rizō. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1979.
- Imakagami*. In *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai*, vol. 21, edited by Kuroita Katsumi. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998.

- Imakagami*. In *Imakagami zenchūshaku*, edited by Kawakita Noboru. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2013.
- Iwasa Miyoko. *Gyokuyō wakashū zenchūshaku*. 4 vols. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1996.
- Itō Seikō. *Sōzō rajio*. Tokyo: Kawaide Shobō Shinsho, 2013.
- Jien. *Gukanshō*. In *Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, vol. 86, edited by Okami Masao and Akamatsu Toshihide. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992.
- . *The Future and the Past: A Translation and Study of the Gukanshō, an Interpretative History of Japan Written in 1219*. Edited and Translated by Delmer M. Brown and Ichirō Ishida. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Keikai. *Nihon ryōiki*. Edited by Nakada Norio. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vol. 10. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1995.
- Kujō Kanezane. *Kundoku gyokyō*. Edited by Takahashi Sadaichi. Tokyo: Takashina Shoten, 1989.
- Minamoto Akikane. *Kojidan*. In *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, vol. 41, edited by Kawabata Yoshiaki and Araki Hiroshi. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2005.
- Motoori Norinaga. *Motoori Norinaga zenshū*. 21 vols. Edited by Ōno Susumu. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969.
- Murasaki Shikibu. *Genji monogatari*. 6 vols. Edited by Abe Akio, Akiyama Ken, Imai Gen'e, and Suzuki Hideo. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vols. 20–25. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1994–98.
- . *Murasaki Shikibu nikki*. Edited by Nakano Kōichi. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vol. 26. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1994.
- . *Murasaki Shikibu shū zen hyōshaku*. Edited by Nanba Hiroshi. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1983.
- . *The Tale of Genji*. Translated by Royall Tyler. New York: Penguin Classics, 2001.
- Manyō shū*. 4 vols. Edited by Kojima Noriyuki, Kinoshita Masatoshi, and Tōno Haruyuki. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vols. 6–9. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1994–96.
- Minamoto Tomoaki. *Kōan Genji rongi*. In *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 17, ed. Hanawa Hokinoichi. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1993.
- Nihon kiryaku*. In *Shintei zōho kokushi taikei*, vol. 10, edited by Kuroita Katsumi. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998.

- Nihon Sandai jitsuroku*. In *Shintei zōho kokushi taikei*, vol. 4, edited by Kuroita Katsumi. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000.
- Nihon shoki*. 3 vols. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vols. 2–4, edited by Kojima Noriyuki, Kuranaka Susumu, Mōri Masamori, Naoki Kōjirō, and Nishimiya Kazutami. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1994–98.
- Ōkagami*. Edited by Tachibana Kenji and Katō Shizuko. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vol. 34. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1996.
- Sanjō Sanefusa. *Gumaiki*. In *Dai Nihon kokiroku*. Edited by Shiryō Hensanjo. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2010–13.
- Shoku Nihongi*. In *Shintei zōho kokushi taikei*, vol. 2, edited by Kuroita Katsumi. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998.
- Shōwa Tennō jitsuroku*. Vol. 13. Edited by Kunaichō. Tokyo: Tōkyō Shoseki, 2017.
- Sugawara no Takasue no musume. *Sarashina nikki*. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vol. 26, edited by Inukai Kiyoshi. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1994.
- Sutoku-in. *Gyokuyō wakashū zenchūshaku*. Vol. 3. Edited by Iwasa Miyoko. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1996.
- Sutoku Tennō jitsuroku*. In *Tennō kōzoku jitsuroku*, vol. 41, edited by Fujii Jōji and Yoshioka Masayuki. Tokyo: Yumani Shuppan, 2008.
- Taira Nobunori. *Heihanki*. 2 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Shiseki Hozonkai, 1918.
- Taishō shinshū daizōkyō, Zuzōbu*, vol. 12. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō and Watanabe Kaigyoku. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924.
- Tale of the Disorder in Hōgen: Hōgen monogatari*. Translated by William R. Wilson. Ithaca, NY: East Asian Program, Cornell University, 2001.
- Ueda Akinari. *Ugetsu monogatari*. In *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vol. 78, edited by Takada Mamoru. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1995.
- Yoshida Kenkō. *Tsurezuregusa*. In *Nihon koten bungaku zenshū*, vol. 27. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1971.
- Yoshida Tsunefusa. *Kikki*. Edited by Takahashi Hideki. 4 vols. Osaka: Izumi Shoin, 2002–08.
- Yoshishige Yasutane. *Chiteiki*. In *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, vol. 27, edited by Satake Akihiro. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992.

Yotsusuji Yoshinari. *Kakaishō*. In *Genji monogatari kochūshaku taisei*, vol. 6. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1978.

Secondary Sources

Akasaka Norio, ed. *Kyōgi no shisō e*. Tokyo: Shin'yōsha, 1992.

Akashi Kazunori. *Kodai, chūsei no ie to josei: Kazoku no riron*. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2006.

Akata Mitsuo. *Ie no denshō to senzokan*. Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin, 1988.

———, ed. *Sorei shinkō*. Tokyo: Yūzankaku, 1991.

Amino Yoshihiko. *Nihon no rekishi o yominaosu*. Tokyo: Tsukuma Shobō, 1999.

Andō Yoshie. “Nakarai-bon *Hōgen monogatari* ni okeru Sutoku-in no rekihizuke kara no sogai ni tsuite.” *Gunki to katarimono*, vol. 28 (March 1992): 1–12.

———. “*Hōgen monogatari* kenkyū no genzai to kadai.” In *Hōgen monogatari no keisei*, edited by Tochigi Toshitada, Kajihara Masaaki, Yamashita Hiroaki, and Hasegawa Tadashi. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1997.

Asao Hiroyoshi. “Rokujō miyasudokoro to sentei: Mononoke o shiza to shita *Genji monogatari* no kōzō.” *Chūko bungaku*, no. 35 (May 1985): 19–28.

———. *Genji monogatari no junkyo to keifu*. Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2004.

Atkins, Paul S. “Depictions of the Kawara-No-in in Medieval Japanese Nō Drama,” *Asian Theatre Journal* 27, no. 1 (2010): 1–22.

Bialock, David. “Nation and Epic: *The Tale of the Heike* as Modern Classic.” In *Inventing the Classics: Modernity, National Identity, and Japanese Literature*, edited by Haruo Shirane and Tomi Suzuki, 151–78. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

———. *Eccentric Spaces, Hidden Histories: Narrative, Ritual, and Royal Authority from The Chronicles of Japan to The Tale of the Heike*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007.

———. “Biwa Masters and Musical Hierophanies in the *Heike monogatari* and Other Medieval Texts.” *Journal of Religion in Japan*, no. 2 (2013): 119–51.

Bargen, Doris G. *A Woman's Weapon: Spirit Possession in the Tale of Genji*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.

- . *Mapping Courtship and Kinship in Classical Japan: The Tale of Genji and Its Predecessors*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015.
- Roland Barthes. *Fashion System*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1983.
- Bergson, Henri. *Creative Evolution*. Translated by Arthur Mitchell. New York: Holt and Company, 1911.
- Borgen, Robert. *Sugawara no Michizane and the Early Heian Court*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994.
- Brightwell, Erin L. "The Mirror of China: Language Selection, Images of China, and Narrating Japan in the Kamakura Period (1185–1333)." PhD diss., Princeton University, 2014.
- Butler, Judith. *Antigone's Claim: Kinship between Life and Death*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- . *Dispossession: The Performative in the Political: Conversations with Athena Athanasiou*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "The Time of History and the Times of Gods." In *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital*, edited by Lisa Lowe and David Lloyd, 35–60. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
- . *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Como, Michael. *Weaving and Binding: Immigrant Gods and Female Immortals in Ancient Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010.
- Compton, Eno. "A Genealogy of an Erotic Figure: Reading 'Chinese Influence' of Heian Literature." PhD diss., Princeton University, 2013.
- Conlan, Thomas D. "Thicker Than Blood: The Social and Political Significance of Wet Nurses in Japan, 950–1330," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 65, no. 1 (2005): 159–205.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Memories for Paul de Man*. Translated by Cecile Lindsay, Jonathan Culler, Eduardo Cadava, and Peggy Kamuf. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- . *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. Translated by Peggy Kamuf. New York: Routledge, 1994.

- . *The Work of Mourning*. Translated by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Durkheim, Émile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Translated by Joseph W. Swain. New York: Free Press, 1965.
- Emmerich, Michael. *The Tale of Genji: Translation, Canonization, and World Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.
- Engels, Friedrich. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. New York: International Publishers, 1942.
- Eubanks, Charlotte D. *Miracles of Book and Body: Buddhist Textual Culture and Medieval Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.
- Fujii Sadakazu. “Kyōdo tōgi: Higuchi Ichiyō no sakuhin o yomu.” *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū* 29, no. 13 (October 1984): 76–107.
- . *Monogatari bungaku seiritsushi: Furukoto, katari, monogatari*. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1987.
- . *Genji monogatari ron*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2000.
- . *Monogatari no kigen: Furukotoron*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1997.
- Fujimoto Katsuyoshi. *Genji monogatari no “mononoke”: Bungaku to kiroku no hazama*. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1994.
- . “Rokujō no miyasudokoro monogatari no shudai.” In *Genji monogatari kenkyū shūsei*, vol. 1, edited by Ii Haruki, Masuda Shigeo, and Suzuki Hideo, 265–310. Tokyo: Kasama Shobō, 1999.
- Fukutō Sanae, *Heianchō no haha to ko: Kizoku to shomin no kazoku seikatsushi*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1991.
- . *Ie seiritsushi no kenkyū: Sosen saishi, onna, kodomo*. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 1991.
- . *Heian ōchō no kodomotachi: Ōken to ie, warabe*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2004.
- . *Heian ōchō shakai no jendā: Ie, ōken, seiai*. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2005.
- . “Heian chūki no kon’in to ie, kazoku.” In *Kōza Genji monogatari kenkyū*. Vol. 2, *Genji monogatari to sono jidai*, edited by Kanō Shigefumi and Ii Haruki, 74–99. Tokyo: Ōfū, 2006.

- . *Heian ōcho no chichi to ko: Kizoku to shomin no ie to yōiku*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 2010.
- Fukazawa Tōru. *Gukanshō no uso to makoto: Rekishi gatari no jiko genkyusei o koete*. Tokyo: Shinwasha, 2006.
- . “Ichijirushkiki shutai kōchiku: *Gukanshō* ni miru ‘katakana hyōki’ no pafōmatibu,” *Kodaigaku kenkyū kiyō*, no. 20 (March 2014): 63–80.
- Furuhashi Nobuyoshi. *Monogatari bungaku no tanjō: Man'yōshū kara no bungakushi*. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 2000.
- Fuss, Diana. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Gordon, Avery. *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Groner, Paul. *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002.
- Hambrick, Charles H. “The ‘*Gukanshō*’: A Religious View of Japanese History.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, vol. 5, no 1 (March, 1978): 37–58.
- Haramizu Tamiki. “Sutoku-in no fukken.” *Kokugakuin zasshi*, no. 87 (August 1986): 34–46.
- . “Sutoku-in shinkō shi.” *Gengo bunka kenkyū*, vol. 4 (February 1997): 1–25.
- . *Hōgen monogatari keitō, denpō kō*. Osaka: Izumi Shoin, 2016.
- . “Sutoku-in Shinkōshi kō,” *Gengo bunka kenkyū*, no. 4 (February 1997): 1–25.
- Hegel, G. W. F. *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A. V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Higuchi Kentarō. *Chūsei sekkanke no ie to kenryoku*. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2011.
- Hijikata Yōichi. “Katarite ga kataranakatta koto.” *Nihon Bungaku*, no. 37 (January 1988): 10–19.
- Hinata Kazumasa. *Genji monogatari no junkyo to wakei*. Tokyo: Shibundō, 1999.
- Hirabayashi Moritoku. *Ryōgen*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987.
- Hirano Satsuki. “Nakarai-bon ‘Hōgen monogatari’ ni okeru kotsuniku sōkoku no mondaiten.” *Kokubungaku kenkyū*, no. 122 (June 1997): 12–26.

- Hirayama Toshijirō. *Nihon chūsei kazoku no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppankyoku, 1980.
- Hirokawa Katsumi. *Shinsō no tennō: Genji monogatari no kokyō*. Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin, 1990.
- Hosoi Hiroshi. “Jikan, koyomi to tennō.” In *Tennō to ōken o kangaeru*, vol. 8, *Kosumorojii to karada*, edited by Amino Yoshihiko, 127–50. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002.
- Horton, H. Mack. “They Also Serve.” In *Approaches to Teaching Murasaki Shikibu’s The Tale of Genji*, edited by Edward Kamens, 95–108. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1993.
- Hu Jie. *Heian kizoku no kon’in kanshū to Genji monogatari*. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō, 2001.
- Husserl, Edmund. *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917)*. Translated by John B. Brough. Dordrecht. The Netherlands: Kluwer Publishing, 2008.
- Hyōdō Hiromi. *Katarimono Josetsu: ‘Heike’ gatari no hassei to hyōgen*. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1985.
- . *Ōken to monogatari*. Tokyo: Seikyūsha, 1989.
- . *Biwa hōshi: Ikai o kataru hitobito*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2009.
- Ii Haruki. “Kiritsubo kan no honbun to kōshaku no hōhō.” In *Genji monogatari no shihatsu: Kiritubo kan ronshū*, edited by Hinata Kazumasa and Nihei Michiaki. Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2006.
- Ikemi Chōryū. “Jo ni kaete: Myōken ron no chihei.” In *Myōkenron: Nihonjin no seishinshi*, edited by Ikemi Chōryū, 5–54. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2012.
- Imai Hisayo. “Monogatari keizu no shikaku: Udaijinke no keifu ni tsuite.” *Nihon Bungaku*, no. 96 (September 2001): 1–12.
- Imanishi Yūichirō. *Genji monogatari oboegaki*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1998.
- Inaba Yōko. “Engi shoryōryōshiki ryōbo rekimei ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu.” *Shikan*, no. 166 (March 2012): 1–21.
- Ishiguro Hisato. *Chō kyūjoken Līpu*. Tokyo: Gakugei Miraisha, 2014.
- Ishiguro Shiho. “Jien no gengokan to Inseiki no karon.” *Narashien* (2010): 17–32.
- Ishikawa Michiko. “*Genji monogatari* ni okeru Kashiwagi no sonzai.” *Hokuriku koten kenkyū*, no. 17 (2002): 25–35.

- Jackson, Reginald. "Scripting the Moribund: The Genji Scrolls' Aesthetics of Decomposition." In *Reading the Tale of Genji: Its Picture-Scrolls, Texts and Romance*, edited by Richard Stanley-Baker, Murakami Fuminobu, and Jeremy Tambling, 3–36. Folkestone, UK: Global Oriental, 2009.
- Kadoya Atsushi. "Goryō e to Shinbutsu shūgō." *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō* 63, no. 3 (March 1998): 138–145.
- Kanda Tatsumi. "Gukanshō to iu 'gengo kōi.'" *Bungaku* 8, no.6 (November/December 2007): 14–24.
- Katō Masayoshi. "Genji monogatari no sakusha ha Murasaki shikibu da to ieruka." In *Heian Bungaku o ika ni yomi naosuka*, edited by Tani Tomoko and Tabuchi Kumiko, 312–47. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2012.
- Kawazoe Fusae. *Genji monogatari jikūron*. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppan, 2005.
- Kanebishi Kiyoshi, ed. *Yobisamasareru reisei no shinsaigaku: 3.11, sei to shi no hazama de*. Tokyo: Shinyōsha, 2017.
- Kimbrough, Keller R. "Reading the Miraculous Powers of Japanese Poetry: Spells, Truth Acts, and a Medieval Buddhist Poetics of the Supernatural." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 32, no.1 (2005): 1–33.
- Kimura Saeko. *Shinsaigo no bungakuron: Atarashii bungaku no tame ni*. Tokyo: Seidosha, 2013.
- . *Sonogo no shinsaigo bungakuron*. Tokyo: Seidosha, 2018.
- Kobayashi Miwako. "Fukusengata jujutsu no monogatari ni okeru kōka." *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 52, no. 12 (December 1975): 15–28.
- Kobayashi Shigefumi. "Sawara shinnō onryō gensetsu no hatsume." *Shigaku* 79, no. 3 (July 2010): 211–244.
- Kōchi Shōhei. *Hōgen no ran, Heiji no ran*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002.
- Kojima Naoko. *Genji monogatari no sei to seitan: Ōchō bunkashiron*. Tokyo: Rikkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2004.
- . "Rokujōin to mononoke: 'Rokujō no furumiya' no 'chi' to 'ie.'" *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kanshō* 71, no. 5 (May 2006): 71–79.
- Komoto Mitsugi and Yagi Tōru. *Kazoku to shisha saishi*. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 2006.

- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Kudō Shigenori. *Heianchō no kekkon seido to bungaku*. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō, 1994.
- . *Genji monogatari no kekkon: Heianchō no kon'in seido to ren'aitan*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2012.
- Kurihara Hiromu. *Heian zenki no kazoku to shinzoku*. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2008.
- Kuroda Toshio. *Obō to buppō: Chuseishi no kozu*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1983.
- . “Chūsei teki chishiki taisei no keisei.” *Nihon Chūsei no shakai to shūkyō*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1990, 157–89.
- . *Kuroda Toshio chosakushū*. 4 vols. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1994–95.
- Kuroda, Toshio and Allan G. Grapard. “The World of Spirit Pacification: Issues of State and Religion.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3/4 (Fall 1996): 321–51.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Boston: Beacon, 1969.
- Li, Michelle. *Ambiguous Bodies: Reading the Grotesque in Japanese Setsuwa Tales*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Lim, Bliss Cua. *Translating Time: Cinema, the Fantastic, and Temporal Critique*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009.
- Loevlie, Elisabeth. “Faith in the Ghosts of Literature: Poetic Hauntology in Derrida, Blanchot, and Morrison’s Beloved.” *Religions* 4, no. 3 (2013): 336–50.
- Lurie, David. *Realms of Literacy: Early Japan and the History of Writing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2011.
- Maki Michio. *Insei jidaishi ronshū*. Tokyo: Yagi Shoten, 1993.
- Makino Junji. “Heike monogatari no ‘buppō.’” *Kodai kenkyūgaku kenkyūjo kiyō*, vol. 14 (2010): 57–69.
- McLaughlin, Levi. “In the Wake of the Tsunami: Religious Responses to the Great East Japan Earthquake.” *Cross Currents* 61, no. 3 (September 2011): 290–97.
- Murakami Manabu. “Nakarai-bon *Hōgen monogatari* ni kansuru ichikōsatsu: Sono katari to honbun no keisei ni kanshite.” *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 71, no. 2 (February 1994): 1–11.
- Murayama Shūichi. *Tenjin shrinkō*. Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1990.

- . *Tenjin goryō shinkō*. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1996.
- Marra, Michael. “The Conquest of Mappō: Jien and Kitabatake Chikafusa.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, vol. 12, no. 4 (December 1985): 319–41.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. *The German Ideology*. Translated by C. J. Arthur. New York: International Publishers, 1973.
- Masuda Shigeo. “Rokujō no miyasudokoro no junkyo: Yūgao-kan kara Aoi-kan e,” in *Genji Monogatari no jinbutsu to kōzō*, ed. Chūko Bungaku Kenkyūkai. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1982.
- . “Kawara-no-in aishi.” In *Bungaku kūkan to shite no Heiankyō*, edited by Gotō Shōko, 33–55. Tokyo: Benseisha, 1994.
- . “Genji Monogatari no kōkyū.” In *Genji monogatari kenkyū shūsei*, edited by Masuda Shigeo, Suzuki Hideo, and Ii Haruki, vol. 1, 167–79. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō, 1998.
- Matsushita, Sachiko. “A Study of the *Tale of Genji*: Focusing on Interior Monologue.” PhD diss., Australian National University, 2006.
- Matsuzono Hitoshi. *Nikki no ie: Chūsei kokka no kiroku soshiki*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997.
- McCullough, William H. *Japanese Marriage Institutions in the Heian Period*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- McLuhan, Marshall and Quentin Fiore, *The Medium Is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects*. London: Penguin, 1967.
- McMullin, Neil. “On Placating the Gods and Pacifying the Populace: The Case of the Gion “Goryō” Cult.” *History of Religions* 27, no. 3 (1988): 270–93.
- Meeks, Lori. “The Disappearing Medium: Reassessing the Place of Miko in the Religious Landscape of Premodern Japan.” *History of Religions* 50, no. 3 (2011): 208–60.
- Mikawa Kei. *Insei*. Tokyo: Chūkō Shinsho, 2006.
- Mitani Kuniaki. “*Genji monogatari* ni okeru ‘katari’ no kōzō: ‘Washa’ to ‘katarite’ aruiha ‘sōshij’ hihanron no tame no joshō.” *Nihon bungaku*, vol. 27, no. 11 (November 1978): 37–52.

- . *Monogatari bungaku no hōhō*. 2 vols. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1989.
- . *Genji monogatari no “katarite” to “gensetsu.”* Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1994.
- . “Genji monogatari no gensetsu bunseki: Katarite no jittaika to sōshiji aruiha miotsukushi kan no Akashi no kimi no ichininshō teki gensetsu o megutte.” In *Genji monogatari*, edited by Matsui Kenji. Tokyo: Wakakusa Shobō, 1998.
- . *Genji monogatari no gensetsu*. Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2002.
- Miura Hiroyuki. “Gukanshō no kenkyū.” *Shirin* 6, no. 1 (January 1921), 1–29.
- Mizuhara Hajime. “Sutoku-in setsuwa no kōsatsu.” *Komazawa kokubun*, no. 7 (June 1969): 1–15.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Motoki Yasuo. *Hōgen, Heiji no ran o yominaosu*. Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai, 2005.
- Nagasaki Hiroshi. *Ransei no seijiron gukanshō o yomu*. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2016.
- Nagayoshi Masao. “Meiji o hiraku Sutoku-in.” *Nihon bungaku* 51, no. 1 (January 2002): 18–28.
- Nakagawa Terumasa. “*Genji Monogatari*” to iu gensō. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2014.
- Nakayama Masahiko. *Monogatari kōzōron: “Genji monogatari” to sono Furansugo yaku ni tsuite*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1995.
- Nanami Hiroaki. “Yūgao kan no kaiki gatari no hyōgen kōzō.” *Bungaku kenkyū ronshū*, vol. 19 (March 2001): 173–96.
- Nickerson, Peter. “The Meaning of Matrilocality: Kinship, Property, and Politics in Mid-Heian.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 48, no. 4 (1993): 429–67.
- Nishida Tomomi. *Chi no shisō*. Tokyo: Kenseisha, 1995.
- Nishimoto Kyōko. “Kawara no in II.” In *Yūgao*, ed. Nishizawa Masashi and Uehara Sakukazu. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2005.
- Nishimura Hiroko. *Chūsei no kazoku to josei*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002.
- Nishizawa Masashi and Sakukazu Uehara eds. *Rokujō no miyasudokoro*. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2005.
- Noguchi Takehiko. *Sanninshō no hakken made*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1994.

- Nonaka Tesshō. *Hōgen monogatari no seiritsu*. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2016.
- Okada, H. Richard. "Domesticating the *Tale of Genji*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 110, no. 1 (1990): 60–70.
- . *Figures of Resistance: Language, Poetry, and Narrating in the Tale of Genji and Other Mid-Heian Texts*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991.
- . "Speaking For: Surrogates and *The Tale of Genji*." In *Crossing the Bridge: Comparative Essays on Medieval European and Heian Japanese Women Writers*, edited Barbara Stevenson and Cynthia O. Ho, 5–27. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- , ed. *The Tale of Genji: Japanese Literature in English*. 3 vols. Oxford: Routledge, 2011.
- Oliver, Kelly. *Family Values: Subjects between Nature and Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Ōe Atsushi. *Nihon kodai no kami to rei*. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 2007.
- Ooms, Herman. *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650–800*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.
- Orikuchi Shinobu. "Reikon no hanashi." *Minzokugaku* 1, no. 3 (September 1923): 153–66.
- Ōsumi Kazuo. *Gukanshō o Yomu: Chūsei Nihon no rekishi kan*. Tokyo: Kōdansha Gakujutsu Bunko, 1999.
- Ōtsu Yūichi. *Gunki to ōken no ideorōjī*. Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2005.
- Ōwa Iwao. *Jinja to kodai ōken saishi*. Tokyo: Hakusuisha, 1989.
- Park Eun-Hee. "Sutoku-in no onryō to Goshirakawa-in, soshite Kiyomori: Sutoku-in onryōtan no monogatari-ka no mondai o megutte." *Bungaku kenkyū ronshū*, no. 20 (March 2002): 258–242.
- Powell, Benjamin D. and Tracy Stephenson Shaffer. "On the Haunting of Performance Studies." *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* 5, no. 1 (April 2009): 1–19.
- Sahlins, Marshall. *What Kinship Is—and Is Not*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Saeki Tomohiro. *Chūsei zenki no seiji kōzō to ōke*. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2015.
- Said, Edward. "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors." *Critical Inquiry* 15, no. 2 (Winter 1989): 205–25.

- Sakai Kōichi. “‘Chi no jojutsu’ to gunki monogatari.” In *Chūsei no gunki monogatari to rekishi jujutsu*, edited by Saeki Shinichi, 529–55. Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2011.
- Sakai, Naoki. *Translation and Subjectivity: On “Japan” and Cultural Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Sakai Yoshiki. “Hikaru Genji-zō keisei ni okeru ‘in’: Naze sono kyotaku ha ‘in’ to yobareruka.” *Geibun kenkyū*, no. 48 (March 1986): 64–80.
- Satō Hiroo. *Hitogami shinkō no keifu*. Tokyo: Iwata Shoten, 2012.
- . “Tennō zō no henyō: Ken no rekishigaku kara meiken no rekishigaku e.” In *Myōkenron: Nihonjin no seishinshi*, edited by Ikemi Chōryū, 85–104. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2012.
- Schneider, David M. *A Critique of the Study of Kinship*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984.
- Seki Yukihiro, “Jōkyū no ran to Gotoba-in,” in *Haisha no nihonshi*, vol. 6, 230–39. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2013.
- Sekine Kenji. “Genji monogatari ni okeru shāmanizumu yōso.” *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kanshō* 46, no. 5 (May 1981): 63–67.
- Shibata Minoru. *Goryō shinkō*. Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1984.
- Shimizu Yoshiko. *Genji monogatari no buntai to hōhō*. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1980.
- Shirane, Haruo. *The Bridge of Dreams: A Poetics of the Tale of Genji*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- Shitate Masakazu, “Katarite no kōsatsu: *Hōgen monogatari*: Kii tekusuto o megutte,” In *Hōgen monogatari no keisei*, edited by Tochigi Toshitada, Kajihara Masaaki, Yamashita Hiroaki, and Hasegawa Tadashi. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1997.
- Souyri, Pierre-François. *The World Turned Upside Down: Medieval Japanese Society*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Translator’s Preface.” In Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, ix–xc. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Steininger, Brian. *Chinese Literary Forms in Heian Japan: Poetics and Practice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asian Center, 2017.

- Stinchecum, Amanda M. *Narrative Voice in the Tale of Genji*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1985.
- Stockdale, Jonathan. *Imagining Exile in Heian Japan: Banishment in Law, Literature and Cult*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015.
- Sueki Fumihiko. *Kamakura bukkyō tenkairon*. Tokyo: Toransubyū, 2008.
- Taira, Masayuki. "Kuroda Toshio and the Kenmitsu Taisei Theory." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3/4 (Fall 1996): 427–48.
- . "Chūsei Bukkyō ni okeru jujutsusei to gōrisei." *Kokuritsu rekishi minzoku hakubutsukan kenkyū hōkoku*, no. 157 (2010): 159–73.
- Taga Munehaya. *Jien no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1980.
- Takagi Makoto. *Heike monogatari: Sōchi to shite no koten*. Yokohama: Shunpūsha, 2008.
- Takahashi Tōru. "Yūgao no maki no hyōgen: Tekusuto, katari, kōzō," *Bungaku* 50, no. 11 (November 1982): 77–98.
- . "Monogatari to media." In *Shin monogatari kenkyū*, edited by Monogatari Kenkyūkai, vol. 1. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1993.
- . "Genji monogatari no 'mononoke' to shinteki enkinhō." In *Nihon ni okeru Shūkyō to bungaku*, edited by Kokusai Nihon Bunka Kenkyū Sentā, 151–168. Kyoto: Kokusai Nihon Bunka Kenkyū Sentā, 1999.
- Takamure Itsue and Kurihara Hiromu. *Heian Kamakura Muromachi kazoku no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1985.
- Takatori Masao. *Minkan shinkōshi no kenkyū*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1982.
- Takeda Chōshū. *Nihonjin no "ie" to shūkyō*. Tokyo: Hyōronsha, 1976.
- Takeda Seiko. "'Midaregahashi' ki Kashiwagi." In *Jinbutsu de yomu Genji monogatari: Naidaijin, Kashiwagi, Yūgiri*, vol 16. edited by Uehara Sakukazu, 249–265. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2006.
- Takehara Hiroshi. "'Yūgao kan' no shudai to hōhō ni tsuite: Mononoke shōtairon ni furetsutsu," *Kokubungaku kenkyū*, no. 8 (November 1972): 13–22.
- Tamagami Takuya. *Genji Monogatari ondoku ron*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2003.
- Tanaka Hitoshi. "'Makotoya' Hikaru Genji to katarite to." *Kokugo kokubun* 50, no. 3 (March 1981): 17–37.

- Tochigi Yoshitada. “Sōseiki Hōgen monogatari kenkysūshi no kōsatsu.” In *Hōgen monogatari no keisei*, edited by Tochigi Toshitada, Kajihara Masaaki, Yamashita Hiroaki, and Hasegawa Tadashi. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1997.
- . *Gunki monogatari keisei josetsu*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002.
- Tokiwa Kazuko. *Genji monogatari kokeizu no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1973.
- Tsumida Fumiko. “Rokujō no miyasudokoro no seisei katei o megutte: ‘Rokujō watari’ no tokushusei to Kawara no in.” *Kokubun*, no. 39 (June 1973): 1–15.
- Tsunoda Bunei. *Taikenmon'in Tamako no shōgai: Shōtei hishō*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1985.
- Tyler, Royall. *The Disaster of the Third Princess: Essays on The Tale of Genji*. Acton, ACT: ANU E Press, 2009.
- Wade, Peter. “Hybridity Theory and Kinship Thinking.” *Cultural Studies* 19, no. 5 (2005): 602–21.
- Wakabayashi Haruko. “Chūsei ni okeru Jie taishi shinkō: Ma no imēji o chūshin ni.” In *Geinō no chūsei*, edited by Gomi Fumihiko, 218–40. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000.
- Wakabayashi, Haruko. *The Seven Tengu Scrolls: Evil and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy in Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2012.
- Wakita Haruko. *Nihon chūsei joseishi no kenkyū: Seibetsu yakuwari buntan to bosei, kasei, seiai*. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1992.
- Yamada Masahiro and Ino Yōko. “Genji monogatari no bunpō kōza Oba.” In *Jinbutsu de yomu Genji monogatari: Rokujō no miyasudokoro*, vol. 7, edited by Nishizawa Masahi and Uehara Sakukazu, 295–301. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2005.
- Yamada Yūji. “Sutoku Tennō shinrei no kikan.” In *Kindai Nihon no rekishiteki isō: Kokka, minzoku, bunka*, edited by Ohama Tetsuya, 4–29. Tokyo: Tōsui Shobō, 1999.
- . *Sutoku-in onryō no kenkyū*. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2001.
- . “Onryō no shisō.” In *Nihon shisōshi kōza*, vol. 1, edited by Karube Tadashi, Kurozumi Makoto, and Satō Hiroo. Tokyo: Perikansha, 2012.
- . *Onryō, kiai, Ise Jingū*. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2014.
- Yamanaka Yutaka. *Rekishi no naka no Genji monogatari*. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2011.

Yamashita Hiroaki. “Katarimono ni okeru ‘katarī’ no kōzō: Gunki monogatari o chūshin ni.”
Bungaku vol. 27, no. 11 (November, 1978): 17–26.

Yamauchi Hisashi. *Mononoke*. 2 vols. Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppanyoku, 2004.

Yamauchi Masujirō. *Imakagami no shūhen*. Osaka: Izumi Shoin, 1993.

Yoda, Tomiko. *Gender and National Literature: Heian Texts in the Constructions of Japanese Modernity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

Yonemura Chiyo. “*Ie*” o yomu. Tokyo: Kōbundō, 2014.

Yoshikai Naoto. “Rokujō no miyasudokoro to ‘makotoya.’” In *Genji monogatari no jinbutsu to kōzō*, edited by Chūko Bungaku Kenkyūkai, 99–119. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1982.

Yoshioka Hiroshi. *Monogatari no katarite: Naihatsuteki bungakushi no kokoromi*. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1996.