Abstract: The Munakata goddesses are a group of marine goddesses headed by the island goddess of Okinoshima, a landmark island in “Kaihoku.” These local goddesses are worshiped by the Munakata clan, who was based in the Munakata district of the former Chikuzen Province [the western part of present Fukuoka Prefecture]. The clan and goddesses had close relations with the Yamato kingly power, especially with the Emperor Jomei lineage under the international climate surrounding East Asia during the 7th century. This observation is supported by a number of pieces of evidence. These include (i) legends in Kojiki (the Records of Ancient Matters) and Nihonshoki (the Chronicles of Japan) about the birth of the Three Goddesses, (ii) the tales of the reigns of the Emperor Ōjin lineage in Nihonshoki, and (iii) the transfer of the divided spirits of the Munakata goddesses to the Kinai region [Kinai kanjō]. Even under the Ritsuryō System, the Munakata district remained the only Shingun (a land for deities) in Kyūshū and the Munakata clan served as both Gunji (the district administrator) and Kannushi (the Shintō priest)—an ancient form of rituals that embraced the unity of religion and politics that remained for centuries that followed. With its close association with the Sea of Japan route and its resemblance to Izumo-no-Omi [the Izumo clan, with “no-Omi” meaning the clan had a title “Omi,” one of the honorary titles for a clan] who served as both Kuni-no-Miyatsuko (provincial administrator with ritual duties) and Gunji, the Munakata clan even came to assert that they shared the same ancestor with the Izumo clan. The role of the Munakata clan as Kannushi changed in nature after the establishment of Gūji (the chief priest of a Shintō shrine) and Daigūji (the senior priest of Shintō shrine; the highest position of the Munakata Shrine), putting an end to the internal succession rite for the Kannushi on Okinoshima Island as performed in ancient times.

Keywords: Munakata-no-Kimi, Kannushi of Munakata, Okinoshima, Ukei legend, Ichikishimahime, Takashina-no-Mahito, Izumo-no-kuni-no-miyatsuko

1. Introduction

The Munakata clan is the powerful clan who, from ancient times to the late Medieval period, worshiped the Munakata goddesses and maintained and even expanded its power based in the Munakata district of Chikuzen Province. The land of Munakata shared borders with the Onga district to the east; along the district border stand the four mountains called Yotsuzuka: Mt. Tsutagake, Mt. Kana, Mt. Yugawa, and Mt. Kōdaiji. To the south is a mountain mass— including the Akagi Pass—which borders with the Kurate district. To the north lies the Genkai Sea. To the west is the Kasuya district. The district border with the Kasuya district has continued to coincide with a climatic division even today. In short, the Munakata district is a distinct entity from the geological and historical perspectives. Flowing through this region to the northwest is the Tsuri River (Class-B river). In the land of Munakata, the coastline was situated deep inland during the Jōmon period. The area from the present-day Tōgōbashi to Tsuchiana constituted an inlet, which is now the Tsuri River1, along which the wind blows. On the extension of the Tsuri River lie Ōshima and Okinoshima islands.

Okinoshima is a small island measuring one kilometer east to west and 0.5 kilometers north to south, and about four kilometers in circumference. The highest crest is Mt. Ichinotake, 243 meters above sea level. The island is home to Okitsu-miya of the Munakata Grand Shrine. Okinoshima is often described as a “solitary desert island in distant seas”2 or a “solitary island in the Genkai Sea”3. The author fears that the phrases like “in distant seas” and “solitary island,” together with the Genkai Sea, may have created a stereotype about the island and Munakata goddesses among the public and that they fail to grasp the true nature of Okinoshima and the faith in Munakata goddesses. If people automatically think of Okinoshima as an island that is most distant both physically and psychologically, inhibited by deities, and outside the realm of everyday life, they are wrong. Okinoshima Island is visible with the unaided eye not only from Munakata, Hakata Bay and its vicinity but also from Iki and Tsushima island.4 Residents in Munakata know from their daily experience that they can view Okinoshima not only from Ōshima and Jinoshima...
islands but also from some parts of the main island of Kyūshū, including Mt. Tsutagatake (a mountain with an altitude of 369 meters popularly known as Jōyama) and the coastal areas facing the Genkai Sea except those from which the view of Okinoshima Island is blocked by either of these two islands. In short, Okinoshima is a divine but familiar island visible from Munakata in the main land Kyūshū.

Okinoshima Island came to attract the interest and attention of the public as well as the academia due to the three rounds of archaeological surveys, which were conducted intermittently from May 1954 to May 1971 as well as their outcomes. These surveys were not something the public regard as excavation projects. The dating activity was based on the artifacts rather than archaeological features that had been found. The surveys have found that Okinoshima rituals evolved through four phases: (i) ritual(s) on top (atop) of a rock(s); (ii) ritual(s) in the shade of a rock (in the shade of a overhanging rock; beneath a overhanging rock); (iii) ritual(s) partly in rock shadows and partly in the open air; and (iv) ritual(s) in the open air (under the open sky). The surveys have also found that Okinoshima rituals continued for over 500 years from the late 4th century to the end of the 9th century or the beginning of the 10th century.

A wide variety of objects have been found. Among them are high-quality artifacts of a Chinese or Korean origin and nearly 60 mirrors and small jars of Nara three-colored (trichrome) glazed ware, including triangular-rimmed deity-and-beast mirrors (including those made abroad and their imitations). As a result, Okinoshima came to be called the “Shōsōin of the Sea,” after the Imperial treasure house in Nara. The national nature of ancient rituals in Okinoshima is strongly suggested as their discontinuation almost corresponded with the end of the national project of sending envoys to Tang China. The actual picture remains hazy, however, as there are virtually no contemporary historical material that describes the ancient rituals for the Munakata goddesses, especially those in Okinoshima.

2. The Notation and Etymology of Munakata

The term Munakata, as used in the name of deity, clan, or place, is known to be expressed in three forms: (i) 胸肩, 胸形, or 胸方, (ii) 宗形, and (iii) 宗像. It is undoubtedly safe to say that the second form “宗形” was used chiefly in Nara period (710-794), as seen in Syōsō-in-monyō, ancient documents of Shōsō-in of Tōdai-ji Temple, and Nagaya-ō-ke mokkan, a set of recently unearthed wooden plates on which records of the Prince Nagaya family are written, while the third form “宗像” has been in common use since Heian period (794-1192). The first form is seen in the two oldest extant historical records of Japan: Kojiki (the Records of Ancient Matters) and Nihonshoki (the Chronicles of Japan). The form “胸形” appears in the first section of Kojiki, known as 神代巻 (book on the age of deities), while Nihonshoki uses “胸肩” in 神代 下 (the second of the two volumes on the age of deities), “胸形” (in the articles of the 41st year of the reign of Emperor Ōjin and the second year of the reign of Emperor Temmu), and “胸方” (in the articles of the ninth year of the reign of Emperor Yūryaku and the 13th year of the reign of Emperor Temmu). What is notable is the use of “胸” in both chronicles. Nihonshoki’s article of February of the second year of the Temmu reign (673) includes a sentence: “次納胸形君徳善女尼子娘，生二高市皇子命一” Nihonshoki’s article of November of the 13th year of his reign enumerates 52 clans who were granted the title “朝臣 [ason],” one of the eight honorary titles known as “八色の姓[Yakusa-no-kabane].” Among the 52 clans is “胸方君” [the Munakata clan, with “no-Kimi” showing the clan had a title “Kimi,” one of the honorary titles for a clan]. Nihonshoki uses the term Munakata as the name of a deity as well. For example, its article of February of the 41st year of the reign of Emperor Ōjin includes the term “胸形大神”. Likewise, Nihonshoki’s article of February of the ninth year of the Yūryaku reign includes the term “胸方神”. These articles suggest that Munakata and “胸” were closely related to each other over the years.

Nihonshoki often added embellishments or amendments to the original historical material in the process of compilation based on the latest knowledge at that time. For example, it used the term “郡” in place of the term “評”. Likewise, it was presumably possible to replace “胸” in Munakata with “宗.” Clearly, the possibility that “宗” was used in the original and changed to “胸” in the editing process is extremely low compared with the possibility of the other way around. It is thus reasonable to conclude that the use of “胸” reflects the notation in the original; editorial amendments were unlikely. This is associated with the etymology or the origin of the term Munakata; it also concerns the attributes of the Munakata goddesses.
and the Munakata clan.

For the etymology of Munakata, four major theories have been proposed: (i) the “身形” theory; (ii) the “放光” theory; (iii) the “沼無潟・空潟” theory; and (iv) the “文身（入墨）” theory.

The first theory is based on Saikaidō Fudoki in Munakata Daibosatsu Goengi, which states that the Munakata Grand Goddesses descended from heaven and deposited Aoninotama, Murasakidama, and a mirror in the three shrine as “神體之形” (images of objects in which a deity resides) and that the region accordingly came to be called the “身形郡”, which was later changed to the “宗像” district. The note to Saikaido Fudoki states that another story says that the region came to be called “身像郡” because, of the four gods, the three elders had their younger brother Ōamano Mikoto reside as the embodiment of the three “三柱御身之像” in the region. It would be illogical to regard either of these two stories as belonging to ancient times because Munakata Daibosatsu Goengi itself was compiled in the Medieval period and because Munakata Daibosatsu, a term indicating Buddhist influence, is used. Saikaido Fudoki is unique in at least two aspects. First, it regards Ōamano Mikoto as the ancestor of Munakata-no-Ason [the Munakata clan, with “no-Ason” meaning that the clan had a title “Ason,” one of the hereditary titles that represent a high political and social status]. Second, it states that he sacrificed his life for the three Munakata gods (rather than goddesses). These descriptions are contradictory to the old legends such as Kojiki and Nihonshoki. It is more reasonable to conclude that this theory is based on the misinterpretation of Kata as image. The second theory is based largely on the old chronicle quoted in Chikuyōki by YASUMI Arisada (Volume 12: Munakata Gun [district]), which includes a story that when the Three Goddesses of Munakata appeared, they gave off a light from their shoulders [肩] and chests [胸]. This interpretation is likely derived from a radiant halo around a Buddhist image. It is a story redolent of Buddhism. In that sense, this theory resonates with the first theory. The third theory is based on Chikuzen Shi by FUKUMOTO Makoto, which argues that Munakata derives from the assumption that the Tajima River (the present-day Tsuri River) was once an inlet deep inland with much of the region being tidal flats. This assumption has already been substantiated by AOYAGI Tanenobu as well as by recent surveys. This theory should be interpreted as reflecting the forced analogy between the geological history and Munakata. The first and third theories fail to mention the term “胸” as used in Kojiki and Nihonshoki. The second theory reflects the forced analogy between 胸/肩 and Munakata—an analogy redolent of Buddhist influence.

Compared with these three theories, the fourth theory of 細身（入墨） espoused by KANASEKI Takeo deserves attention. Kanaseki argues that the character “文” in “胸” was originally written as “文.” He maintains that the character “文” meaning “pattern” is derived from a tattoo [入墨] character on the chest according to studies on ancient inscriptions of Chinese characters on oracle bones and carapaces. The scale-like pattern featuring triangular figures in a later period represent the scales of a serpent that are associated with the dragon and serpent faith believed in the coastal area facing the China Sea. KANASEKI says: “Munakata in northern Kyūshū was originally written as ‘Munakata’ (expressed by the Chinese character made up of 胸 in the upper half and 月 in the lower half plus another character 形). The descendants of amabe who served the Yamato kingly power with their marine products and navigation skills] with scale-like patterned tattoos on their chests constituted the Munakata clan in northern Kyūshū.” The text on Wa in the Biographies of the Wuhuan, Xianbei, and Dongyi of the Records of Three Kingdoms (Sanguo Zhi) includes a sentence: “Water-men of Wa are good at diving and catching fish and clams; they wear tattoos to ward off large fish and waterfowls.” Even haniwas or ancient Japanese clay figurines have tattoos of a scale pattern. Nihonshoki’s article of April of the first year of Emperor Richū reign states that the face tattoos associated with Azumi-no-Muraji [the Azumi clan, with “no-Muraji” meaning the clan had a title “Muraji,” one of the honorary titles for a clan] was called “Azumi-me.” The Azumi clan was a family who worshiped the marine deities called Azumi-no-Kami (the deities of Watatsumi) and gathered marine products for the Emperor. Relics of such incantational practices were seen as late as the early 1960s in the Munakata region. In those days, women divers in the Kanezaki area inscribed the character “大” on their belongings and stitched a asterisk (starfish) pattern onto their clothes. The assumption that the term Munakata derives from a tattoo of a scale pattern distinct from Azumi-me is quite consistent with the profuse use of “胸” in Kojiki and Nihonshoki.
3. The Trinitiy of Marine Goddessess

The Munakata goddesses, worshiped by the Munakata clan, constitutes a trinity, as shown by articles in Kojiki and Nihonshoki as well as Volume 10 of Engi-Shiki, a set of Japanese governmental regulations compiled in the Engi era (901-923), all of which include the expression “the three Munakata shrines.” The Azumi gods and the Sumiyoshi gods are also known as a trinity of deities. Both have features characteristic of marine deities.

Kojiki and Nihonshoki both describe the Azumi and Sumiyoshi gods as having appeared in a simultaneous and integrated manner in their respective chapters on the birth of four deities of their respective volume on the age of the gods. According to Nihonshoki (Volume 1, the first of the two volumes on the age of the gods), the Azumi and Sumiyoshi gods were born when Izanagi-no-mikoto, after returning from Yomotsukuni where he had visited in pursuit of Izanami-no-mikoto, performed ablutions and ritual purification (misogiharae) in Tsukushi no Himuka no Odo no Tachibana no Awakihara. First, he “went to the bottom of the sea and washed himself” and bore Sokotsuwatatsumi-no-Mikoto and Sokotsutsunoo-no-Mikoto in that order. Second, he “washed himself in the seawater” and bore Nakatsuwasatatsunoo-no-Mikoto and Nakatsuwasunoo-no-Mikoto in that order. Then he “floated on the seawater and washed himself” and born Uwatsuwatatsumi-no-Mikoto and Uwatsutsunoo-no-Mikoto. Sokotsutsunoo-no-Mikoto, Nakatsuwasunoo-no-Mikoto, and Uwatsutsunoo-no-Mikoto represent the trinity of Sumiyoshi gods, as explained in Kojiki (“三柱神者、墨江之三前大神也”) and Nihonshoki (“是即住吉大神矣”). Likewise, Sokotsuwatatsumi-no-Mikoto, Nakatsuwasatatsunoo-no-Mikoto, and Uwatsutsunoo-no-Mikoto represent the trinity of Azumi gods or Watatsumi nokami, as explained in Kojiki (“此三柱綿津見神者、阿曇連等之祖神以伊都久神也。故阿曇連等者、其綿津見神之子、宇都志日金析命之子孫也”) and Nihonshoki (“是阿曇連等所祭神矣”). The birth of the two trinities of gods due to the ablutions and ritual purification occurred at the bottom of the sea, in the middle of the seawater, and on the seawater. And their names bear the characters that reflect where they were born: Soko (bottom), Naka (middle), and Uwa (on)—three vertical positions in the seawater. All these aspects clearly show that the Azumi and Sumiyoshi trinities are inseparable from the sea. And their names themselves clearly show that they are gods, not goddesses.

The Azumi gods or the Watatsumi nokami were worshiped by Azumi-no-Muraji (the Azumi clan). The use of the terms “祖神” and “所祭神” clearly shows that the Azumi gods are their ancestral deities. Three major pieces of evidence show that Azumi-no-Muraji and their gods were chiefly characterized by fishing or by the status of fishermen (amabe). First, the Azumi clan subjugated fishermen of several places who had defied orders and thus served as their leader (as reported by Nihonshoki’s article of Nobember of the third year of Emperor Ōjin reign). Second, the clan wore Geimen called “Azumi-me” as mentioned earlier (as reported by Nihonshoki’s article of April of the first year of Emperor Richū reign). Third, the Azumi clan was traditionally ordered to serve as Tomo-no-miyatsuko-kei-shizoku tasked with overall management of cooking for the Emperor under the Ritsuryō system. Azumi-no-Muraji was a traditional trade-specific clan who gathered fish, shellfish, and seaweeds, and serve meals to the Emperor.

The Sumiyoshi gods are not specified by the name of Tsutsunoo-no-Mikoto in Kojiki or Nihonshoki, which simply call them “Suminoe-no-Mimaes-no-Ōkami” or “Sumiyoshi-no-Ōkami.” Neither Kojiki nor Nihonshoki specifies which clan worshiped these gods. These two chronicles make the subsequent reference to the Three Gods of Sumiyoshi when they tell a story in which Emperor Chūai and Empress Jingū tried to subjugate the Kumaso people and Silla. Emperor Chūai defied the oracle he received as he tried to defeat the Kumaso and consequently died in Kashii-no-miya in Tsukushi. Empress Jingū wanted to know which deity(ies) gave the oracle. That deity(ies) turned out to be the Sumiyoshi gods. According to Nihonshoki, these gods said to Empress Jingū before she embarked on her endeavor to conquer Silla: “和魂 [nigimitama] (their peaceful and calming aspect) shall stand by the Empress and protect her life. 荒魂 [aramitama] (their harsh and raging aspect) shall lead the van of the war vessels” (Nihonshoki’s article of September of the ninth year of the Chūai reign, the pre-Jingu era). 荒魂 is 「軍に従ひ神表筒男・中筒男・底筒男、三の神、皇后に従へば日はく、我が荒魂をば、穴門の山田邑に祭はしめよ。時に穴門直の祖踐立・津守連の祖田裳見宿祢、皇后に啓して曰さく、神の居しまさ欲しくしたまふ地をば、必ず定め奉るべし。則ち踐立を以て、荒魂を祭ひたてまつる神主とす。仍りて祠を穴門の山
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Engishiki (Volume 10, the second of the two volumes on the names of deities) includes an interlinear note that states 元名津守氏人神 for the two deities enshrined at the Ovatatsumi Shrine in Sumiyoshi district, Settsu Province. This reflects the addition of “名”, as well as the change from “安” to “氏”, made to the original term “元津守安人神” by the editor of Shintei Zōho Kokushi Taikei. However, the deity name “津守安必登神” (two deities described as marine deities) appears in Sumiyoshi Taisha Jindai Ki. There is no need to dwell on the fact that 津守安必登神 is 津守安人神. The above-mentioned story about Empress Jingū indicated that Tsumori-no-Muraji’s involvement in the Sumiyoshi gods was the result of the kingly power’s order. In other words, the clan performed the rituals as a duty. The fact that the name of the clan does not correspond to that of the deities suggests that the deities are not the ancestral deities of the clan. By contrast, the inclusion of “津守” in “津守安必登神=津守安人神” indicates that these deities are those originally worshiped by Azumi-no-Muraji; they are likely the clan’s ancestral deities. The term “Tsumori” literally derives from “protecting [mori] the port [tsu].” The port in this case refers to the port of Sumiyoshi (Suminoe), an outport of Yamato kingly power. It would thus be safe to say that the Sumiyoshi gods were the gods of Sumiyoshi port. Engishiki shows that the Sumiyoshi gods were not enshrined in the Kantō region; they were worshiped in places along the most important route connecting the Kinai region and Korea via the Inland Sea, northern Kyūshū and Iki and Tsushima islands (摂津・住吉郡[Sumiyoshi-gun (ancient district),Settsu province]→播磨・賀茂郡[Kamo-gun,Harima province]→長門・豊浦郡[Toyouura-gun,Nagato province]→筑前・那珂郡[Naka-gun,Chikuzen province]→壹岐・壹岐郡[Iki-gun,Iki province]→対馬・下県郡[Shimoagata-gun,Tsushima province]). This is also reflected in the Empress Jingū legend, which represents the results of the kingly power having gained control over the external sea routes and the ports essential for navigation along these routes.

The trinities of the Azumi and Sumiyoshi gods were marine gods based in and around Ōsaka Bay; the former and the latter were the fishing gods and the port gods, respectively, of Yamato kingly power, which ruled the Kinai region. The Sumiyoshi gods also had attributes as navigation deities because they were basically port gods. What about the trinity of the Munakata goddesses then? This is the question the next section tries to answer.

4. The Legend of the Birth of the Three Goddesses of Munakata (Ukei Legend)

A total of six accounts (or versions of the legend) are known regarding the birth of the Munakata goddesses; one in the first section of Kojiki, the main account and three alternative accounts in Chapter 6: “瑞珠盟約章” in the first of the two volumes on the age of deities of Nihonshoki, and one in Chapter 7: “宝鏡開始章” of the same volume. It is safe to say that these accounts are as politically motivated as the Tenson Kōrin legend in which Ninigi-no-Mikoto, a grandchild of Amaterasu-Ōmikami, descended from Takamagahara. The following paragraph summarized the account that the editors of Nihonshoki adopted as the main text:

One day, Susanowo-no-Mikoto was ordered by his father Izanagi-no-Mikoto to go to Nenokuni [the land of the dead]. Susanowo-no-Mikoto first headed for Takamagahara [High Heavenly Plain] where his sister Amaterasu-Ōmikami [the Sun Goddess] to make his farewell to her. His trip rocked both the sea and the mountains. Suspicious that her brother was coming up to seize her territory, Amaterasu-Ōmikami tied her hair atop the head to look like a man and armed herself with a sword and a bow and arrow. To prove his sincerity, Susanowo-no-Mikoto suggested giving birth to children in ukei [trial by pledge]. He told his sister to believe his sincerity if he gives birth to male children; if the children turn out to be female, then he is insincere. Amaterasu-Ōmikami broke her brother’s sword into
three pieces, rinsed them in the water from the well called 天真名井[Ame-no-manai], chewed them, and spewed them out from her mouth in a mist form. From the mist appeared the three goddesses: 田心姫[Tagorihime], 湾津姫[Tagitsuhime], and 市杵嶋姫[Ichikishimahime]. Likewise, Susanowo-no-Mikoto spewed his sister’s ornaments out in a mist form. From the mist appeared five gods, including 天忍穂耳尊[Ame-no-oshihomimi-no-mikoto]. Amaterasu-Ōmikami said that the gods were her children because they were born out of her ornaments. Likewise, she said that the goddesses were her brother’s children because they were born out of his sword and gave the goddesses to Susanowo-no-Mikoto. The three goddesses were those worshiped by Munakata-no-Kimi in Tsukushi.

The six accounts about the birth of the Munakata goddesses revolve around 誓約[ukehi; vow]between Amaterasu-Ōmikami, the supreme goddess in Takamagahara, and Susanowo-no-Mikoto, 国津神[Kunitsu-kami; a deity of earth]. The accounts differ, however, in a number of aspects. These different aspects are summarized in Table 1. Major differences lie in Aspect 1 (Amaterasu-Ōmikami or 日神), Aspect 3 (whether monozane [things from which the deities were born] were exchanged, Aspect 10 (whether 所生神 were exchanged), and Aspect 11 (whether 天降り took place). Based on these differences, the six accounts can largely classified into A and B as shown in the 18th row. Of the accounts classified as A, the second alternative account in Table 1 is tentatively reclassified as A’ because it is opposite to other accounts classified as A in four aspects: it mentions the exchange of the monozane in Aspect 3, fails to mention the exchange of the offspring deities in Aspect 10, describes the monozane of the three goddesses as gems in Aspect 4, and describes the monozane of the gods as a sword. Of the accounts classified as B, the third account in Chapter 7 omits the details of the birth of the three goddesses by Hinokami and focuses its attention rather on the birth of the gods by Susanowo-no-Mikoto. It bears resemblance to the third account in Chapter 6 in stating that six—five gods (the five gods plus Hinohayahi-no-Mikoto). Because of its slight differences from other accounts classified as B, however, the third account in Chapter 7 is tentatively reclassified as B’. In term of Aspect 12 (which clan worshiped the offspring deities), it would be safe to regard the Class-A accounts as being of an origin of Munakata-no-Kimi and the Class-B accounts as being of an origin of Minuma-no-Kimi [the Minuma clan, with "no-Kimi" showing the clan had a title "Kimi," one of the honorary titles for a clan]. Table 2 is a revised version of Table 1 with its focus placed on the birth of the Three Goddesses of Munakata. The following paragraphs delve deeper into the accounts with reference made to Table 2.

Ukei in Aspects (a) serves as the criterion for verifying which is right: Susanowo-no-Mikoto’s sincerity (the unfairness of Amaterasu-Ōmikami’s suspicion) or his insincerity (the fairness of Amaterasu-Ōmikami’s suspicion). As to who proposed this criterion, Class-A accounts cite Susanowo-no-Mikoto and Class-B accounts name Amaterasu-Ōmikami, except that the account in Kojiki fails to specify who proposed it. However, this account may suggest that Susanowo-no-Mikoto might have proposed the criterion as it states that after the birth of the offspring deities, Susanowo-no-Mikoto said: “我心清明⇒手弱女⇒自我勝.”

The difference in the criterion for proving Susanowo-no-Mikoto’s sincerity—whether the offspring deities are gods or goddesses—corresponds to the difference between Kojiki (which specifies goddesses) and Nihonshoki (which specify gods), not to the difference between Class-A accounts and Class-B accounts. In the act of ukei, Amaterasu-Ōmikami or Hinokami used a 剣 whether it belonged to her or Susanowo-no-Mikoto, and Susanowo-no-Mikoto used 玉 whether they belong to him or Amaterasu-Ōmikami (or Hinokami) except in the second alternative account in Table 1, in which 剣 and 玉 are reversed. It is generally believed that a sword represents a man and a gem symbolizes a woman. If this belief is relevant to this particular act, either performer in ukei used the monozane representing the opposite sex to give birth. That would be a humanistic and realistic story although it belongs to the legendary world.

Class-A accounts and Class-B accounts differ on how the offspring deities were born. The former states that they were born out of the mist of the chewed monozane that had been spewed from the mouth. The latter says that they were born as the result of eating the monozane, except in the account in Chapter 7, in which the offspring deities were born out of the chewed monozane placed on the palm of the hand. The ways in which the offspring deities were born differ greatly from those in the case of the Azumi gods or the Sumiyoshi gods, which appeared at successive vertical positions. The Munakata goddesses, by contrast,
appeared from the mist horizontally spewed, according to Class-A accounts. This difference deserved attention from the viewpoint of mythology as well.26)

The Kojiki and the Nihonshoki concur in stating that the offspring deities were of the same sex as the performer. According to these two historical records of Japan, the three goddesses were born between Amaterasu-Ōmikami or Hinokami and the sword, while the five (or six) gods were born between Susanowo-no-Mikoto and the gems in aspects (e) (except in the second alternative account in Chapter 6).

Table 1 The legend of the birth of the Three Goddesses of Munakata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>要素</th>
<th>出典</th>
<th>古事記</th>
<th>日本書紀</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>第6段</td>
<td>第7段</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>誓約者</td>
<td>天照大御神</td>
<td>日神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>天照大御神</td>
<td>天照大神</td>
<td>日神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>誓約基準設定者</td>
<td>素戔嗚尊</td>
<td>天神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>素戔嗚尊</td>
<td>素戔嗚尊</td>
<td>天神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>三女神誕生の物実</td>
<td>須佐之男命の十握剣</td>
<td>日神の十握剣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>須佐之男命の十握剣</td>
<td>九握剣</td>
<td>日神の十握剣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>三女神誕生の物実</td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>日神の十握剣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>日神の十握剣</td>
<td>日神の十握剣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>市杵嶋の御統の瓊</td>
<td>日神の十握剣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>市杵嶋の御統の瓊</td>
<td>日神の十握剣</td>
<td>日神の十握剣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>天照大神所生</td>
<td>三女神</td>
<td>三女神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>三女神</td>
<td>三女神</td>
<td>天照大神所生</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>三女神 (出生順)</td>
<td>多紀理売命*</td>
<td>田心姫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>市杵嶋売命**</td>
<td>瀬津嶋姫</td>
<td>田心姫命</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>日神所生</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>素戔嗚尊所生五男神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>鬧所</td>
<td>胸形之男津宮</td>
<td>海濱</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>胸形之男津宮</td>
<td>海濱</td>
<td>胸形之男津宮</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>子の交換</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>天照大神所生五男神</td>
<td>五男神</td>
<td>五男神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>天照大神所生五男神</td>
<td>五男神</td>
<td>五男神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>天真名井</td>
<td>赤津□</td>
<td>赤津□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>天安河</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>天安河</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>五男神誕生の物実</td>
<td>天照大御神之神</td>
<td>天照大神の御統の瓊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>萬松の御統の瓊</td>
<td>天照大神の神</td>
<td>天照大神の神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>五男神 (出生順)</td>
<td>天照大御神之神</td>
<td>天照大神の神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>天照大神之神</td>
<td>天照大神之神</td>
<td>天照大神之神</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>分類</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The hatched part of 17 shows records of “後裔氏族”.
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This resonates with the understanding that the three goddesses worshiped by Munakata-no-Kimi and Minuma-no-Kimi derive from Amaterasu-Ōmikami or Hinokami; it is favorable for the worshiping clans in their political relationship with the kingly power and the genealogy of gods. The relationship with the kingly power must have been affected, however, by the act of exchanging the offspring deities on account of the owner of the monozane as seen in Aspects (c) and making the three goddesses the children of Susanowo-no-Mikoto.

Kojiki states that Susanowo-no-Mikoto’s sincerity will be proved if goddesses result. Nihonshoki, by contrast, states that his sincerity will be proved if gods result. In other words, Amaterasu-Ōmikami’s offspring deities are male according to Kojiki and female according to Nihonshoki. 27) Class-A accounts agree on almost all the aspects, except that the account in Kojiki differs from both the main account and the second alternative account in Nihonshoki on the criterion for proving Susanowo-no-Mikoto’s sincerity. Because Kojiki specifies goddesses as proof for his sincerity, Susanowo-no-Mikoto, who gave birth to gods, should have been judged to be insincere, according to the logic of Kojiki. There are only two options to negate this conclusion: specifying gods as proof for Susanowo-no-Mikoto’s sincerity as in Nihonshoki or denying that the gods are his children. In selecting the second option, Kojiki carried out complex manipulations—regarding the offspring deities of Susanowo-no-Mikoto as goddesses, as well as exchanging both the monozane (Aspects (b)) and the offspring (Aspects (c)), or in other words, regarding the offspring as the children of the owner of the monozane. 28) The main account in Nihonshoki has created a major contradiction in which Susanowo-no-Mikoto should be judged insincere because while regarding gods as proof for this sincerity, it states that the exchange of the offspring took place, making the goddesses his children. A similar contradiction does not occur in the second alternative account in Chapter 6, in which the monozane was exchanged but the children were not. This suggests that the exchange of the offspring in the main account in Nihonshoki is not of primary importance.

Both Class-A and Class-B accounts in the Nihonshoki, which think of gods as proof for Susanowo-no-Mikoto’s sincerity, regard the gods as the children of Susanowo-no-Mikoto because the
performer in ukei (Susanowo-no-Mikoto) gave birth to the gods. Class-A accounts state that the belonging of the performer’s sibling was used as monozane (meaning that the exchange took place). In that sense, they differ from Class-B accounts, which state that the performer’s belonging was used as monozane (meaning that the exchange did not take place). Apart from this difference, both accounts concur in stating that Amaterasu-Ōmikami or Hinokami performed ukei with a sword (Aspects (d)) and that Susanowo-no-Mikoto performed ukei with gems (Aspects (e)), with the exclusion of the second alternative account in Chapter 6. According to the Class-B accounts, Amaterasu-Ōmikami or Hinokami gave birth to the goddesses and Susanowo-no-Mikoto gave birth to the gods regardless of whether the performer or the owner is regarded as the one who gave birth. Regarding the performer as the one who gave birth would contradict the criterion in the Class-A account in Kojiki, as has been noted earlier. Regarding the owner of the monozane as the one who gave birth would not contradict the criterion in Kojiki because in that case, Susanowo-no-Mikoto’s monozane resulted in the birth of the goddesses and Amaterasu-Ōmikami’s monozane resulted in the birth of the gods. However, it would go against the criterion in Nihonshoki. If the exchange of the monozane and offspring deities is a secondary matter in Class-A accounts in Nihonshoki, then it transpires that Kojiki, which thinks of goddesses as proof of Susanowo-no-Mikoto’s sincerity, regards the owner of the monozane as the one who gave birth, meaning that his offspring are goddesses.

This means that the three goddesses derive from Susanowo-no-Mikoto (the Izumo lineage); this lineage would put kingly power at a politically disadvantageous position. That does not mean, however, Izumo-no-Omi worshipped the three goddesses. It can be interpreted that the relationship between Munakata-no-Kimi (三女神奉斎氏族) and Amaterasu-Ōmikami or 日神 (Aspects (d)) means the political approval of the clan by the kingly power and even the status of it as relatives of the kingly power. The change of the biological parent of the goddesses to Susanowo-no-Mikoto does not necessarily mean that the kingly power lowered the status of the worshipping clan. Rather, it is more likely means that the change was made as demanded by the clan and that the kingly power approved the change.

As will be discussed later, the kingly power and Munakata-no-Kimi established close political ties through marital relationship when Amako-no-Iratsume, daughter of Munakata-no-Kimi Tokuzen, married Prince Ōama-no-Miko (Emperor Tenmu, a descendent from Emperor Jomei) and gave birth to Prince Takechi-no-Miko, who came to play a major political role later. This political relationship allowed the Munakata goddesses to assume the nature of being an Amatsukami [a deity of heaven] by regarding them as the children of Amaterasu-Ōmikami in the Takamagahara legend amid a number of major developments, including the promotion of Amaterasu-Ōmikami to the status of being the founding deity of the Imperial Clan, the compilation of Kojiki and Nihonshoki, and the reorganization of the Jingi rituals (rituals dedicated to Kami of heaven and earth). In the Jingi system under the Ritsuryō regime of the Nara period, the Ritsuryō government had to approve the powerful traditions of Munakata gods (Munakata-no-ason) and the Izumo deities (Izumo-no-Omi), who asserted their identity in that period of time. That may have led to the assertion that the three goddesses were the children of Susanowo-no-Mikoto, a Kunitsukami [a deity of earth], as described in Kojiki.

5. The Names of the Three Goddesses and Their Original Residence

As has been summarized in the previous section, the six accounts of the birth of the Three Goddesses of Munakata can be largely classified into Class A and Class B. There are differences between Kojiki and Nihonshoki as well. The complexity involving the exchange of the monozane and the children and the conflicting criteria, coupled with the Tenson Kōrin legend, is closely associated with the inclusion of the deities of the Izumo lineage into those in Takamagahara (those of the Yamato lineage) in the more politically-motivated legend on the birth of the three goddesses and the five gods.

Nihonshoki describes the Munakata goddesses as a trinity, referring to them as the trinity of goddesses worshiped by Munakata-no-Kimi (神代上・瑞珠盟約章) and as "於筑紫所居三神" (in its article of fifth year of Emperor Richū reign). It also described them as "胸形大神" (in the article of the 41st year of Emperor Ōjin reign) and "胸方神" (in the article of the ninth year of the Yūryaku reign). The collective name of the deities corresponds to that of the worshipping clan as in the case of the Azumi gods, as has been discussed. Unlike the marine-born Azumi or Sumiyoshi gods, the Munakata goddesses were said to
have been born as the result of ukehi in 高天原[Takamagahara]; no connection with the sea is explicitly shown. Such connection is implicitly indicated, however, by the names of the goddesses shown in Table 1, as well as by the terms “Dōtū” and “Kaihokudōtū.” The existence of an amabe settlement in the Munakata district is also suggestive of such connection. The following paragraphs summarize these indications.

As Aspects 7 and 8 in Table 1 show, the three goddesses are called Takitsuhime, Takorihime, and Ichikishimahime (or Itsukishimahime). Their names almost correspond to those specified in Kojiki and Nihonshoki. Takitsuhime is expressed as 多岐都比売命 and 濟津姫, Ichikishimahime as 市寸嶋比売命 and 市杵嶋姬, and Takorihime as 多紀理田比売命 and 田心姫 in Kojiki and Nihonshoki, respectively.

The expression “田霧姫” in the third alternative account in Table 1 of Nihonshoki corresponds to 田心姫.32) Where do these divine names come from? And what do they mean? The character “湍” in Takitsuhime means “fast, fast flowing, or rapid stream.”33) If this character is a meaning-equivalent character rather than a phonetic-equivalent one, “Takitsu” in Takitsuhime denotes “tagitsu” or “tagiru” meaning a rapidly eddying tide. Such tides must have been deified as Takitsuhime. Takorihime, which is also expressed as “田霧姫,” may well represent a divinity that has personified a marine fog. Both “Ichiki” in Ichikishimahime and “Itsuki” in Itsukishimahime mean “斎く.” Ichikishimahime (Itsukishimahime) is interpreted to represent a goddess to be worshiped or enshrined (斎つき祀られ、斎つき祀る神). The word “Ichikishimahime” (also known as “Okitsushimahime”) and other words representing this goddess in all the six accounts contain the common word component “shima” meaning “island.” This suggests that this goddess is 瀬島 (island deity) in nature34) and that it is the central deity among the three goddesses. If that is the case, Kojiki inappropriately regards 奥津嶋姫比売命 as another name of 多紀理田比売命 instead of 市寸嶋比売命. This must have been influenced by 狭依田比売命.35)

Where has this island goddess resided? It is most reasonable to assume that it has resided in the island farthest from the coast. For one thing, the three goddesses correspond to three shrines in Kojiki and the second alternative account in Table 1—Okitsu-miya, Nakatsu-miya, and Hetsu-miya. For another, they also correspond to the divine names in the third alternative account in Table 1 of Nihonshoki.36) In all the six accounts but the main account in Nihonshoki, the three goddesses each resided in the farthest, middle and nearest locations in the order of birth. The three alternative accounts in Nihonshoki describe the horizontal distribution of the three goddesses from the location farthest from Munakata in the main island of Kyūshū toward the main island. The main account in Nihonshoki, by contrast, describes the distribution from the main island. The goddess residing in a location farthest from the main island was called Okitsushimahime, as people saw the island farthest from the coast. This contrasts sharply with Watatsumi of Azumi and Sumiyoshi, whose names include components meaning the surface, the middle and the bottom. The fact that there are no such names as “Nakatsushimahime” or “Chikatsushimahime”37) may suggest that Okitsushimahime is different from the other two goddesses in terms of both divinity and the time of appearance.

It should be noted here that Okitsushimahime is expressed as “奥津嶋比売” in the Class-A account in Kojiki and “瀛津姫” in the two Class-B accounts, that is, the first and third alternative accounts in Nihonshoki as shown in Aspects 7 and 8. The first and the second expressions contain the characters “奥” and “瀛” respectively. Likewise, the goddess’s residence also contains “奥” in Kojiki and “瀛” in the second alternative account in Table 1 of Nihonshoki. The use of the second character “瀛” in Nihonshoki is limited. The use in 天津中原瀛真人, the Japanese posthumous title for Emperor Temmu (Prince Ōama-no-Miko) is one of the few known examples. The character “瀛” meaning “sea” or “ocean” is also known to have Taoist connotations as seen in the expression “瀛洲,” a mountain in the Tokai region that was believed to be home to Taoist immortals. The inclusion of “瀛” as well as “真” in 天津中原瀛真人 is the result of Emperor Temmu himself having performed divination. Emperor Temmu, as well as his mother Empress Saimei, who built a Taoist temple, is known to be associated with Taoism and the Way of Yin and Yang. In this way, the use of “瀛” provides a useful clue as to how and when the legend of the birth of the three goddesses was developed.

It would be safe to say that by the time when Kojiki and Nihonshoki were completed, the residences of the deities had been generally determined to be Okinoshima Island, Ōshima Island, and the mainland Kyūshū.
Table 1 suggests, however, that which goddess resided on which (is)land had not been fully established. What had been established is that Okitsushimahime who resides in Okinoshima is actually Ichikishimahime, as evidenced by factors. The relationship between 市杵嶋姫 and 瀬津嶋姫 in four of the five accounts of Nihonshoki. It must be the other two goddesses whose residences were in a state of flux. This may suggest that these two deities came some time after Ichikishimahime. The two Class-A accounts, one in Kojiki and the other being the main account in Nihonshoki, might reflect the state of more confusion before Nihonshoki. Be that as it may, it is clear that the goddess residing in Okinoshima represents the original form of the Munakata goddesses and that Okinoshima is their original residence.

6. Okinoshima Island: a Landmark in Kaihoku

Ichikishimahime (Itsukishimahime), the central figure among the Three Goddesses of Munakata, is 島神 (island deity) and a major landmark in the Genkai Sea. These attributes are best expressed in the direction given by Hinokami as described in Class-B accounts in Nihonshoki about the birth of the three goddesses. Regarding this direction, the first alternative account in Table 1 of Nihonshoki states: "日神(略)乃以二日神所生三女神ー、令レ降二於筑紫洲ー。因教之曰、汝三神、宜降二居道中ー、奉レ助二天孫ー、而為二天孫ー所祭也." Included in this passage is the phrase "descend on Michi-no-Naka." The third alternative account in Chapter 6 of Nihonshoki states: "日神(略)即以二日神所生三女神ー者、使レ降二居于葦原中國之宇佐嶋ー矣。今在二海北道中ー。號曰二道主貴ー." Included in this passage is the phrase "[the goddesses,] now in Umi-no-Kita-no-Michi-no-naka, are called Michinushi-no-Muchi." "Michi" clearly refers to a sea route. The goddesses residing in the sea route are the guardians of the sea route, which is none other than "Michinushi-no-Muchi." The fact that this direction was intended for the Munakata goddesses, as well as the phrase "descended on the land of Tsukushi" in the first alternative account, shows that the sea refers primarily to the Genkai Sea. Likewise, it is clear that the goddesses reside in Okinoshima. It is possible that the other two goddesses were added later as additional deities to protect the sea route over the years during which the people of the sea continued to worship Okinoshima (or 島神) from the shore of Munakata or from the sea.

The third alternative account in Table 1 explicitly states that Minuma-no-Kimi contributed to these Class-B accounts. As will be discussed later, Minuma-no-Kimi is a clan which was based in the Mizuma county in Chikugo Province and closely related to the Ariake Sea. The Munakata goddesses were not their ancestral deities; they were secondary deities for them. Given this fact, nothing must have stood in the way of the clan handing down the legend that regarded the Munakata goddesses they worshiped as the deities residing on the island in the Genkai Sea. According to the third alternative account, the Munakata goddesses descended on 葦原中國之宇佐嶋. Experts are divided over what Usa-no-Shima represents. Some argue that it refers to Usa in Buzen Province. Others maintain that it refers to Okinoshima in Chikuzen Province. The use of the ambiguous expression "葦原中國," as opposed to "the land of Tsukushi" as specified in the first alternative account, seems to have been politically motivated as in the case of the Tenson Ko Rin legend in Nihonshoki. According to the first alternative account, the three goddesses descended "to support the successive descendants." Because of this support, "the goddesses were worshiped by the descendants." If this concept is applicable to the third alternative account, this account can be interpreted as stating that the three goddesses were ordered to descend on the island to support the descendants. "Dōtyū" in the first alternative account corresponds to "Kaihokudōtyū" in the third alternative account. There has been a general understanding that "Kaihokudōtyū" refers to the sea route to the Korean Peninsula via Okinoshima, distinct from the one via Iki and Tsushima islands. The expression "Kaihoku" also appears in the memorial to King Song of Paekche in Nihonshoki’s article of December of the 15th year of Emperor Kimmey reign, which reads: "以斯羅無道、不レ畏二天皇ー、與レ狛同レ心、欲レ残二滅海北彌移居ー。臣等共議、遣二有至臣等ー、仰乞二軍士ー、征二伐斯羅ー." The expression "海北彌移居" in this passage is generally interpreted to mean Miyake in the Korean Peninsula from the overall context. This does not, however, explicitly mean that "Kaihoku" is a synonym for Korea or the Korean Peninsula. It is more appropriate to assume that "Kaihoku" simply means "to the north from a reference point."
sense of direction" regards Korea and China as located to the west as shown in such expressions as “海西諸国” (in the article of May of the 50th year of Jingū reign), “海西” (in the article of March of the 51st year of Jingū reign), “海西諸国官家” (in the article of February of the fifth year of Emperor Kimmei reign), “海西蕃国” (in the article of February of the 16th year of Emperor Kimmei reign), and “西海使” (in the article of July of Hakuchi 5 and the articles of the second, third, and fourth year of Emperor Saimei reign). There seems to be no problem in interpreting “to the west” as “to the west of the sea.” Experts would agree that Nihonshoki places the reference point in the Kinai region. By contrast, the reference point for “Kaihoku” is northern Kyūshū, not the Kinai region. It is more reasonable to assume that “Kaihoku” refers to the waters in and around the Genkai Sea, not a specific sea route and that “Kaihoku” in the legend of the three goddesses primarily points to the waters north of the Munakata region.

Today, vessels are generally equipped with modern instruments such as nautical charts and a radar; very few sailors navigate only with their own eyes. It is safe to say, however, that Okinoshima Island remains an important navigational landmark for vessels sailing in the Genkai Sea. As a map of the region shows, Okinoshima is situated in the center of the Genkai Sea, 60-70 kilometers each from Munakata (on the main island of Kyushū), northern Kyushū, Iki and Tsushima Island, Tsunoshima Island of Yamaguchi Prefecture, and Shimonoseki. If the ancient navigation was Jinori Kōhō, which centered around coastal or near coastal navigation that depended much on visual observations, then Okinoshima must have been a landmark in Kaihoku and served as a beacon that allowed sailors to know where they were and the direction they were heading for. This characterizes the Munakata goddesses as island deities. They protected the people of the sea (sailors and fishermen) who did not confine themselves to Munakata and northern Kyūshū, wished for safe voyages and abundant catches in the Genkai sea, and worshiped these deities.

7. The Munakata Goddesses and Yamato Kingly Power

The third alternative account in Table 1 of Nihonshoki, which is classified as belonging to Class B in Table 1, describes the three goddesses as “此筑紫の水沼君等が祭る神、是なり.” Minuma-no-Kimi was a powerful clan based in the Mizuma district in Chikugo Province near the Chikugo River and the Ariake Sea. Much of their origin is unknown, however. Nihonshoki, in its article of February of the fourth year of the Keikō reign, describes Kunichiwake-no-Miko (Haha-sono-Take-hime) as “the progenitor of the Munuma clan.” According to Nihonshoki’s article of July of the 18th year of the Emperor Keiko reign on the emperor’s trip to Kyūshū, Minuma-no-Agatanushi-Saru-Ōmi told him in Yame-ken that a goddess called Yametsu-hime resided in the mountains. These tales point to the clan’s close relationship with Yamato kingly power. It is important to remember that the tales of the imperial trip to Kyūshū in the reign of Emperor Keikō are more recent; Kojiki does not contain similar tales. Sendai Kūji Hongi, in Volume 5 on the grandson of Amaterasu-Ōmikami, describes Mononobe-no-Ajiko-no-Muraji-no-Kimi, the 14th descendant [of Umashimachi-no-Mikoto] as “the ancestor of the Minuma-no-Kimi and others.” The Mononobe was deeply involved in the pacification of or the rule over Kyūshū by the kingly power. For example, Mononobe-no-Ōmuraji-Arakabi is believed to have been dispatched to the Chikugo region to quell the “rebellion” by Iwai of Tsukushi-no-Kimi [the Tsukushi clan]. Be that as it may, the genealogical description in Sendai Kūji Hongi is secondary in importance and untrustworthy.

Minuma (水沼) may also be written as “水間” or “三瀬”. The character “瀬” means “a pool of water or a pond.” The clan’s names likely reflect such features in the lower reaches of the Chikugo River.

On the meaning of “minuma,” ORIKUCHI Shinohu argues that “minuma” and “mitsuha” are two different forms of the same word and that “mitsuha” in “Mitsuhanome” means “minuma.” He contends that “Mitsuhanome” was apparently thought to be a female serpent or an aquatic animal. Building on ORIKUCHI’s theory, TANIGAWA Kenichi maintains that mitsuha refers to a kind of aquatic serpent (mizuchi) and that Minuma-no-Kimi was none other than the shrine maiden who worshipped the serpent-shaped goddess who resided on the bottom of the water (the goddess of minuma). He considers it logical to conclude that the Munakata clan also worshipped this goddess. People living off the sea likely feared and venerated something lurking in the sea, and it seems that the Munakata was no exception. That does not necessarily mean, however, that the serpent-shaped goddess suggested by these two experts was directly associated with the Munakata goddesses or the Munakata-no-Kimi. If Minuma-no-Kimi
worshipped such a water deity, it is more likely that the clan had a chance to associate it with the Munakata goddesses and Munakata-no-Kimi. The pacification of the “rebellion” by Chikushi-no-Kimi Iwai represents a watershed in the process of Yamato kingly power gaining rule over Kyūshū. The Munakata made inroads into Chikugo and the Ariake Sea probably with the backing and intentions of the kingly power.

The tales that suggest close association between the Munakata clan and goddesses and the Chikugo region often feature hataori, which was without doubt closely associated with Jingi rituals. Hizen-no-Kuni Fudoki, in an episode in Himekosō gō, Kii -gun (ancient district), states that when Kaseko, a resident in the Munakata district, threw a banner to identify and pacify the raging deity, it flew over the grove of Himekosō Shrine in the Mihara district and fell near Yamaji River. This allowed Kaseko to know where the raging deity resided. The appearance of loom parts--kutsukubiki and tatari--in his dream showed that the deity turned out to be a goddess. According to the Nihonshoki’s article of February of the 41st year of the Ōjin reign, Achi-no-Omi and others were ordered to bring seamstresses and sent to Kure. After returning to Tsukushi with four seamstresses, they offered E-hime, one of the four, at the behest of Munakata-no-Ōkami. The other three arrived at Muko (Tsu) in Tsu Province. The article adds: This is the ancestor of the Mitsukai-no-Kimi, the clan who are now in Tsukushi Province. “This” in the sentence probably refers to Ehime. The identity of this clan cannot be independently confirmed. A similar tale is contained in the Nihonshoki’s article of January of the 14th year of the Yūryaku reign. According to the article, Ao and others of Musa-no-Suguri brought skilled seamstresses including Ayahatorī, Kurehatorī, and Kinunui-no-Ehime-Otohime from Kure and had them stay in the port of Sumiyoshi. Ehime was offered to Ōmiwa-no-Kami. Also referring to Ao and others of Musa-no-Suguri as well as Kure is the article of September of the tenth year of the Yūryaku reign. According to this article, the geese offered from Kure was bitten to death by a dog of the Minuma-no-Kimi, who offered swans and a swan-keeper to the kingly power as a sign of their atonement. Achi-no-Omi, Musa-no-Suguri, and others were from the Yamato-no-Ayashi, a clan who had come from the Eastern Han Dynasty of China. It is likely that these tales are the product of combing the clan’s tales with those of weavers (the Munakata goddesses) and bird-keepers (Minuma-no-Kimi). It is likely that these tales do not date back much. For one thing, it is assumed that Achi-no-Omi was placed above Tsuka-no-Omi as an older ancestor. For another, similar stories are contained in Nihonshoki’s articles on the Ōjin and Yūryaku reigns.

The articles in Nihonshoki reporting on the relationship between Yamato kingly power and the Munakata goddesses or Munakata-no-Kimi are those of March and October of the fifth year of the Richū reign and the one of February of the ninth year of the Yūryaku reign, as well as the volume on the Ōjin reign as mentioned above. According to these two articles on the Richū reign, “the three deities residing in Tsukushi” appeared in the imperial palace and raged: “Why did you take away our people? Now we shall shame you.” The Emperor “prayed but did not worship them (inorite matsurazu),” which “failed to pacify the divine curse (kami no tatarī wo osamezu).” As a result, Princess Kuro-hime died. It turned out that Kurumamochi-no-Kimi, the clan in charge of supervising the Kurumamochi-be, a group of people tasked with building and carrying the vehicles of the Court, went to Tsukushi and, in the process of inspecting the members of Kurumamochi-be, took away those entrusted with divine rituals. These members were later put back in the service of the three deities. According to the Newly Compiled Record of Surnames [Shinshen Shojirōku], a genealogy of noble clans, Kurumamochi-no-Kimi was given its name because the clan offered vehicles to Emperor Yūryaku. The Record categorizes Kurumamochi-no-Kimi under Kobetsu (offshoots of the imperial line, descended from Amaterasu-Ōmikami), Sakyō. Under the Ritsuryō system, Kurumamochi-no-Kimi supported Tonomoribe officers in the Imperial Palace Keeper's Bureau of the Imperial Household Department; it took charge of the Emperor’s vehicles and attendance on the Emperor. Some members of the clan were likely put in charge of the vehicle for the three deities of Tsukushi. The divine curse likely reflects the ire of the deities whose demand had not been met; it does not signify that the Munakata goddesses were cursing deities. This tale reflects the memory of the “rebellion” by Chikushi-no-Kimi Iwai representing a watershed in the process of Yamato kingly power gaining rule over Kyūshū. The Munakata made inroads into Chikugo and the Ariake Sea probably with the backing and intentions of the kingly power.

According to the article of the Yūryaku reign, Ōshikōchi-no-Atai-no-Katabu and uneme attendant were dispatched to worship the Munakata deities. When they were about to perform a rite in the altar hall, Katabu raped her. Upon hearing this news, the Emperor sent Naniwa-no-Hidaka-no-Kishi to put Katabu to death. He ran away. Eventually Yuge-no-Muraji Toyo [the Yuge clan] caught and executed Katabu in Aihara of the Mishima district. The act by the kingly power of sending a pair of a man and a woman to
worship the Munakata goddesses reflects the ancient form of religious rituals in Japan. Informed of the sexual act in the altar hall, the Emperor said, “you should worship deities and pray for good luck in a decent manner,” and punished Katabu. It is thought that this reflected the values of the period when the true meaning of the act of marriage between a human being and a deity in a ritual had already been forgotten. The later state of affairs as highlighted by the appearance of Yuge-no-Muraji, combined with the memory of the times when the kingly power had to make some concessions to local powerful clans as in the case of the above-mentioned article of the Richu reign, seems to reflect a new type of embellishments. The tale of worshipping the Munakata goddesses and the tale of executing Katabu might have been combined into one story.

It should be noted here that the articles on the Munakata goddesses are unique to Nihonshoki; Kojiki does not contain such articles. For one thing, these two historical records are not based on common historical literature. For another, Nihonshoki was compiled sometime later than Kojiki. It is important to remember that these tales, despite being suggestive of the connection between the kingly power and the Munakata goddesses, are contained in the volumes on the reigns from Ōjin to Yūryaku. They are not contained in the volume on Emperors Sujin and Suinin, in which articles on rituals for deities important to the kingly power, including deities of Ise, Miwa, Yamato-ō-Kunitama, Isonokami, and Izumo, tend to be concentrated. That will help understand the intentions and the historical context behind the compilation of Nihonshoki.

8. The Transfer of the Divided Spirits of the Munakata Goddesses to the Kinai Region [Kinai Kanjō] and the Sea Routes for the Kingly Power

Two articles in Nihonshoki clearly show the relationship between Yamato kingly power and Munakata. One is the article of February of the second year of Emperor Temmu reign (673), which states: “Next, Munakata-no-Kimi Tokuzen [the Munakata clan] offered [the Emperor] his daughter Amako-no-Iratsume, who gave birth to Prince Takechi-no-Miko.” The other is the article of Nobember of the 13th year of the Temmu reign, which reports that the Emperor granted “Ason,” one of 八色の姓 known as “Yakusa-no-Kabane” to 52 clans, including Munakata-no-Kimi.

According to the second article, the title “Ason” was granted to 39 clans with the title of Omi, two clans with the tile of Muraji, and 11 clans with the title of Ki. Munakata-no-Kimi was among these 11 clans along with .getApplicants of had a high status within the Court. The fact that Kurumamochi-no-Kimi was also granted the Ason title coincides with the above-mentioned article of the Emperor Richū reign.

The marriage between Prince Ōama-no-Miko (Emperor Temmu) and Amako-no-Iratsumie was of great significance not only for the Munakata but also for the imperial family of Emperor Jomei lineage. Prince Takechi-no-Miko was the only son of Emperor Temmu who took part in the Jinshin War as a general. Because of his role in the war, Prince Takechi-no-Miko carried weight in the Imperial Court. Prince Takechi-no-Miko has a son known as Nagaya-ō. Prince Takechi-no-Miko, who is regarded by some as the “founder” of the Munakata Shrine in the Shikinokami district in Yamato Province, passed away in July of the 10th year of Emperor Jitō reign (696). It is not known how old when he died or when he was born. Historical materials of later periods suggest that he was born in the fifth year of the Hakuchi reign (654) or the first year of Emperor Saimei reign (655), indicating that Prince Ōama-no-Miko married Amako-no-Iratsumie earlier.

Iminaoama, the real name of Emperor Temmu, likely derived from the name “Ōama-no-sukune,” the family who brought him up (yōiku shizoku); in the mogari funeral ritual for Temmu, Arakama of Ōama-no-sukune is known to have spoken about his memory of rearing the emperor as a child in his eulogy. Amako-no-Iratsumie was also appropriately named for a woman who came from a clan who worshipped the Three Goddesses of Munakata, as ‘Amako” in Amako-no-Iratsumie can be expressed as 海子 [child of the sea]. Furthermore, the valets attending Prince Ōama-no-Miko (Temmu) included Ōkida-no-Kimi Esaka and Wakami (Okida-no-Kimi was a powerful clan in Kyūshū). This is yet another piece of evidence showing that Prince Ōama-no-Miko was closely associated with the sea and Kyūshū. This association seems to have derived from the political will of someone higher in status, rather than the will of the prince himself.
In the reign of Yūryaku in the late 5th century, Yamato kingly power grew and increased its dominance over local powerful clans, as evidenced by the inscriptions on the iron single-edged sword excavated from the Eta-Funayama (mounded) tomb and those on the iron double-edged sword unearthed from the Inariyama (mounded) tomb. The kingly power virtually brought the whole country under its control by the early 6th century with its successful pacification of the "rebellion" by Tsusuki-no-Kimi Iwai. It built a number of footholds, including Natsu-no-Miyake, for ruling Kyūshū as well. The reunification of the Northern and Southern Dynasties in China at the end of the 6th century and the subsequent rise and fall of Sui and Tang Dynasties brought about a major upheaval to East Asia. In and after the Suiko reign, the kingly power faced two major challenges: how to establish new relations with the dynasties in China and countries in the Korean Peninsula, and how to restructure the domestic regime in line with the changing international situation. An even more daunting challenge came between the 640s to the 660s. During this period, the Yamato kingly power was managed by the descendants of Prince Tamura (Emperor Jomei), who succeeded to the throne after Emperor Suiko. This lineage, to which Temmu belonged, can be described as a new imperial lineage, which began with his father Emperor Jomei. The lineage, which may have derived from the Okinaga clan, was distinct from the traditional Soga lineage. Those of this lineage eventually “modernized” ancient Japan by establishing the Ritsuryō System. In the process, the kingly power made a number of attempts to establish new relations with Tang China and Korean countries. In one of these attempts, the kingly power sent troops to Paekche, which were defeated in Hakuwukinoe. It is obvious that sea routes via the Genkai Sea had an essential role to play in these attempts and attracted fresh attention of the kingly power.

For the Yamato kingly power, sea traffic was essential for successful exchanges with Kyūshū and even other countries. There were two major routes for such traffic: the Sea of Japan route and the Inland Sea route. The Sea of Japan route went northward from Yamato Province, passed Yamashiro Province and Ōmi Province, arrived at Tsuruga (or Tsuruga Bay and Wakasa Bay from a wider perspective), went along the Sea of Japan coast, passed Izumo Province, turned southward near Tsunoshima Island, and arrived at the Kammon Strait or Shimonomoseki or veered to the Hibiki Sea and headed toward the western Genkai Sea. This is the route Empress Jingū (Okinagatarashi-Hime-no-Mikoto) took when she headed for Anato [the Kammon Strait] from Tsunuga to meet Emperor [Chūai], who was in Kii Province, as part of their plan to defeat the rebellious Kumaso people who refused to bring a tribute to the kingly power, according to Nihonshoki’s article of March of the second year of the Chūai reign. The Munakata Shrine in Hōki Province and the Ou district in Izumo Province were located almost halfway between Tsuruga and the Kammon Strait. About 60 kilometers to the west from Tsunoshima Island sits Okinoshima Island. Tsushima Island is 70 plus kilometers from Okinoshima. The Inland Sea route, on the other hand, went westward from the port of Naniwa or the port of Sumiyoshi along the coast of the mainland Honshū (along the Sanyō-dō) or along the coast of the main island of Shikoku (along the Nankai-dō). The Honshū course ran through Honshū and arrived at northern Kyūshū via the Kammon Strait or at the east coast of Kyūshū through the Suō Sea. The Shikoku course first went northward from Matsuyama through the Inland Sea to Höfu and converged with the Honshū course or went through the Suō Sea toward the Kunisaki Peninsula and headed north in the waters along the eastern coast of Kyūshū and passed the Kammon Strait, or landed directly on the eastern coast. The Kammon Strait, where the tide has been strong to this day, posed a major challenge for travelers. Travelers who wished to deter this strait and opt for a safer route landed the eastern coast of Kyūshū facing the Suō Sea, took an inland route to arrive at Hakata Bay, Karatsu Bay or the Ariake Sea.64

These traffic routes had political and military significance for Prince Ōama-no-Miko (of the Jomei lineage). It is reasonable to conclude that Ōama-no-Miko wanted to have close relations with Ōkida-no-Kimi and Munakata-no-Kimi to gain control over the Suō Sea (the inland sea) and the Genkai Sea (the open sea), respectively. Such awareness was likely shared among the elites at the kingly power in that period of time. The marriage between Prince Ōama-no-Miko and Amako-no-Iratsumae may have been motivated by the kingly power’s wishes to establish such relations, and presumably by the intentions of the central figures of the kingly power—including Emperor Kōgyoku—to do so.65

9. Munakata and Izumo

Both Kojiki and Nihonshoki fail to mention the origin of Munakata-no-Kimi, who was granted the title of
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朝臣, one of the eight honorary titles known as “八色の姓” (Yakusa-no-Kabane). The origin is mentioned only in Shinsen Shōji Roku, which states: “宗形朝臣 大神朝臣同祖、吾田片隅命之後也”(左京神別)・”宗形君 大国主命六世孫、吾田片隅命之後也” (河内国神別). The Record characterizes the clan as a clan supposedly descended from a deity (or deities of the land or earth). [宗形朝臣・君 mentioned here was a branch family who transferred its domicile to the Kinai region sometime in the history. It is unlikely that they maintained that they came from a different origin from the Munakata Clan in Chikuzen. It is known at least that the Munakata Clan made the point between the end of Nara period and the beginning of Heian period that they were of the Izumo lineage, or more specifically, a descendant of Atada-Katasumi-no-Mikoto, who was a descendant of Ōkuninushi-no-Mikoto. Saikaidō Fudoki, as quoted in Munakata Daibosatsu Goengi, compiled by the Munakata Grand Shrine, states: “The descendants of Ōama-no-Mikoto include present-day Munakata-no-Ason.” The description of this origin was made actually later in time. The trustworthiness of Saikaidō Fudoki itself as a historical record cannot be independently verified. The notion that the clan derived from Ōkuninushi-no-Mikoto is unreliable because the deity is a god, not a goddess. This notion might be the product of more recent interpretations.

The claim that the Munakata family is of the Izumo lineage seems to be reflected in a number of legends. One such legend is that the Three Goddesses of Munakata were born as the result of ukei between Amaterasu-Ōmikami (Hinokami) and Susanowo-no-Mikoto of the Izumo lineage. Another is a legend in Kojiki that Ōkuninushi-no-Kami married the “goddess residing in Munakata Okutsu-Miya,” that is, Takirihime-no-Mikoto, who gave birth to Aisuki-Takahikone-no-Kami. The second legend was likely aimed at further explaining the relationship between Munakata and Izumo.

Munakata and Izumo bear similarities. As will be discussed later, an analogy can be drawn between the administrator of the Munakata district and that of the Ou district, as well as between the Kannushi of Munakata and Izumo-no-kuni-no-miyatsuko. In this context, special attention should be given to Nihonshoki’s article of July of the 60th year of the Sujin reign, which describes Izumo’s subjugation to the kingly power.66)

Emperor Sujin wanted to see the sacred treasure that Takehinateru-no-Mikoto had brought from heaven and was now deposited in the shrine of Izumo-no-Ōkami. One day, he sent an envoy to Izumo, where the envoy found that Izumo-Furune, who was a remote ancestor of Izumo-no-Omi and was in charge of the management of the sacred treasure, was away on a trip to Tsukushi Province. His younger brother Iirine offered the treasure as ordered by the Emperor. When Izumo-Furune returned home and learned what had happened, he got angry and made up his mind to kill his brother: Later, Izumo-Furune asked his brother to go to a pool for a bath with him. They bathed. Then Izumo-Furune got out of the water and took his brother’s sword. Iirine got out and took his brother’s sword, which turned out to be a wooden sword. They hit each other and Izumo-Furune was killed because of the wooden sword. Upon hearing what happened, the Emperor executed Izumo-Furune. Lest the Emperor get angry, Izumo-no-Omi refrained from worshipping the god for some time.

Then Hikatobe, a man of Hikami in Tamba told Crown Prince Ikume-no-Mikoto (Emperor Suinin) of a casual remark his child had made, adding that the remark might be a divine oracle, not the words of a small child. The Crown Prince reported this to the Emperor, who in turn ordered Izumo-no-Omi to worship Izumo-no-Ōkami.

This tale is unique to Nihonshoki; it is not contained in Kojiki. Yet Kojiki, in its chapter on Emperor Keikō, includes a tale about the murder of Izumo-Takeru on orders from Yamatotakeru-no-Mikoto. A parallel can be drawn between this tale and the tale of the fratricide if attention is given to such symbols as the fake (wooden) sword, bathing, the exchange of the swords, and a ballad. The tale of the fratricide revolves around the absence of Izumo-Furune, who was tasked with the management of the divine treasure. Where he had gone should not have mattered, but Tsukushi Province was specified. This should not be interpreted as the product of whimsical thinking; it should be interpreted to represent the actual relationship between Izumo and Tsukushi.67) The reference to Tsukushi Province reflects the perception of the people who told this tale from generation to generation or the situation when this tale was created, including the existence of the Sea of Japan route. Tsukushi Province in this tale refers not to Kyūshū as a whole but to a specific location in the main island. More specifically speaking, it would be safe to say that the creator of this tale was mindful of the Munakata district in Chikuzen Province in using this expression.
The Munakata Shrine in the district of Aimi in Hōki Province (present-day Munakata, Yonago City, Tottori Prefecture) is the only shrine listed in Engi-Shiki along the Sea of Japan coast. The Aimi district shared the border with the Ou district in Izumo Province. The land of Munakata where this shrine is located is home to the Higashi-Munakata archaeological site, which include the Higashi-Munakata and Munakata mounded tomb groups. Round Burial Mounds No. 6 and No. 7 in the Higashi-Munakata mounded tomb groups are thought to have been built in the early 6th century. Their burial facilities are pit-type stone chambers with a horizontal-entrance, the type of chambers that was common in northern Kyūshū from the late 5th century to the early 6th century. The Rōji (mounded) tomb in Fukuoka City provides a good example of this type. It is thought that the builders of these tumuli at least had direct contact with northern Kyūshū. More evidence is needed, however, to determine they were people of Hōki or even those of northern Kyūshū themselves. Yet the fact that tumuli with a stone chamber that is most prevalent in northern Kyūshū exist within hailing distance from the Munakata Shrine in the “Munakata” area in Hōki Province would not make it unreasonable to assume that this land had connections with northern Kyūshū, especially the Munakata region in Chikuzen, and even that people from the region settled down in the Munakata area in Hōki.

The Sea of Japan route that connected Munakata with Izumo also provided a link between Tsuruga and northern Kyūshū, an important link for the kingly power. This route may have been established with the involvement of the Okinaga clan based in the Sakata district in Ōmi Province—a clan that led to the Jomei lineage. Such a historical background, as well as the state of the affairs in the 7th century, partly explains why the imperial family of the Jomei lineage placed a high value on sea traffic and Kyūshū.

10. Serving As Both the Kannushi or Kuni-no-Miyatsuko, and Gunji

The extant historical texts record the activity of Munakata-no-Kimi (Munakata-no-Ason) as a local clan from the 8th century onward; no such literature is available on their activity in earlier times. These texts show yet another similarity between the Munakata and Izumo clans: they had both administrative and religious duties. Munakata-no-Ason served as both Gunji of the Munakata district and the Kannushi of Munakata, while the Izumo-no-Omi served as both Gunji of the Ou district and Kuni-no-Miyatsuko of Izumo Province. As far as the Munakata and Izumo clans are concerned, the practice of a clan having such dual duties continued even after the separation of religion and politics was completed, as highlighted by the establishment of two distinctive entities: Dajōkan (the Council of State) and Jingikan (the Council of Religious Affairs). In other words, the Ritsuryō government (Imperial Court) allowed the Munakata and Izumo clans to practice the unity of religion and politics. Moreover, both the Munakata and Ou districts held the title of Shingun. This title had been granted to support specific shrines outside the Kinai region; it represents favorable treatment of these shrines by the kingly power. These two districts were the only Shingun in the western provinces, with the Ou district serving the Kumano-ni-Imasu Shrine (and Kitsuki Taisha) and the Munakata district serving the Munakata Shrine. The fact that there were no Shingun in the Inland Sea area may reflect the historical background regarding the rule and consideration by the kingly power.

The history of the relationship between Yamato kingly power and the Izumo clan is characterized by rule and subjugation. The expression “Izumo-no-Kuni-no-Miyatsuko” first appears in Nihonshoki’s article of the fifth year of the Saimei reign (659), which includes a passage: “[The Emperor] ordered Izumo-no-Kuni-no-Miyatsuko to repair the shrine.” The subjugation of Izumo to the Yamato kingly power is suggested by the myth of kuniyuzuri (cession of land) and the tale of Izumo-Furune and Izumo-Takeru and by the inauguration rite for Izumo-no-Kuni-no-Miyatsuko that reflected the memory of these legends. On the other hand, no historical material is available that suggests the existence of Kuni-no-Miyatsuko in Munakata. Nihonshoki contains a number of articles that point to the Yamato kingly power’s consideration for the Munakata goddesses and the Munakata clan, partly in the context of marital relations between the Munakata-no-Kimi and the kingly power. These articles appear in the sections on the Ōjin, Richū, and Yūryaku reigns. Despite these historical differences, the legends of Munakata and those of Izumo, including ウケヒ神話 and the Tenson Kōrin myth, were integrated into the legends of the kingly power. It was important for the kingly power to gain control over these two areas, which were connected to each other by the Sea of Japan route. The international situation in East Asia in the 7th century made firm control
of these areas even more necessary.

What is special about the Shingun-Gunji (Gunji administering Shingun) was that the Gunji’ relatives in the third degree were allowed to replace them. In March of the second year of Emperor Mommu reign (698), third-degree relatives of the Gunji of both the Munakata district of Chikuzen Province and the Ou district of Izumo Province were allowed to take over the office, according to Shoku Nihongi (the Continuation of Chronicles of Japan). It was until as many as 25 years later that this arrangement was approved for other Shingun, including the Watarai district of Ise Province, as part of measures by the procedure of the Dajōkan in November, Yōrō 7 (723) (Ryō-no-Shūge 選叙令 7 同司主典条). The preceding approval of in-family succession in the two Shingun-Gunji suggests that the unity of religion and politics was practiced more substantially there than in other Shingun and that the Imperial Court, mindful of that reality, had to show a measure of consideration for the two clans. In Izumo, the Gunji doubled as the Kannushi with Kuni-no-Miyatsuko playing a pivotal (mediating) role (「承前国造兼帯神主一」 in the Decree of the Dajōkan in October, Enryaku 17 in Ruijū-Sandai-Kyaku). In Munakata, where Kuni-no-Miyatsuko was not stationed, the Gunji doubled as the Kannushi without such mediation (「令国造帯郡領一」 in the Decree of the Dajōkan in March, Enryaku 17 in Ruijū-Sandai-Kyaku, Vol. 7). The difference in dual-office arrangement between the two Shingun reflects the gap in the history of their relations to the kingly power. Be that as it may, the Munakata and Izumo clans were eventually put under pressure to practice the separation of religion and politics.

The Izumo clan was ordered to do so by the Decree of the Dajōkan issued in March, Enryaku 17 (798) titled “應任出雲国意宇郡大領一事”, which states: “昔者国造郡職職員有居别、各守其任不思違越、慶雲三年以来令国造帯郡領、寄言神事動庇務、雖則有居別違越而不加刑罰、（略）自今以後、宜著改舊例国造郡職職員居別職任之” (Ruijū-Sandai-Kyaku, Vol. 7). The decree cited as the reason the tendency for the double-office holding clan to giver priority to their duties as Kuni-no-Miyatsuko or the Kannushi, often neglecting their administrative duties as top district officials [gunryō]. As discussed earlier, Kuni-no-Miyatsuko renovated a shrine (probably the Kumano-ni-Imasu Shrine in the Ou district) during the Emperor Saimei reign, indicating that Kuni-no-Miyatsuko served as a mediator between the Kannushi and the top district officials. Under Ritsuryō system, the system of Kuni-no-Miyatsuko was once abolished, and many of them were appointed as top district officials. Eventually it was reorganized into a new system known as Ritsuryō kuni-no-miyatsuko. It is thought that the Izumo clan had many of the attributes characteristics of old kuni-no-miyatsuko. These developments provide a background to the article of Keiun 3 (706) cited in the Decree of the Dajōkan. It would be safe to say that the double-office arrangement was in place some time before and after that year.

The Munakata clan was ordered to abolish the double-office practice two years after the Izumo clan was ordered to do so, according to the Decree of Dajōkan issued in December, Enryaku 19, titled “應任出雲国造郡領職員居別職任之” (Ruijū-Sandai-Kyaku, Vol. 7), which states: “右大臣宣称、奉勅、郡司神職職員皆居別、為令郡司兼帯神主之”。 The practice of 大領補任=神主兼帯=(外)五位叙位 was customary as shown in the report to the central government by Dazai-fu (the government headquarters in Kyūshū), quoted in the Decree of Dajōkan, which states: “當郡大領補任之日、例兼神主即敘五位”。 This practice is consistent with the state of Gunji and Kannushi under Ritsuryō system as shown in Table 3. This government decree also made the following three points. First, an imperial rescript issued in March, Enryaku 17 called for making merit—not lineage as had traditionally been the case—the key condition for appointing Gunji. Efforts were thus made, in line with the imperial order, to search high and low for the right person to succeed Munakata-no-Ason Iketsukuri as Gunji, who had just deceased in February. With the title of 外従五位, he served as both Gunji and Kannushi. As a result, it was often impossible to perform the rituals to worship the goddesses. Second, this state of affairs made it necessary to select a man of integrity (kessei rentei) from the clan who was capable of rituals and appoint him as Kannushi for only a six-year term in accordance with the decree issued by Jingikan in February, Enryaku 7. Third, it was thus necessary to abolish the practice of double-office holding because it was “inappropriate” since the term of office for Gunji was permanent while that for Kannushi was six years. Again, there are many similarities and a few differences between the Izumo and Munakata clans in how the double-office practice was abolished. Be that as it may, the second half of the Enryaku era (the reign of Emperor Kanmu) was a turning point for both clans.
11. Munakata-no-Ason and Takashina-no-Mahito (Takashina Clan)

Table 3 summarizes the articles on the court ranks conferred on, and the offices given to, people of Munakata-no-Ason. Under the Ritsuryō system, Gunji was outside the scope of the job-ranking system whereby offices corresponded to court ranks. It was simply stipulated in Yōrō Senjo Ryō, which states: “其大領外従八位上、少領外従八位下叙之”73) (Article 13 on Gunji). Table 3 shows that the original court ranks largely ranged from 外八位 to 外五位, not unusual for Gunji.

Table 3 Gunji and Kannushi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>年 月</th>
<th>人 名</th>
<th>職 名</th>
<th>位 階</th>
<th>叙 位</th>
<th>出 典</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 709</td>
<td>和銅2年5月</td>
<td>宗形朝臣等冨</td>
<td>大領</td>
<td>外従五位上</td>
<td>外従五位上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 729</td>
<td>天平1年4月</td>
<td>宗形朝臣鳥麻呂</td>
<td>大領</td>
<td>外従七位上</td>
<td>外従五位下</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 738</td>
<td>天平10年2月</td>
<td></td>
<td>神主</td>
<td>外従五位下</td>
<td>外従五位上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 745</td>
<td>天平17年6月</td>
<td>宗形朝臣與志</td>
<td>大領</td>
<td>外従五位上</td>
<td>外従五位下</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 778</td>
<td>祖亀9年4月</td>
<td>宗形朝臣大徳</td>
<td>大領</td>
<td>外従五位上</td>
<td>外従五位下</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 785</td>
<td>制覇景雲2年8月</td>
<td>宗形朝臣深津</td>
<td>大領</td>
<td>外従五位下</td>
<td>外従五位下</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 813</td>
<td>弘仁4年</td>
<td>宗形朝臣秋足</td>
<td>大領(故人)</td>
<td>外正7位上</td>
<td>(當年没)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person who deserves attention in Table 3 is 鳥麻呂 in the second row. Describing Torimaro, Shoku Nihongi states “筑前国宗形郡大領外従七位上宗形朝臣鳥麻呂、神斎に供奉るべき状を奏す。外従五位下を授け、物賜りに数有り” in its article of April 5, Tempyō 1 (792). The phrase “供奉神斎” in “奏...状上” refers to the act of the Kannushi, adding to the evidence that the Gunji doubled as Kannushi. The phrase “奏...状” means that he reported to the Emperor verbally, not in writing, that he came to engage in votive abstinence. It is reasonable to assume that the court title “外従五位下” and a present was given to him for assuming the office of Kannushi. The question is: Where did he make the reporting and receive the title and the present? Munakata is unlikely. It was possible for the Imperial Court to send the court rank diploma and the present directly to Munakata or to Dazai-fu so that he could receive them there. Given the relationship between the Munakata clan and the Imperial Court, it is more likely that 鳥麻呂 went to the capital, where he did the reporting and received the present directly. If the case of 鳥麻呂 was the norm rather than the exception, then that points to the set procedures whereby the newly appointed top district official who doubled as Kannushi went up to the capital for reporting his appointment and receiving the title “五位（外位）”. Such investitures must have been different in nature from the ceremony in the Imperial Court palace for a newly-appointed Izumo-no-kuni-no-miyatsuko because the latter was meant to show his subjugation to the Imperial Court.

秋足 in the seventh row died in Kōnin 4 (813), 15 years earlier than Tenchō 5 (828). The fact that his highest office and rank were 大領 and 外正七位上, respectively, can be interpreted to mean that he did not assume the office of Kannushi because the separation of Gunjir and Kannushi was already in place in accordance of the government decree in December, Enryaku 19 as mentioned earlier.

There is an interesting story about the 深津 in the fourth row in Table 3. 深津, who was 大領外従六位下, was later promoted to 外従五位下 for building an anchorage in Kanezaki at the virtuous persuasion of Buddhist monk Juō. His wife 竹生王 with no court rank (无位), was also promoted to 従五位下. It is interesting that the governor of a Shingun built an anchorage at the encouragement of a monk. What is even more interesting is that a man of Munakata-no-Ason, which was no more than a local powerful clan, was married to a princess, even though she had no court rank. This case, as well as the preceding case in which Amako-no-Iratsume was married to Prince Ōama-no-Miko, suggests that the Munakata Clan had maintained close relationship with the Imperial Court or the central government even in this period of time.
Such close relationship is also indicated by the existence of two princes named Prince Munakata, although the possibility of the two being the same person cannot be ruled out. One was promoted from 无位 to 従四位下 (his first Imperial Court title) in Tempyō-hōjī 3 (759) and appointed to the office of Migi-no-Ōtorine-no-Kami in Tempyō-hōjī 6. The other prince was promoted from 无位 to 従五位下 (his first Imperial Court title) in Höki 3 (772) and assumed the office of Ki-no-Kami in Höki 10. After being promoted to 従五位上 in Enryaku 2 (783), this Prince Munakata assumed the office of Ōi-no-Kami in Enryaku 3 and the office of Sanuki-no-Kami in Enryaku 9. Their name may reflect their association--possibly through fostering--with the Munakata Clan. If that is the case, women from the Munakata Clan may have served as nursemaids to look after these two persons when they were small children. Montokutenmō-Jitsuroku contains an article reporting that Munakata-no-Ason Toyoko with the title of 外従五位下 was promoted to 従五位下 in July, Kashō 3 (850). The women concurrently promoted were high-ranking and low-ranking court ladies, raising the possibility that Toyoko was also a low-raking court lady in the imperial seraglio. A few historical records are available that provide information on people from the Munakata family who lived in the Kinai region. Be that as it may, it is likely that the Munakata family in Chikuzen were generally cooperative to the Imperial Court or possibly an integral part of it. The marriage between Prince Ōama-no-Miko and Amako-no-Iratsume acted as a major impetus for some members of the Munakata family to move to the Kinai region and for the Munakata goddesses to be enshrined also in the Shikinokami district in Yamato Province. And their son Prince Takechi-no-Miko is often highlighted. In light of the Jomei lineage mentioned earlier, it is possible to assume that the Munakata Clan began to make inroads into the Kinai region a little earlier.

However, historical literature on the Munakata Shrine in Yamato Province makes no mention of Munakata-no-Ason. According to the Decree of Dajōkan of October, Gangyō 5 (881) in Ruijū-Sandai-Kyaku, Vol. 3, in the Tenmu reign onward, members of the Munakata clan offered a great deal of divine treasure and non-paddy farmland and took charge of shrine affairs from generation to generation. Their commitment waned over the years and “each of the members waited for someone else to perform rituals, effectively neglecting (keta) their collective duty to do so.” Accordingly, a request was made to station Kannushi at the Munakata Shrine in Yamato and appoint Takashina-no-Mahito to that post to follow the example of the head shrine in Chikuzen. And this request was accepted. According to the Decree of Dajōkan of October, Kampyō 5 (893), the repair of the deity-enshrined building of the Munakata Shrine in Yamato had traditionally been financed by the annual tribute from the bond servants (shisen) in Kanekazi of the Munakata district who were owned by Takechi-no-Miko, the founder of the Takashina clan. Due to the considerable inconvenience involved, however, “Kano-Yashiro-no-Ujibito” Takashina-no-Mahito Tadamine and others made a request to promote 16 of the bond servants to the status of ryōmin [free people] and finance the repair instead with the contributions from eight yōtei (people engaged in miscellaneous labor service) in Shikinokami and other districts in Yamato Province. The request was approved. This episode points to close relations between the Munakata Shrine in Yamato and Takashina-no-Mahito in this period of time. The Decree of Dajōkan of 881 cited above clearly shows that Takashina-no-Mahito managed the Munakata Shrine in Yamato. It could even be possible to assume that Munakata-no-Ason took charge of the management, given that a request was made to appoint a member of the Munakata clan as a new Kannushi to rectify the situation in which members of the clan “passed the buck to another” to evade their ritual duties due to their waning commitment. The move by Takashina-no-Mahito was likely associated with the official listing of the Munakata Shrine in Yamato one year earlier, in March, Gangyō 4, with the description “the shrine sitting at Higashi-Ichijo-Tei of the Grand Minister (Fuyutsugu) and the one sitting in the Munakata district of Chikuzen Province are separate shrines dedicated to the same deities.”

Takashina-no-Mahito is the title for a clan chieftain granted to Prince Nagaya-Ō’s son Prince Asukabe in October, Höki 4 (773), according to the Newly Compiled Record of Surnames, which states: “出雲白鳥冠” 天武皇子浄広壱太政大臣高市王一也、続日本紀合天武皇子浄広壱太政大臣高市王一也、続日本紀合” (左京皇別). Prince Asukabe, whose mother was a daughter of Fujiwara-no-Fuhito, survived after being accorded a special pardon in connection with the Incident of Prince Nagaya-Ō, according to Shoku Nihongi’s article of Hinoe-inu [23rd] of October, Tempyō-hōjī 7: 復合_従坐_以_藤原太政大臣之女所, 生、特贈_不_死_。 The relationship between the Fujiwara Clan and the Munakata goddesses started when Fujiwara-no-Fuyutsugu, guided by the oracle of the latter, bought a tract of land in Sakyō-Ichijō in the Heian Palace, established residence there, and invited them to the southwest corner of the residence to be enshrined there. Thereafter, the Munakata Clan had
close relations with the Fujiwara regent family thereafter (with Fuyutsugu’s son Yoshifusa onward). Such developments surrounding the Munakata goddesses in this period of time owed much to the regent family. The fact that Takashina-no-Mahito, who had connection with the Fujiwara Clan, strengthened relationship with the regent family under these circumstances may have reflected in the Decrees of Dajōkan mentioned earlier. Nagaya-O-ke wooden tablet (mokkkan) clearly shows that Prince Nagaya-Ō had close relationships with the Munakata Shrine, who came from Munakata-no-Ason, from which his grandmother also came. If the Munakata Shrine in the Shikinokami district of Yamato Province was maintained by Amako-no-Iratsume → Takechi-no-miko → Nagaya-Ō → Takashina-no-Mahito in succession after Amako-no-Iratsume was married to Ōma-no-Miko, then it is possible to assume that the spirits of the Munakata goddesses were divided and a part of them was transferred to the Kinai region more recently than generally believed. The lack of historical literature on the Munakata Clan in the Kinai region may support this assumption.

It might be worth adding that the term of office for the average Gunji and Kannushi is estimated at about 20 years based on Table 3. This figure is not unusual. It may serve as a standard for the term of the double office of Gunji and Kannushi.

12. The Kannushi of Munakata and the Office of Daigūji

Although the Kannushi was not stationed at every Shintō shrine, the post was widely distributed across Japan, including Munakata, Izumo, Ise, and Ōmiwa, according to Shoku Nihongi and subsequent records considered authentic. Nihon Kōki, third of the six classical Japanese history texts after Nihonshoki and Shoku Nihongi, used the expression roughly translated as “Kannushi at shrines across Japan” in its article of October, Kōnin 3 (812). It is known that the Kannushi topped the hierarchy of priests, followed by negi and hafuri from Montokutennō Jitsuroku’s article of April, Saikō 3 (856) and other literature. The term “Kannushi” first appears in Nihonshoki’s article of the Jingū reign that Empress Jingū, in an effort to know the identify of the deity who gave the oracle to her deceased husband, Emperor Chūai, became a Kannushi herself and organized a divinity-worshipping rite. The term is more explicitly used in Nihonshoki’s article of May of the sixth year of the Temmu reign (677), which states: “勅すらく、天社地社の神税は、三つに分ちて、一つをば神主に分ち給へ。” The Kannushi in the Jingū reign resonates with “荒魂を祭る神主” (Nihonshoki’s article of December of the Kanoetatsu [17th] year of the Jingū reign), “祭事に堪える者” (Ruijū-Sandai-Kyaku, Vol. 7, the Decree of Dajōkan of February, Enryaku 7), and “監神者神主也” (職員令神祇官条説). In short, the Kannushi is essentially characterized by divinity worshiping. It is believed that the Kannushi took full control of all aspects of his shrine, including “repairing shrine buildings” (Ruijū-Sandai-Kyaku, Vol. 1, the Decree of Dajōkan of June, Jōgan 10).

It is thought that the Kannushi at the Munakata Shrine had such attributes common to such Kannushis. A significant change came, however, during the Tengyō era [938-947]. In Tengyō 5 (942), Minamoto-no-Kiyohira was appointed as deputy director of Dazai-fu, where he deceased in January, Tengyō 8. According to the request made in February, Tenen 2 (974) by the Gūji of the Munakata Shrine and members of the Munakata clan, the Munakata goddesses, who had been given the divine title of 正一位勲一等 after the revolt by Fujiwara-no-Sumitomo, was granted the title of Bodhisattva. Before the Tengyō era, there were no such offices as Gūji; the Kannushi worked as “雑々執行之長.” Newly-appointed Kiyohira then established the office of Gūji and made the Kannushi double as Gūji “執印勤行” as well. Once the office of Gūji was put under the condition described as “不蒙二官符一補二任件職”, there appeared a situation described as “只就二府国一遞以競望、仍雖二神田地子三時六度祭料一，而更闕一其用一，枉為一勲劣、因之神宮雜務勿，不一陵遲...” In accordance with the Decree of Dajōkan in Anzu 2 (969), the Kōra Shrine came to appoint Daigūji. As a result, the divine authority of the shrine was strengthened and the shrine buildings were kept in good repair. Daigūji was also appointed in such shrines as Sumiyoshi, Kashii, Tsukushi, Kamado, and Hasaki. The Gūji of the Munakata Shrine and members of the Munakata clan thus requested the establishment of the office of Daigūji and the appointment of [Munakata-no-] Ujiyoshi, saying that doing so with the authority of the Decree of Dajōkan would solve the
problems and allow for "社務無レ闕、祠祭有レ勤." Jingi-kan (the Council of Religious Affairs) accepted this request and issued a statement calling for the approval of the request in August, Jōgen 3 (978) to Dajōkan. The request was officially approved by the Decree of Dajōkan to Dazai-fu titled "應レ補下任坐二筑前国...宗像宮大宮司...正六位上宗形朝臣氏能事" (Ruijū-Fusen-shō, Vol.1, 諸神宮司補任) in February, Tengen 2. That was five years after the Gūji of the Munakata Shrine and others made the request.

Earlier, the office of Gūji as established by Kiyohira took full charge of everything from personnel affairs, finance, and building maintenance. The Kannushi’s job was limited to performing rituals. This division of role was often blurred because the Gūji doubled as Kannushi. Another major problem was that the appointment of Gūji was not based on a Decree of Dajōkan. This allowed Dazai-fu and the governor of Chikuzen Province to exert influence on the Gūji and the shrine as a whole. These circumstances constituted the background against which the Gūji of the Munakata Shrine and others called for the establishment of the office of Daigūji. This is how Daigūji came to combine the duty of the Kannushi to perform rituals with the authority of the Gūji over the personnel affairs and property. This happened against the background of internal rivalry within the Munakata Clan. The chasm came to a head when Fujiwara-no-Sumitomo revolted, with the mainstream faction siding with Sumitomo and the anti-mainstream faction with the imperial Court. It was under these circumstances that Kiyohira established the office of Gūji. It is thought that the Munakata Clan pursued the establishment of the office of Daigūji to strengthen their power base amid these moves by the key actors, including Dazai-fu, the imperial Court, and the Fujiwara Clan.82)

Between the end of the 9th century and the early 10th century, the Munakata Clan thus acted differently from the Izumo Clan. The nature of the Kannushi also changed in the process. Religion and politics, once inseparable, became separated with the former managed by Kannushis and the latter by Gunji, who eventually underwent qualitative transformation. In line with these moves, there was a succession of three phases: (i) rule by the Kannushi over the Munakata Shrine and the Shingun; (ii) the separation of authority of the Kannushi as a result of the establishment of the office of Gūji, and (iii) the unified rule over the authority of the Gūji and the Kannushi by the Daigūji. Eventually, the Munakata Daigūji family became the retainer of the Hei-ke family and developed into a powerful local clan characteristic of the Medieval period.

The qualitative transformation of the Kannushi of Munakata must have affected the way the rituals for the Munakata goddesses were performed. These developments surrounding the Munakata Shrine and the Kannushi of Munakata may have helped put an end to the Okinoshima rituals.

13. The Inauguration Rite for the Kannushi of Munakata and Okinoshima Island

Virtually no historical literature is available that shows how the rituals for the Munakata goddesses were practiced in ancient times and how that faith developed. The author postulates that in assuming the office of Kannushi, Torimaro of Munakata-no-Ason as shown in Table 3 went up to the capital and performed a certain inauguration rite in the imperial Court, just as the same way that newly-appointed Kuni-no-Miyatsuko of Izumo went to the capital and performed a subjugation rite.83) Despite a few differences in their implications, these two types of rites were performed between the two clans and the imperial Court. In contrast to these external inauguration rites, the Izumo Clan performed an important rite for the inauguration of Kuni-no-Miyatsuko in Izumo Province earlier. This internal site is known as "火継式."

When Kuni-no-Miyatsuko died, his heir promptly went from Izumo Kokusokan (Kitsukino-Oyashiro Shrine in the Izumo district) to the Kumano-ni-Imasu Shrine (present-day Kumano-Taisha Shrine) with a Hikiri-usu mortar and a Hikiri-kine mallet. At Sankaden of the Kumano-ni-Imasu Shrine, he started a fire with the mortar and the mallet. The fire was used to cook a meal. By having the meal, he became Kuni-no-Miyatsuko of Izumo and "became one" with the distant ancestor of Amenohohi-no-Mikoto. This divine fire was kept at Sankaden of Izumo Kokusokan. While in office, Kuni-no-Miyatsuko continued to eat meals cooked with this fire. Undoubtedly, this divine rite dates back to a period before the Ritsuryō era, although it is not clear precisely when it started. It was an internal rite for succeeding (the right to perform) rituals with no direct connection with the kingly power.
What deserves attention in connection with the internal succession of (the right of) rituals or the inauguration of Kuni-no-miyatsuko is the Decree of Dajo-kankan October 11, Enryaku 17 (798) titled “禁下出雲国造託二神事一多娶二百姓女子一為妾事” (Ruijū-Sandai-Kyaku, Vol. 1, 神宮司神主祢宜事). The full text is as follows:

The expression “the newly appointed” means the newly appointed Kuni-no-Miyatsuko who would double as the Kannushi. The gist of the Decree of Dajo-kankan is as follows: Kuni-no-Miyatsuko shall not abandon his wedded wife and take maidens from a farming family as shrine attendants and made them his mistresses on the day of inauguration because that would be a lewd act under the pretext of a divine rite; provided, however, that if that is unavoidable, he may choose only one woman by drawing from those who names are shown to the provincial governor. The act of taking a maiden from a farming family as a shrine attendant may represents the transformation of the ancient form of rituals in which a man and a woman performed a rite in pair and the woman (maiden) was also a goddess. This act was considered lewd because the true meaning of the rite was forgotten. It resonates with the tale contained in Nihonshoki’s section on the Yūryaku reign about Ōshikōchi-no-Atai-no-Katabu and his maiden attendant as mentioned earlier. Be that as it may, the act also retained vestiges of the ancient tradition. This is why the state had to make a “compromise” that allowed Kuni-no-Miyatsuko to take one maiden on condition that Kokushi (provincial governor) act as a guarantor. As has already been discussed, the Imperial Court applied a strategy of stepping up pressure or even forcing changes on Izumo and Munakata in the Enryaku era by, for example, limiting the term of office of Kannushi to six years and banning the practice of serving as both Kuni-no-Miyatsuko (or Kannushi) and top district official. The act of prohibiting the practice of newly-appointed Kuni-no-Miyatsuko abandoning his wedded wife and “taking” a new maiden attendant on the day of his inauguration may have been part of this strategy. This practice represented a “watershed” between the states before and after the inauguration. The author believes that the practice carried value as a traditional internal ritual that had been handed down over the years, just as the act of newly-appointed Kuni-no-Miyatsuko striking a fresh divine fire and keeping it alive while he was in office. In the words, the practice represented the act of creating a “watershed”—putting out the divine fire that had been kept alive by his deceased predecessor and starting a new one.

This interpretation of the act of the Kuni-no-Miyatsuko of Izumo sheds new light on the last passage of the above-mentioned the Decree of Dajo-kankan that reads: “this applies to the Kannushi of Munakata in Chikuzen Province.” If the “Kuni-no-Miyatsuko of Izumo” was replaced with “Kannushi of Munakata” in this Decree of Dajo-kankan, the resultant text would read something like: “the Kannushi of Munakata traditionally abandoned his wedded wife and took many maidens from farming families as shrine attendants and made them his mistresses on the day of inauguration. This act shall be prohibited as it will incite immorality. The implications are that such an act retained vestiges of the ancient tradition as in the case of Izumo. It was performed as a “watershed” on the inauguration day of the newly-appointed Kannushi in Munakata as well. In other words, the act can be interpreted to have been performed as part of the internal rite for the succession of the (right of) rituals for the Munakata goddesses.

The central ritual for this succession rite was (Jinka) Hitsugishiki in Izumo; there is no known equivalent in Munakata. It is well conceivable that such a central ritual was practiced in Munakata as well. It would be rather illogical to think otherwise. It is reasonable to assume that such a ritual, whatever its content, was performed on Okinoshima Island, which is home to the Munakata goddesses and where the god in the island reside, given the nature of the Three Goddesses of Munakata and the Munakata Shrine. It must have been the ritual through which the Kannushi assumed the divinity of the Munakata goddesses and started a new life. Okinoshima, where the Okitu-miya Shrine is located, is a divine but familiar island visible not only from the Chikuzen Ōshima Island and the mainland Munakata but also from any part of the Genkai Sea. At the same time, it is an unfamiliar divine island in that it lies in the rough sea of Genkai and defies each landing. Given the geographical inaccessibility of the island, it is less likely that people of Munakata often landed on the island to perform rituals. It is more likely that they did so on special occasions. There is
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a good chance that on such an occasion, they performed the rite for the inauguration of a newly-appointed Kannushi, in other words, the rite for the succession of the (right of) rituals. The end of the ancient rituals on Okinoshima cannot be analyzed without considering the internal transformation of Munakata. The ritual sites as well as the features and artifacts found there should be studies from this perspective as well.

14. Conclusion

In this paper, the author has reviewed a number of aspects, including the background to the origin of the ukei legend about the birth of the Three Goddesses of Munakata, the relationship between Takashina-no-Mahito and the Fujiwara Clan over the Munakata Shrine in Yamato, the practice of serving as Dairyō (district governor) and Kannushi concurrently at the Munakata Shrine, similarities between Munakata and Izumo, and the relationship between the Genkai Sea and the Munakata goddesses. What has emerged as a key issue in the process is the relationship between the internal succession rite for the Kannushi of Munakata and Okinoshima Island. The rather lengthy discussion, which has significantly exceeded the space assigned to the author, has often depended on assumptions rather than established facts. Further research is required to delve further into this issue as well as many other underaddressed issues.

Notes (not translated):

1) 宗像市史編集委員会編『宗像市史』通史編第 1 巻(1997 年、宗像市)および「付図 3 絹文時代の宗像の地勢」。
2) 弓場紀知『古代祭祀とシルクロードの終着地 沖ノ島』(新泉社、2005 年)。弓場氏は沖ノ島の第三次調査に参加された方で、本書は近年刊行された沖ノ島についての簡にして要を得た書籍であるので例示的にあげたものであり、他意はない。
3) 宗像神社復興期成会編『神ノ島』(吉川弘文館、1958 年)の「序説」参照。
4) 註 3 の「序説」には「(宗像郡玄海町神湊・壱岐島芦辺・対馬厳原)これ等の島々や陸地は、天気が澄み静時は沖ノ島を見わたせるけれども、少しばかりの煙り気でも島の見えぬことが多い。やや近く視野に入るものは南方では小呂島・大島等がある」と沖ノ島からの視界について指摘されている。筆者も一ノ岳(海上保安庁の灯台がある)に二度登ったが、天候に恵まれ目視することができた。
5) 筆者も城山(雲ヶ嶽)山頂や地頭、また相島(福岡県新宮町)などから目視した経験がある。なお、宗像市田野に在る瀬戸 4 号墳・3 号墳の発掘調査報告書の巻頭図版に「古墳から望む沖ノ島」の写真が掲載されている(『田野瀬戸古墳』宗像市文化財調査報告書第 59 集、宗像市教育委員会、2007 年)。
6) 1954 年 5 月〜55 年 11 月の第一次調査の成果は宗像神社復興期成会編『沖ノ島』(吉川弘文館、1958 年)として、また 1957 年 8 月〜58 年 9 月の第二次調査の成果は宗像大社復興期成会編『続沖ノ島』(吉川弘文館、1961 年)に、1969 年 9 月〜71 年 5 月の第三次調査の成果は第三次沖ノ島学術調査隊編『宗像沖ノ島』(三集冊、宗像大社復興期成会、1979 年)に纏めて公刊されている。三次に亘る調査の総括は第三次調査の報告書で行われている。
7) 1978 年 1 月に行われた井上光貞氏の東京大学退官の最終講議「古代沖ノ島の祭祀」は、この考古学的調査を受けて文献史学の側から律令祭祀制の成立についての関心に続いて聴講が加えられたものである(井上光貞『東大三十余年』、私家版、1978 年、のち『井上光貞著作集』第 5 巻に再録)。井上説は学界に大きな影響を与え、沖ノ島祭祀の第三期と律令的祭祀の先駆形態という点を中心に批判を加えた岡田精司氏(『古代を考える 沖ノ島祭祀遺跡の検討』、古代を考える会、1984 年)がある。なお、井上氏に沖ノ島調査の概要を説明されたのは、第三次調査に参加された弓場氏であるとのことである(注 2 著書参照)。
8) 岡崎敬「総括編」(注 6 『宗像沖ノ島』)
9) 全調査に参加された小田富士雄氏は、「第三次調査のところから誰言うとなく海の正倉院というキャッチフレーズが喧伝されるようになった。まことに言いたいのは妙である」といわれた(小田富士雄「祭祀遺跡沖ノ島の歴史的位置」、同氏編『古代を考える 沖ノ島と古代祭祀』、吉川弘文館、1988 年)。
10) こうした理解は調査の検討過程で次第に調査団の共通的なものになっていたものかと思われるが、注 8 の岡崎敬氏の総括はその後の理解(解釈)に大きな影響を与えたのではないかと思われる。
お、古代の国家的外交交渉の相手は4世紀後半〜9世紀後半では、中国の南北朝系王朝・隋・唐の諸王朝、朝鮮では高句麗・百済・新羅（統一朝を含む）や渤海の諸王朝であり、中国王朝に限定されるものではないということである。質の高いといわれる中国・朝鮮系の、取分け金属類の年代が7世紀より以前に比定され、律令制下の祭祀遺物との類似性が高い8世紀以後ではなさそうな点は、在地と王権の関係からも注意されよう。発見遺物の製作地や制作者、島内の縦入ルートやその主体など、解明すべき事柄は多く残されている。

従ってムナカタ表記の変遷は①→②→③と考えて誤りはないであろう。①から②への変化には、和銅6（713）年5月の「畿内七道諸国の郡・郷の名は、好き字を着けしむ」（『続日本紀』）という行政地名の表記の改正、胸形（方）郡→宗形郡が与っていたかもしれないが、後述するムナカタの特別な有り様からは今少し早く大宝律令編纂時、評→郡への変化の時期を想定することも可能かと思われる。ムナカタはミノカタよりもムネカタから変化した言葉というべきであり、音声言語ムネにどの漢字を当てるかは、表音ではなく表意からの漢字選択、和（倭）語「ムネ」⇨漢字「胸」と考えるのが妥当であろう。なお、本稿では史料に基づく場合を除いて、ムナカタの表記は現行の宗像を使用する。

11) 従ってムナカタ表記の変遷は①→②→③と考えて誤りはないであろう。①から②への変化には、和銅6（713）年5月の「畿内七道諸国の郡・郷の名は、好き字を着けしむ」（『続日本紀』）という行政地名の表記の改正、胸形（方）郡→宗形郡が与っていたかもしれないが、後述するムナカタの特別な有り様からは今少し早く大宝律令編纂時、評→郡への変化の時期を想定することも可能かと思われる。ムナカタはミノカタよりもムネカタから変化した言葉というべきであり、音声言語ムネにどの漢字を当てるかは、表音ではなく表意からの漢字選択、和（倭）語「ムネ」⇨漢字「胸」と考えられるのは妥当であろう。なお、本稿では史料に基づく場合を除いて、ムナカタの表記は現行の宗像を使用する。

12) 宗像神社復興期成会編『宗像神社史』上巻（宗像神社復興期成会、1961年）による。

13) 宝永2（1705）年以降の成立かといわれる。近世の地誌類および解題は、中村正夫編校訂『宗像郡地誌綜覧』（文献出版、1997年）による。

14) 1974年の臨川書店の復刻版による（原著は1903年刊）。

15) 青柳種信編『筑前国続風土記拾遺』（宗像郡上・田島村）。文化11（1814）年以降の成立と考えられる同書には、「往昔此村ハ江海の浜にして東南北の三方ハみな潮水たゝへて、田島川の上、土穴稲本村等の辺まて遠く入海なり。近代に至りて潮水やゝあせて斥滷の地を開墾て佃となせり。故に村名を田嶋といふ」とある。

16) 金関丈夫「むなかた」（『えとのす』12号、1979年、同氏著『発掘から推量する』に再録）。

17) 例をあげると福岡県八女市の立山山13号墳の人物埴輪にみることができる。

18) 安曇・住吉神出現については、『書紀』は神代の第5段（四神出生章）の異伝の一つ=第6の一書にのみ記している。『記』（上巻）も大略同内容であるが、神名を底津綿津見神・中津綿津見神・上津綿津見神、底箇之男命・中箇之男命・上箇之男命と表記する。

19) 神名ワタツミはワタ＋ツ＋ミで、ワタは海、ツは格助詞「の」、ミは霊、即ち「海の霊」=海神を意味する語句と考えるのが妥当であろう。『書紀』（神代下・第10段や景行40年是歳条など）や『万葉集』の「海神の手に巻き持てる玉ゆゑ」（巻7・1301番）、「海神の持てる白玉」（1302番）では「海神」を「ワタツミ」と訓んでいる。なお、「アヅミ」については太田亮のアマツミ（海積）や本居宣長のアマツモチ（海人つ持）の約まった語とする説がある（佐伯有清『新撰姓氏録の研究』考證篇第3、吉川弘文館、1983年、安曇宿祢の項を参照）。

20) 『新撰姓氏録』（右京神別下）によれば、安曇宿祢（連）は「海神綿積豊玉神子穂高見命」の後も神別・地祇に区分されている。同書は佐伯有清『新撰姓氏録の研究』本文篇（吉川弘文館、1962年）による。なお、安曇連の本貫については①九州（博多湾岸）説と②畿内（大阪湾岸）説がある。前者は延喜式内社志加海神社三座が筑前国糟屋郡にあり、現在の神主も阿曇姓である。しかし、畿内神である住吉神が式内社住吉神社三座だためであり、現在の住吉大社の地である②説が妥当であろう。なお、『住吉大社神代記』（田中卓『住吉大社神代記』、住吉大社、1951年、のち『田中卓著作集7』に再録）によれば、和魂を大津渟中倉長岡（田裳見宿祢に当る）に祭拝させ、また皇后に代わって手操足尼を神主として斎祓奉らせたとする。

21) 田中卓、註21著書参照。田中氏は「元来、津守氏はこの海神を奉拝していたのであろう」といわれる。なお、住吉神の神名「ツツ」については、『簡』と表記されることと相俟って、①星説・②船雲器物説・③蛇神説・④津の男説・⑤豆殻の男説・⑥兎枝の男神説などの諸説がある。中でも①の津の男説はなお有力な説というべきである。山田孝雄氏によれば（『住吉大神の御名義について』）、安曇宿祢は「海神綿積豊玉神子穂高見命」の後も神別・地祇に区分されている。同書は佐伯有清『新撰姓氏録の研究』本文篇（吉川弘文館、1962年）による。なお、安曇連の本貫については①九州（博多湾岸）説と②畿内（大阪湾岸）説がある。前者は延喜式内社志加海神社三座が筑前国糟屋郡にあり、現在の神主も阿曇姓である。しかし、畿内神である住吉神が式内社住吉神社三座だためであり、現在の住吉大社の地である②説が妥当であろう。なお、『住吉大社神代記』（田中卓『住吉大社神代記』、住吉大社、1951年、のち『田中卓著作集7』に再録）によれば、和魂を大津渟中倉長岡（田裳見宿祢に当る）に祭拝させ、また皇后に代わって手操足尼を神主として斎祓奉らせたとする。

22) 田中卓、註21著書参照。田中氏は「元来、津守氏はこの海神を奉拝していたのであろう」といわれる。なお、住吉神の神名「ツツ」については、『簡』と表記されることと相俟って、①星説・②船雲器物説・③蛇神説・④津の男説・⑤豆殻の男説・⑥兎枝の男神説などの諸説がある。中でも①の津の男説はなお有力な説というべきである。山田孝雄氏によれば（『住吉大神の御名義について』）、安曇宿祢は「海神綿積豊玉神子穂高見命」の後も神別・地祇に区分されている。同書は佐伯有清『新撰姓氏録の研究』本文篇（吉川弘文館、1962年）による。なお、安曇連の本貫については①九州（博多湾岸）説と②畿内（大阪湾岸）説がある。前者は延喜式内社志加海神社三座が筑前国糟屋郡にあり、現在の神主も阿曇姓である。しかし、畿内神である住吉神が式内社住吉神社三座だためであり、現在の住吉大社の地である②説が妥当であろう。なお、『住吉大社神代記』（田中卓『住吉大社神代記』、住吉大社、1951年、のち『田中卓著作集7』に再録）によれば、和魂を大津渟中倉長岡（田裳見宿祢に当る）に祭拝させ、また皇后に代わって手操足尼を神主として斎祓奉らせたとする。
て」「歴史公論」6-5、1937年）、住吉三神の名はソコツ+ツノオ+ノミコトに分けて考えるべきで、ツノオのツに御名の核心がある。ツノオは津之男＝津を知る神であり、単に住吉に止まらず航海又は往還する船舶に関わるものであって、つまるところ「津を司る長神」の意であろう。これら諸説の整理については、西宮一民「御祭神としての神功皇后」（神功皇后論文集刊行会編『神功皇后』、皇学館大学出版部、1972年）などを参照されたい。

23）『書紀』垂仁39年10月条や87年2月条にみえる物部連の石上神宮への関与も同様の事例であり、物部連の祖先神は物部神である。

24）畿内ヤマト王権が大阪湾周辺に有した港湾＝外港は住吉津と難波津が代表的である。ともに大津と称され、かつても物部連と王権との関係が密接であったが、前者が古く栄え、6世紀以降に後者が繁栄するようになったとされる（大阪府史編集専門委員会編『大阪府史』第2巻古代編Ⅱ、大阪府、1990年や岡田精司「古代の難波と住吉の神」、林陸朗先生還暦記念会編『日本古代の政治と制度』、続群諸類従完成会、1985年を参照されたい）。

25）この神話についての諸説の概要等については、正木喜三郎「宗像三女神と記紀神話」（小田富士雄編『古代を考える 沖ノ島と古代祭祀』、吉川弘文館、1998年、のち正木『古代・中世 宗像の歴史と伝承』に再録）を参照されたい。また、本稿で扱う宗像神誕生（ウケヒ）神話を含む『書紀』の神話について、読み下し文・注釈・考察を加えたものに角林文雄『日本書紀神代巻全注釈』（塙書房、1999年）がある。

26）益田勝実氏は沖ノ島の巨岩Dの7号・8号遺跡、特に前者の遺物の種類や分布状況から、三女神誕生神話の誓約（ウケヒ）の行為が実修されたのではないかといわれ、沖ノ島での儀礼＝「秘儀」の形跡を発掘調査の結果と関連付けて見い出そうとされた（「秘儀の島ー神話づくりの実態ー」、『文学』39・4・5・6、1971年、のち同著『秘儀の島』に再録）。氏の着想と考察は貴重なものであり、演じられ繰り返される行為と神話や説話がしばしば密接な関係をもつことを肯定してよいと考えるが、発掘時点での遺物の出土と分布の評価の問題は依然残るように思われ、それを前提での解釈には慎重でなければならないであろう。

27）『記・紀』神話において17男神を天照大神の子とする痕跡は、例えば正哉吾勝勝速日天忍穂耳尊について窺うことができる。この神は神統譜ではニニギノ尊の父とされ、当初天降りを予定されながらニニギノ尊が生まれると子に降臨を委ねたとされる神であるが、具体的な活動は知られぬ。ところが天孫降臨段で天照大神はこの天忍穂耳尊を、「我が御子」（『記』）、「天照大神の子」（『書紀』第9段本文・「吾が児」（第2））と呼んでいるのである。所伝の性格など問題はあるが、男神の中に出雲系の神とともに高天原系のしかも天孫降臨に関わる神が含まれていることは、後述することと合わせて三女神を天照大神の子とする所伝の作為性が窺えるのではなかろうか。

28）物実と子神の交換がA類のみであるB類にないこと、その提案者が天照大神であって日神ではないこと、Aが胸形君系所伝であって水沼君系でないこと、A・B系神話の成立背景＝王権と奉斎氏族との政治的関係からも注意しておく必要があると思われる。

29）Bはdで物実の剣を日神自身の物としているが、剣が男性を象徴するとすれば、その剣に誓約相手のスサノヲ命を言外に想定しているとも考えられる。同様にeの玉も日神を想定しているともいえる。

30）17男神の内のアメノホヒ命について、『記』はその子建比良鳥命を出雲国造の祖、『紀』の「本文」は出雲臣・土師連の祖としている。また、熊野クスヒ命・熊野オシホミ命の熊野を紀伊の熊野とする考えもあるが、熊野坐神社（意宇郡）とみてよければ、五男神に含まれる出雲系の神ということができる。

31）そもそもこの『記・紀』の宗像三女神（ウケヒ）神話は、高天原において国津神が誕生するという特異なもので、天津神天照大神と国津神スサノヲ命を姉弟とする神話の形成と、ある意味で不可分の関係で三女神に天津神と国津神の性格が混在するという状況を生み出したのであろうが、太陽神の日神→天照大神の成立とも密接な関係があると思われる。出雲系神話が国造制の解体＝一律令的中央集権への移行という政治過程に対応し、天武朝に完成した神話体系は『記』上巻に近い形であろうという岡田精司氏の考察は、三女神神話の成立にも当てはまるものと思われる（「記紀神話の成立」岩波講座日本歴史2古代2、岩波書店、1975年）。

32）タゴリ（田心）はタキリ（田霧）の転訛（『古事記』日本思想大系1巻7号、岩波書店、1982年、46頁頭注参照）。　

33）諸橋徹次『大漢和辞典』（巻7の「湍」を参照。）　

34）島神が鎮座する「神の島」は、全国的に知られるが、陸地からの距離が数10㎞に及ぶことや朝鮮等の外国に近い点などは他に比べがたい沖ノ島の特徴であろう。宗像神社との関係が注目される。
神社に、宗像神を祭すると広島県の厳島神社がある。『延喜式』では厳島神社を祭神とする島神の社の意味である伊都伎嶋神社(安芸国佐伯郡)と表記され、宗像神のイチツキシマ姫と共通する島神であることが示される。しかし、『延喜式』には宗像神社(大和国・筑前国)・宗形神社(尾張国・備前国)・脅神社(下野国・伯耆国)の如く宗形神を祭る宗像神社が存在しているにも拘らず、この神社が宗像名を称していないことは、この段階で伊都伎嶋神社の祭神が宗像神であったのか疑問が残るところである。島神の属性を共に伊都伎嶋神社の祭神が宗像神とされる契機に、宗像大宮司の平氏家人化や平清盛の存在があったのではなかったかと思われる。なお、島神については、注3の『宗像沖ノ島』第1分冊や和田萃「沖ノ島と大和王権」(注4『古代を考える 沖ノ島と古代祭祀』、のち同著『日本古代の儀礼と祭祀・信仰』下に再録)が参考になる。

近年わが国で注目されている韓国の竹幕洞祭祀遺跡(全羅北道扶安郡邊山面格浦里竹幕洞山)は、海に面した半島部の先端近くに所在する露天祭祀遺跡で、出土遺物の石製模造品にわが国のものと類似する物があり、倭人との関係が推測され、沖ノ島祭祀遺跡との比較がいわれたりしている。私も現地を見学する機会があったが、その祭祀が沖ノ島的な島神祭祀であるとは素直には理解し難いところがあった。

狭依田比売命が「神の依り憑く」ヒメノミコト(注31、『古事記』、47頁頭注参照)の意とすれば、それが市寸嶋比売命の別名とされていることは、市寸嶋比売命が最も重視された神格であることを示唆している。また、イチキ・イツキについて、水野祐氏は「斎き」の義か、「い憑き」か解釈が別れるとし、『記』が亦名をサヨリヒメとするところから後者がよいかと思われるが、狭依田比売命を亦名とするのは一つの解釈であり本来的なものではないであろう。

『記』は7・9のように中津宮には市寸嶋比売命が鎮座するとしている。宗像大社の中津宮は宗像市大島に所在するが、その背後の御嶽山(標高224m)山頂の中津宮の摂社御嶽宮周辺が、2010年9月〜11年1月にかけて発掘調査が行われた。奈良三彩や八稜鏡・金属製雛形・滑石製形代・須恵器土師器・宋銭・寛永通宝が出土し、8世紀〜9世紀の年代が現在のところ与えられている。この調査で全てを判断はできないが、律令時代の祭祀であり、7世紀以前の特に6世紀を遡るものでないことは、宗像三神の中核神が祀られ祭祀が行われていたとは考えにくい。「大島御嶽山遺跡調査報告会」資料(宗像市市民活動推進課文化財係、2011年3月20日、於ユリックス)参照。

『先代旧事本紀』(巻4・地神本紀)には、「次市杵嶋姫命、亦名佐依姫命、亦云中津嶋姫命、坐宗像中津宮、是所居于中嶋者也」「次湍津姫命、亦名多岐都姫命、亦名邊津嶋姫命、坐宗像邊津宮、是所居于海濱者也」とあり、中津嶋姫命・邊津嶋姫命とあるが史料の性格からしても『記・紀』段階まで遡及させるのは難しく、後代的な付会の名であろう。ナカツシマヒメについては中世期の宗像神社の史料『宗像大菩薩御縁起』と『正平年中行事』に見られるが、ヘツシマヒメについては中世期の宗像神社の史料『宗像神社史』(上巻、1961年)第4章第1節)参照。

玄界灘の名称は糸島郡の「月海島」(現在の玄界島)に由来するといわれる(吉田東伍『増補 大日本地名辞書』第4巻、冨山房、1971年および『角川日本地名大辞典』40福岡県、角川書店、1988年)。その範囲は必ずしも確定的ではないが、西は壱岐・対馬、東は本州西端(含響灘)、北は対馬海流域であるといってよいかと思われる。なお、「宇」(巻3)には「居處・さかひ・地域」など、
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「佐」(巻 1)には「たすける・うかがふ」などの意味があるが、詳しくは諸橋徹次『大漢和辞典』を参照されたい。

弥永貞三氏はこの史料について、「書記編者の潤色がほとんど加わっていない部分」「極めて原文に近い形で日本書紀に登載されたもの」「官家・僕移居考」、『名古屋大学文学部研究論集』35、1964年、のち改題して同著『日本古代社会経済史研究』に再録といわれる。この記事の続きには天皇によって派遣された有臣が率いていた兵士(本文は民と記す)に火箭を能く射る筑紫物部莫奇委沙奇がおり、その活躍が特記されているが、筑紫と海北の関係を注意してよいかもしれない。なお、『宋書』(夷蛮伝倭国条)の倭王武の昇明(478年)の上表文にも「渡平海北九十五国」の表記があるが、慎重な扱いが必要であろう。

弥永貞三氏はこの史料について、「書紀編者の潤色がほとんど加わっていない部分」「極めて原文に近い形で日本書紀に登載されたもの」(『官家・彌移居考』、『名古屋大学文学部研究論集』35、1964年、のち改題して同著『日本古代社会経済史研究』に再録)といわれる。この記事の続きには天皇によって派遣された有臣が率いていた兵士(本文は民と記す)に火箭を能く射る筑紫物部莫奇委沙奇がおり、その活躍が特記されているが、筑紫と海北の関係を注意してよいかもしれない。なお、『宋書』(夷蛮伝倭国条)の倭王武の昇明(478年)の上表文にも「渡平海北九十五国」の表記があるが、慎重な扱いが必要であろう。

弥永貞三氏はこの史料について、「書紀編者の潤色がほとんど加わっていない部分」「極めて原文に近い形で日本書紀に登載されたもの」(『官家・彌移居考』、『名古屋大学文学部研究論集』35、1964年、のち改題して同著『日本古代社会経済史研究』に再録)といわれる。この記事の続きには天皇によって派遣された有臣が率いていた兵士(本文は民と記す)に火箭を能く射る筑紫物部莫奇委沙奇がおり、その活躍が特記されているが、筑紫と海北の関係を注意してよいかもしれない。なお、『宋書』(夷蛮伝倭国条)の倭王武の昇明(478年)の上表文にも「渡平海北九十五国」の表記があるが、慎重な扱いが必要であろう。

弥永貞三氏はこの史料について、「書紀編者の潤色がほとんど加わっていない部分」「極めて原文に近い形で日本書紀に登載されたもの」(『官家・彌移居考』、『名古屋大学文学部研究論集』35、1964年、のち改題して同著『日本古代社会経済史研究』に再録)といわれる。この記事の続きには天皇によって派遣された有臣が率いていた兵士(本文は民と記す)に火箭を能く射る筑紫物部莫奇委沙奇がおり、その活躍が特記されているが、筑紫と海北の関係を注意してよいかもしれない。なお、『宋書』(夷蛮伝倭国条)の倭王武の昇明(478年)の上表文にも「渡平海北九十五国」の表記があるが、慎重な扱いが必要であろう。
君麻呂ら 3 人、また「大宰府出土木簡」（『大宰府関連木簡集成』144・145 号、『大宰府市史』古代資料編、太宰府市、2003 年）に車持朝臣氏道の名がみえる。

58) この神の祟りが平安期にみられるような怨霊でないことはいうまでもあるまい。「祟」の用例等については、大江篤『祟現象と神祇官の亀卜』（続日本紀研究会編『続日本紀の時代』、塙書房、1994 年、のち同著『日本古代の神と霊』に補訂再録を参照されたい。

60) 神婚の名残りとみられる記事が後述する延暦 17(798)年 10 月の太政官符（『類聚三代格』巻 1) にみられる。宗像神主が新任の日に百姓の女子を神宮采女として娶るのは神事に託して淫風を煽るとして禁止しているのがそれである。

64) 撮稿「ヤマト王権の九州支配と豊国」（『福岡教育大学紀要』第 58 号第 2 分冊、2009年）。既に松原弘宣氏（『豊前国の地方豪族について』『愛媛大学教養部紀要』第 21 号、1988 年）も畿内と九州の交通における周防灘沿岸を陸路に抜けるルートの重要性について指摘されているが、周防灘を陸路で博多湾方面まで有明海に接するルートの重要性は再認識されるべきであろう。海から陸路を通り抜けて内陸部を陸路で進むルートの重要性は絶対的であると考えられる。
『井上光貞著作集』第4巻に再録）や松前健「ヤマトタケル伝承の成立」（『命世記研究』439号、1982年、のち同著『大和国家と神話伝承』に再録）、瀧音能之「古代の出雲と宗像」（『立命館文学』439〜441号、1982年、のち同著『大和国家と神話伝承』に再録）などを参照されたい。

また、崇神70年7月条に関連する話があり、垂仁26年8月条にみえる。天皇はしばしば出雲国に使いを派遣して神宝を検校させたが、はっきりと報告する者がいないので、物部十千根大連に出雲に行って検校することを命じた。出雲に行き神宝を検校し、はっきりと復命した十千根に、天皇は神宝を掌らせることとした、というものである。崇神朝に貢上された神宝が返還されたようにも受け取られる話であるが、十千根の石上神宮の神宝管掌説話と関係するものであろう（拙稿「石上神宮と忍坂大中姫」、横田健一編『日本書紀研究』第13冊、塙書房、1985年）。

68）旧住所表示では西伯郡成実村大字宗像字向塔である。現在の社地は尼子晴久によって、弘治2（1556）年に300m程離れた宮ノ谷から移されたともいわれる。

69）東宗像古墳群の6・7号墳については、『東宗像遺跡』（鳥取県教育文化財団、1985年）によった。

なお、同報告書は東宗像遺跡周辺の地形について、古代の汀線が現在よりもかなり後退していたことも考えられ、海上交通の拠点的な位置を占めていたのではないかと推測している。

70）宗像と日本海については鍵崎の海女の展開が知られている。近世の「あわび」漁を中心とする「筑前蜑」の蜑浦といわれたのは波津・鍵崎・大島・弘の四浦である。近世以前からの伝統を引くのでは鍵崎・大島といわれるが、その展開は対馬の曲・壹岐の小崎・石川県の輪島・鳥取市の夏泊などの他、石川県の舳倉島や山口県の大浦などの移住もされ、出漁地としては角島をはじめ浜田・温泉津・波根・出雲・隠岐などであるが、移住・出漁地はいずれも日本海側である。この広がりは鰻の生産と関係するであろうが、瀬戸内海側には足跡を残していない。古代とは単純に比較できないかもしれないが、近世には宗像から能登辺まで船による移動が行われていたのであり、このことは古代における海上交通を考える上で十分参考にしてよいことであろう。詳しくは『宗像市史』通史編第2巻の近世・第3章第2節（高田茂廣氏執筆）を参照されたい。なお、『延喜式』巻24・主計上の諸国の調・庸・中男作物の品目に鰻がある日本海および瀬戸内海に面した国は、若狭・佐渡・出雲・隠岐と伊予・阿波（紀伊）である。九州では筑前・肥前・肥後・豊後・日向、壱岐である。この外に木簡に贄の鰻がみられるのは、『式』の諸国以外では長門国であるが、「長屋王家木簡」には「長屋親王宮鮑大贄十編」が知られる。このように古代には瀬戸内海方面でも鰻が税として徴収されており、備前国赤坂・津高郡には式内社の宗形神社が分布し、後には安芸国の厳島神社との関係がいわれるにもかかわらず、近世の筑前蜑の展開がみられず、日本海側のみであることは有意なことではないかと思われる。

71）養老7(723)年11月16日の太政官符（『令集解』叙命令7主典条詮説所引の時点では伊勢国渡相郡・竹郡、安房国安房郡、出雲国意宇郡、筑前国宗形郡、常陸国鹿嶋郡、下総国香取郡、紀伊国名草郡）の7国8神郡が定められていた。神郡の初見記事は『書紀』持統6（692）年3月条の伊勢であるが、神郡の設置は伊勢や鹿嶋の例からすれば、孝徳朝の7世紀半頃を一つの目安と考えることができる。神郡とは別に「神封」も限られた神社に付与されたが、神封と「神戸」の関係は必ずしも明確ではない。『新抄格勅符抄』（第10巻、神事諸家封戸）の大同1（806）年牒によれば、熊野神 『出雲国加十戸』「杵築神 出雲天平神護元年奉充」「宗像神 七十四戸（已上四社同国）」とあるが、九州関係は「大宰神封」に纏められている。神戸の初見は崇神7年11月条であり、「養老神祇令」（20神戸条）に規定がある。同条の「神に供せむ調度に充てよ」との規定は、履中紀の車持部＝神充者に当てはまるといえよう。

72）出雲国の大野坐神社（意宇郡）と杵築大社（出雲郡）の関係・歴史には複雑なものがある。神郡はその領域が神の神域とされるものであるが、意宇郡＝神郡、神階の授与、国造継承儀礼・火継神事などにみられる熊野坐神社の優位性は、神郡設定が熊野坐神社を中心とするものであったことを推測させる。平野邦雄「神郡と神戸」（『大化前代政治過程の研究』、吉川弘文館、1985年）などを参照されたい。

73）『令集解』（巻17）の「跡」説は「仮令、内七位任郡司者、即日改敘外位也」となり、出雲国はその領域が神の神域とされるものであるが、意宇郡＝神郡、神階の授与、国造継承儀礼・火継神事などにみられる熊野坐神社の優位性は、神郡設定が熊野坐神社を中心とするものであったことを推測させる。平野邦雄「神郡と神戸」（『大化前代政治過程の研究』、吉川弘文館、1985年）などを参照されたい。
74) 延暦 19(808)年 12 月の太政官府には引用されている「大宰府解」には「当都大領補任の日、例に
よりて神主を兼ね、即ち五位に叙す」とある。鳥麻呂は天平 1 年 4 月の時点で宗形郡大領外従七
位上であり、すでに大領には補任されていたのである。
75) 金崎（滋賀県）が海の難所であったことは、『童戸集』(巻 7、1230 番)に「ちはやぶる金の岬」と詠ま
れたことでも知られる。鎌倉や地場を結ぶラインが発達し、玄界灘の端＝潮目をなし、海の色にも
違いないが認められるこの潮目はほぼ直線に走り、常に白波が立っている古今の難所である。
76) 竹生王は女王と表記する例の一つであるが、女王の結婚については「養老継嗣令」に「凡王
娶親王、臣娶五世王者聴。唯五世王不得娶親王」と規定がある。皇親の範囲は延暦 3(706)年 2 月
の格で五世王も皇親の範囲を譲った。高市皇子を承知せずに譲る二世王をみてよいであろう。
77) 畑本采紫の一例をあげれば、養老 5(721)年 1 月に正位下位解工とみえ、天平 17 年に正五位上
にまで昇叙した宗形朝臣松野(『続紀』)や「元右京人」であった宗形義光(『続後紀』承和 6 年
9 月条)、弘仁 8(817)年 11 月に正六位→外従五位下に昇叙した宗形朝臣藤氏(『類聚国史』)らが知ら
れる。他に天平 5(733)年の「山背国高知郡某郷計帳」に宗方君族入鹿朝宗方君族 4 人がみられるが、
同様や神社 3(726)年の「愛宕郡雲上里・雲下里計帳」には出雲郡族や上毛野君族・白髪郡造族・
鴨郡主族・布世君族など「某姓+姓」を名乗る人物が多く記載されている。筑前在住者では和銅
2(709)年 6 月に『続紀』に益城連姓を賜った筑前国御笠郡大領正七位下宗形部堅牛は、大宰府所在
国の郡長に宗形府の部姓氏氏が就任した例で、賜姓された氏姓益城連益城は肥後国の益城郡
や益城郷に由来するものであろう。また同 4 年間 6 月(『続紀』)に宗形部加麻麻伎に次の大輔が賜
れているが、これから賜姓が宗形部という部姓者であることや賜姓後の氏名との関連からも宗
像勢力の展開の有り様という点で注意されよう。畿内および宗像在住者で名の知られる者について
は、「宗像市史」通史編第 2 巻第 2 章(福原栄太郎氏執筆)を参照されたい。
78) 本位田菊士氏は「高市皇子自身が天武—持統朝にかけて筑前宗像神をこの地に勧請したとみるべ
きであろう」(『高市皇子と胸形氏の伝承』(統紀研究)第 161 号、1972 年)、のち同著で「日本
古代国家形成過程の研究」に再録され、それに同調の氏氏氏氏も「大和国の宗像神社は高市皇子に
によって創建された、と考えることが妥当と思われる」「高市皇子の時代、天武朝から持統朝にかけ
ての時代を、宗像氏の中央進出の時期の上限としてとらえることができる」「宗像氏と大和国宗
像神社」、「明治大学大学院紀要」19、1982 年、のち同著『出雲国風土記と古代日本』に再録)とい
われる。「舒磨氏の王統の意識」という点などからも宗像神の大和国への勧請は高市皇子以前に遡る
可能性があるものと考える。
79) 高階真人的賜姓を受けた人物は安宿王系の他に、承和 10(843)年 6 月に高市皇子の後裔春枝王の六
世寛正王を 3 人と秋枝王の六世正雄王を 4 人(『続後紀』)、翌 11 年に石見王(長屋王と石川婦人
の桑田王の裔・左雄朝に子孫に与えられた「高階氏系譜」、「群書類従」第 5 篇所収)。また、天平
宝字 1(757)年 8 月に長屋王の弟鈴鹿王の裔の出雲王・稲原王・亀旨王らに豊野真人が与えられ
たが(『続紀』)、嘉祥 7(848)年 7 月に豊野真人澄野に 10 人に高階真人が改めて与えられている(『続
後紀』)。
80) 『拾芥抄』(巻名所部第 20)の小一の項に「坤角宗像社有り」と注記されている。その他に「大
鏡」上の藤原忠平の条や「三代実録」(群書類従) 8(859)年 2 月条などにみることができる。
81) 例えば、新羅海賊や神功皇后については「三代実録」(群書類従) 12 年 2 月条や元慶 2 年 12 月条、神階
授与は承和 7(840)年 4 月の従五位下・勅等(『神階記』)、寛平間の間の正位を勅等等が知られ
る。神階授与は Emer 13(794)年 3 月(『類聚国史』)や遺唐使の平安を祈られた承和 5(838)年
3 月(「続後紀」)の例が知られる。承和 5 年は最後の遺唐使が派遣され年であり、宗像神社の新
生の祭 2 人をはじめ 9 人を国分寺・神宮寺に安置供養して使者の無事を祈願したとある。遺唐使
と宗像神社の関係が知られる貴重な史料ではあるが、宗像神に対する祭祀でないことに注意しな
ければならない。
82) この時期の大宰府や宗像神社などの動向については、正木秀三郎「大宰府の変質と宗像氏」(九州
大学国史学研究室編『古代中世史論集』、吉川弘文館、1990 年)、のち同著で「古代——中世——宗像
の歴史と伝承」に再録(および『宗像市史』(通史編第 2 巻)第 5 章第 1 篇)を参照された。なお、九
州については律令制下で大宰府に主神が配され、筑前国司は原則的に置かれずその行政が大宰
府で担われるなど特殊な要因がある。このことと天武—高市皇子以降の舒磨系王統や長屋王後裔
高階真人や藤原氏との関係など、なお考究しなければならない課題は多い。
83) 出雲国造の朝廷出仕による就任儀礼は『延喜式』（臨時祭式・大政官式・中務省式・式部省式など）や『続紀』などによれば、およそ次のようである。「出雲国造は国司が詮擬言上し、太政官において任命し、位階四階を進め、神祇官で負幸物を賜与する。帰国した国造は一年間の潔齋をする。齋を終えると再び国司に率いられて朝廷に上り、大極殿南庭で神寿詞を奏上、神宝を献上する。国造は位階四階を進められ、賜物を給される。帰国して更に一年の潔齋を行い（後齋）、再度朝廷に行き、同様の儀礼を執行する」。これらについては、新古典文学本『続日本紀』、岩波書店の補注7ー8を、また千家尊統『出雲大社 日本の神社』、学生社、1968年や上田正昭編『古代を考える 出雲』（吉川弘文館、1993年）などを参照されたい。

84) 火継式については、註83の千家尊統『出雲大社』および水野祐「出雲の国造」上田編『古代を考える 出雲』参照した。千家氏は「火の継承が人々の耳目をひいて（略）火継式と火に重点が置かれるようになった」が、火とは霊であり、「じつは霊継式というにほかならない」といわれる。なお、この神事について近世に比重があるが、神道学的な考察をしたものに平井直房『出雲国造火継ぎ神事の研究』（大明堂、1989年）などがある。

85) 『類聚国史』（巻19・国造）は延暦17年10月丁亥（12日）とする。なお、『類史』のこの条は、『類聚三代格』の延暦17年3月29日官符と本官符を合わせて一条に纏めている。

86) 宗像神・宗像氏・沖ノ島等について筆者は下記の小文をこれまでに書く機会があった。合わせて参照いただければ幸いである。
宗像市史編集委員会編『宗像市史』史料編第1巻（1995年、宗像市）、同『宗像市史』通史編第2巻（1999年、宗像市、古代第1章）、津屋崎町史編集委員会編『津屋崎町史』資料編上巻（1996年、津屋崎町）、同『津屋崎町史』通史編（1999年、津屋崎町、第4編古代・第1章〜第3章第1・2節）、「沖ノ島と宗像神・宗像神主—宗像覚書ー」（『福岡教育大学紀要』第59号第2分冊、2010年)