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The locations in Kyoto where the founding members of the Ashikaga shogunate lived, worked, and engaged in public religious activities are largely unknown. This study seeks to rectify this problem by introducing the significance of the Sanjō bōmon palace and the Zen temple of Tōjiji to initial Ashikaga power in medieval Kyoto. The Sanjō bōmon palace was Ashikaga Tadayoshi’s (1306–52) first residence in medieval Kyoto. It was there where the shogunal deputy established and administered the earliest bureaucratic organs of the Ashikaga military regime. Adjacent to this structure was Tōjiji, a Zen temple that Tadayoshi made into a public venue of Ashikaga memorial rituals. This study finds that these two sites comprised an integrated architectural complex that provided Tadayoshi the physical infrastructure to exercise sweeping and largely autonomous political, religious, and familial authority. So central was this “temple-palace complex” to institutionalized warrior power that, by the 1350s, it had become the nucleus of the capital’s most substantial warrior enclave. An examination of the site’s origins, physical traits, and functions sheds light on the foundational role Tadayoshi played in both the establishment of shogunal institutions and the creation of religious traditions critical to the Ashikaga family’s long term success. The campaign to oust Tadayoshi that was launched in 1350 by Ashikaga Takauji (1305–58), who was both shogun and elder brother, was as much about asserting political dominance as gaining control over the Sanjō bōmon complex, the first base of Ashikaga political and familial authority in Kyoto.
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Introduction

The Muromachi 室町 palace looms large in the narrative of Ashikaga 足利 shogunal history. Its imperial style architecture, exquisite gardens, and prime location in Kyoto’s elite
district are habitually cited by scholars and others as tangible emblems of the warrior regime’s
gentrification, cultural achievements, and attainment of unrivaled political authority. So central
is this one palace-headquarters to Ashikaga history that its name has become synonymous
with the entire era of Ashikaga rule (1336–1573). There is, however, a fundamental problem
with the very notion of a “Muromachi period,” one that distorts an accurate account of
Ashikaga history. The Muromachi palace was not built until 1379, forty three years after
the establishment of the Ashikaga regime in 1336. The first four decades of “Muromachi”
history, therefore, had nothing to do with that palace or the location from which it took its
name. So where was the Ashikaga regime based prior to this? In fact, we know very little
about the earliest sites of Ashikaga authority in Kyoto and, as a result, overlook much about
the shogunate’s foundational history. This article addresses this problem by introducing the
historical significance of the palace-headquarters of Sanjō bōmon 三条坊門 and the Zen
temple of Tōjiji 等持寺. Located in the medieval capital’s southern district of Shimogyō 下
京, these two sites, it will be argued, comprised a single, integrated architectural complex that
functioned both as the first headquarters of shogunal administration and the earliest base of
public Ashikaga religious rituals in the capital. The complex also constituted the nucleus of a
substantial warrior residential enclave.

This study seeks to add texture to the historical narrative of the contentious relationship
between the first Ashikaga shogun, Takauji 尊氏 (1305–58), and his younger brother, Tadayoshi
尊義 (1306–52). Prior research has examined the political context to reveal that Takauji, despite
being shogun, played only a marginal role in the establishment of key shogunal administrative
institutions. It was, in fact, Tadayoshi who created and administered the bureaucratic bodies
that became critical to the warrior regime’s long term viability. It is likely that the shogun
initially delegated these duties to his brother, but friction arose when the latter began exercising
authority in ways inconsistent with Takauji’s views. Tadayoshi’s creation of a discrete and
autonomous power base in the capital provided him with the physical infrastructure to exercise
not just political but religious and symbolic influence as well. The Sanjō bōmon palace was
Tadayoshi’s first residence in Kyoto, and it was where he founded the most enduring organs
of Ashikaga statecraft. Standing adjacent to this structure was the temple of Tōjiji, which
Tadayoshi transformed into the Ashikaga family’s formal mortuary temple (bodaiji 菩提寺).
The memorial rituals first held there functioned to endow the Ashikaga family in general, and
Tadayoshi in particular, with credentials of moral legitimacy critical to the shogunate’s long
term success. This temple-palace complex eventually became so central to warrior authority in
medieval Kyoto that, by the 1350s, it had become the nucleus of a residential area populated
by the regime’s top officers as well as lower ranking soldiers. In sum, Tadayoshi had established
for himself at Sanjō bōmon a base of power that was elemental to institutionalized warrior
authority and completely autonomous from Takauji’s involvement. An examination of this site’s
origins, material traits, and functions reveals much about the nature of Tadayoshi’s remarkable
importance, and sheds light on the reasons why Takauji eventually sought to supplant him,
both politically and physically.

This essay is not a fundamental reassessment of political and religious authority during
the mid fourteenth century, although it explores both topics in some detail. Here, the objective
is more modest and the findings more narrow. I hope merely to bring into focus, for the first
time, the historical relevance of the Sanjō bōmon complex and, more broadly, demonstrate how
attention to a site such as this, its location, material appearance, and functions, can reveal much
The Ashikaga brothers first came to Kyoto in the 5th month of 1333 at the head of an army fighting in the name of emperor Go Daigo 后醍醐 (1288–1339) who sought to topple the Kamakura 鎌倉 shogunate and establish a revitalized imperial order. Allied forces attacked, then occupied, the Kamakura outpost at Rokuhara 六波羅 which, from its location just beyond the capital’s southeastern boundary, had functioned as a shogunal satellite office for over a century. Takauji subsequently established a base of operations near Rokuhara at the temple of Jōzaikōin 常在光院. While his presence there was only sporadic, documents suggest that the temple was Takauji’s single most consistent place of residence in the capital area throughout the decade following 1333. Takauji’s patronage necessitated Jōzaikōin’s conversion from Tendai 天
Tai to Zen, a development perhaps related more to Takauji’s desire to trumpet his ties to Musō Soseki 夢窓疎石 (1275–1351), a respected Zen monk, than any personal sense of sectarian fidelity.*

Takauji’s early relationship with Musō went on display at yet another location near Kyoto, one of far greater long term significance to Ashikaga shogunal history: the temple of Tōjiin 等持院 which, as we shall see, was discrete from, yet closely related to, Tōjijii. With Musō’s blessing and direction, Takauji established Tōjiin in the lush hills of Kinugasa 衣笠 northwest of the city in about 1334. Nearby, Takauji’s trusted retainer, Kō no Moronao 高師直 (d. 1351), founded the temple of Shinnyoji 真如寺 at which Musō’s lineage “brother,” Mugaku Sogen 無学祖元 (1226–86), assumed the post of abbot. During the several years immediately prior to the Ashikaga shogunate’s establishment, these two temples constituted something of a warrior-sponsored religious enclave located just northwest of the capital.

The fact that both of Takauji’s early bases of operation in Kyoto, Rokuhara and Kinugasa, were located outside the city proper is of particular significance. Until this time, warrior residences and sectarian temples were, in principle, excluded from the capital’s formal area—frequently called rakuchū 洛中—due to resilient classical era principles regarding the city’s status as the exclusive realm of public, imperial authority. Takahashi Shin’ichirō 高橋慎一郎 argues that the reason why the Rokuhara headquarters was built outside rakuchū in the first place was due precisely to these principles, which generally excluded warrior affiliated architecture from what was referred to at the time as “imperial land” (kōke no chi 公家の地). Emperor Go Daigo’s “revolution,” however, changed everything. His policy of direct imperial rule mandated that all formal rewards and recognitions were, in principle, to come directly from him alone. Warriors who sought compensation for services rendered in the war against Kamakura, or those who wished simply to have their land holdings confirmed by the new order, were compelled to make the journey to Kyoto personally. Provincial warriors flooded the city, causing a myriad of problems for local residents. The following account from Taiheiki 太平記 captures the scene with particular poignancy:

Once the eastern and western provinces were calm, the [warrior] houses of Shōni 小弐, Ōtomo 大友, Kikuchi 菊池, and Matsura 松浦 came to the capital aboard more than seven hundred large boats. Nitta Samanosuke 新田左馬助 and his younger brother, Hyōgonosuke 兵庫助, arrived [leading] more than seven thousand mounted cavalry. From all the other provinces too, it was as if not one had been left behind. Kyoto and Shirakawa 白河 had become utterly inundated by warriors.†

Most of the newcomers found accommodations in the district of Shimogyō 三総門 through a sanctioned quartering system called shitaku tenjō 私宅点定, which permitted them to commandeer temples and the homes of commoners on a temporary basis. Despite codes meant to ensure the right of return for those displaced, the practice resulted in the sudden and forced eviction of thousands of people indefinitely.‡ More important, the long standing proscription on warrior residence within rakuchū had been broken decisively and permanently.

Go Daigo himself encouraged his top generals to build residences within the city and granted them large plots of land in the vicinity of the imperial palace specifically for that purpose. Kusunoki Masashige 楠木正成 (1294–1336) and Nawa Nagatoshi 名和長年 (d. 1336) were among the beneficiaries, and it is reasonable to assume Takaui and Tadayoshi were as well.§ Nowhere, however, do we find evidence that either of the Ashikaga brothers built or
acquired residences within the city prior to 1336, the year the shogunate was established. In fact, both were only reluctant residents in the capital region throughout the three years of Go Daigo’s failed experiment with direct imperial rule. In the 6th month of 1333, immediately following the emperor’s initial reentry into Kyoto, Tadayoshi was dispatched to Kamakura to suppress an insurgency there. Takuji’s precise whereabouts during much of this period are difficult to pin down, but we know that by the 8th month of 1335 he had set up a headquarters for himself at Kamakura where he began posturing as a fully legitimate military governor. Both feared and vilified by Go Daigo, Takuji appears to have had no real intention of ever returning to Kyoto. It was the eventual collapse of Go Daigo’s regime and the commencement of hostilities between his supporters and those of a rival branch of the imperial family that precipitated Takuji’s assault on Kyoto in 1336, and set the stage for the subsequent establishment there of the Ashikaga shogunate. Even then, however, the preamble of the Kenmu shikimoku, the regime’s founding legal document, betrays a sense of regret that the continued state of war prevented the establishment of a “proper” warrior administration in Kamakura:

Should the Bakufu remain in Kamakura or be moved to another place? [T]he present disturbances make a transfer difficult. Kamakura is the place where Yoritomo set up his military government… This was the most auspicious place for the military houses.

Takuji remained largely absent from Kyoto. In fact, rather remarkably, there is no evidence that he maintained a dedicated, function-specific domicile in the capital until 1344. Until then, when present in Kyoto at all, the shogun apparently preferred to stay at the residences of retainers or at local temples. As we have seen, he frequented Jōzaikōin and Tōjiin in particular. Takuji’s eventual decision to establish a permanent domicile in the city was probably related to the struggle between himself and Tadayoshi, which was beginning to intensify at the time. His move can be read as the first part of a campaign to undermine, infiltrate, then finally usurp, the physical base of shogunal administration located at Sanjō bōmon.

The Sanjō bōmon Palace

The Sanjō bōmon palace first appears in documents dated to the weeks immediately following the Ashikaga capture of Kyoto. Baishō ron informs us that it was there where Tadayoshi established his formal residence, a “seat” (goza/gyoza), in the 6th month of 1336. Thereafter, the structure appears with increasing frequency in a wide range of sources, where it is consistently described as the regular venue for meetings of the shogunate’s most important governing organs, including the Council of State (hyōjōshū) and the Judicial Board (hikitsukekata). It is difficult to assess the efficacy of these early shogunal institutions, though they themselves claimed prerogative for the “governance of the realm” (tenka seidō). Nonetheless, we know from numerous studies on the ensuing period that these bureaucratic organs deserve a great deal of credit for the Ashikaga shogunate’s long term viability.

The name used to refer to Tadayoshi’s residence, like so many in Kyoto at the time, derived from its location: in this case, on Sanjō bōmon avenue in the southern district of Shimogyō. It is generally assumed that the palace was located south of Sanjō bōmon, but the sources used to confirm this are vague and generally unreliable. The two most frequently cited texts indicate two intersections: Sanjō bōmon—Made no kōji and Sanjō bōmon—Takakura.
There was a convention in premodern records whereby urban locations were identified by their nearest intersection. An intersection, therefore, constituted a sort of “locational coordinate.” Needless to say, this method was imprecise because the indication of a single intersection could point to any one of four surrounding city blocks. Nevertheless, when information from several sources about the surrounding area is integrated effectively, it is often possible to determine a precise location. Whereas the two coordinates given for Sanjō bōmon establish that the palace stood between Takakura and Made no kōji, it is impossible to determine whether it was located north or south of Sanjō bōmon avenue. As we shall see, this apparently minor detail has a dramatic impact on the interpretation of the structure’s physical composition and function.

The main reason it is generally assumed the palace stood south of Sanjō bōmon is that documents confirm the Ashikaga mortuary temple of Tōjiji occupied the block to the north. The assumption has been that the temple covered an entire city block and, therefore, would have excluded all other architecture. More important, all earlier studies have assumed that the palace and the temple were separate and discrete entities. In fact, they were not. The precise location of the Sanjō bōmon palace and its integration with the temple of Tōjiji are of critical significance to an appreciation of the political, religious, and familial dynamics of early Ashikaga rule. To demonstrate how this was so, it is first necessary to explore the origins of Tōjiji.

**Tōjiji’s Origins**

Two historiographical factors have consistently obfuscated Tōjiji’s early history. First, the
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temple is often confused with Tōjiin, which not only resembles the former in name, it too functioned, albeit alternately, as an Ashikaga mortuary temple. Second, investigations into Tōjiin’s origins have invariably relied on accounts in Taiheiki, which refer to its creation by Takauji through the conversion of his Kyoto residence in 1344. Taiheiki, however, cannot be substantiated by any other contemporaneous sources and, as stated, there is no evidence the shogun maintained a residence in Kyoto prior to 1344, let alone one in the vicinity of Tōjiin. Moreover, Tōjiin appears in documents well before 1344.

Tōjiin’s history is indeed tied intimately to that of both Tōjiin and Takauji’s residence, but not in the ways earlier research has concluded. A twisted matrix of shifting identities, compounded by the vicissitudes of the early intra-Ashikaga struggle, have made it exceedingly difficult to sort through the complicated relationships between these sites and the several concerned parties. The difficulties notwithstanding, elucidating Tōjiin’s foundational history clarifies a broad range of issues about the interconnectedness of political authority, religious practice, and Ashikaga legitimacy. How then might the record be set straight?

As discussed, Tōjiin was founded by Takauji and Musō Soseki in the Kinugasa hills northwest of the city in about 1334. After making only a few, unremarkable appearances in textual sources, it disappears entirely from documents following the Ashikaga capture of Kyoto in the summer of 1336. When “Tōjiin” reappears in 1339, it is no longer located in the bucolic hills outside the city, but rather right in the heart of the capital’s crowded commoner district of Shimogyō, directly adjacent to Tadayoshi’s Sanjō bōmon palace. The earliest known textual source that refers to this “new” Tōjiin is a document dated to mid 1339, sent from Tadayoshi to Kosen Ingen, a prominent Zen teacher. It records Tadayoshi’s granting of manorial lands in the province of Tanba 丹波 to fund the commissioning of a honzon 本尊, a principle devotional icon:

> Regarding the estate stewardship (jitōshiki 地頭職) of Kokubunji 国分寺 temple in Tanba province:

> It is hereby decreed that [income from] the said stewardship is to be used to fund the production of a principal devotional icon (honzon), which should be carved by the sculptor Hōin Inkichi 法印院吉.

> [Seal (kaō 花押) of Ashikaga Tadayoshi] Lord General of the Left.26

This decree substantiates Tadayoshi’s role as the founding patron (kaiki 開基) of the relocated temple, and further suggests that it was he who appointed Kosen Ingen founding abbot (kaizan 開山). He is also to be credited with transforming the temple into the preeminent venue of Ashikaga memorial rituals, a role that, as we shall see, endowed Tadayoshi with substantial political capital. But for all these changes, it is critical to note that Tōjiin’s transfer from Kinugasa to Shimogyō in 1339 did not entail a physical transplantation. Rather, it appears that buildings already standing in Shimogyō, those formerly associated with the Pure Land (Jōdo 浄土) temple of Jōkain 法華院, were confiscated and converted (see Figure 3). All that was actually transferred, therefore, was the temple’s name. Meanwhile, the structures that remained at Kinugasa disappeared from texts, suggesting they went out of use until at least 1342. In that year, the Gozan 五山 network of Zen temples underwent a reorganization such that the “latter” Tōjiin in Shimogyō earned a place within the network’s official hierarchy. With this, its name was changed from Tōjiin to Tōjiin. Later that same year, the original Tōjiin of Kinugasa reappears in documents, cited as the venue of competing memorial rituals sponsored
by Takauji. Therefore, in 1342, for the first time, Tōjiin and Tōjiji became two discrete temples, both serving as competing venues of Ashikaga memorial rituals. To avoid confusion, in this article, the temple at Kinugasa will hereafter be referred to as Tōjiin, and the temple in Shimogyō will be called Tōjiji.

The confusion over names has contributed to the mistaken conclusion that Tōjiji, like Tōjiin, was established by Takauji in 1344 through the conversion of a residence he purportedly maintained at Nijō—Takakura.29 The research of Kawakami Mitsugu established the standard thesis on the topic, and it informs the general impression that Takauji was Tōjiji’s founding patron and the subsequent sponsor of the important familial rituals held there. The original assumption that Takauji maintained a residence at the temple site before 1344, however, is incorrect. Only two textual sources refer to a shogunal palace standing there before 1353, and both are unreliable. The first, Taiheiki, is generally more literary than historical, and cannot be trusted on its own. Nagaoki sukune ki echoes Taiheiki, but because it was written more than a century after the supposed residence existed, its validity is likewise questionable.30 Moreover, as mentioned above, there is no evidence that Takauji maintained a stable domicile in Kyoto until 1344, and the one he built that year was located in a part of the city well removed from Tōjiji.

Tōjiji’s early history can be correctly understood only through an appreciation of that temple’s physical integration to the residence of Tadayoshi, the Sanjō bōmon palace. Only then does the picture crystallize to reveal a single, integrated complex of early Ashikaga political and religious activity in medieval Kyoto: a center of government, familial ritual, and warrior residence.

**A Temple–Palace Complex**

Several sources confirm that Tōjiji stood north of Sanjō bōmon avenue, between Takakura and Made no kōji (Figure 2).31 The location of the Sanjō bōmon palace, however, is less clear. We know only that it too bordered on Sanjō bōmon avenue (hence its name) and likewise stood between Takakura and Made no kōji. All previous commentators have assumed that, because Tōjiji occupied the block to the north, the palace must have been located to the south. Nakai

---

**Table 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1334-1339</th>
<th>1339-1342</th>
<th>1343-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinugasa Site</td>
<td>Kinugasa Site</td>
<td>Kinugasa Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW of City</td>
<td>NW of City</td>
<td>NW of City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tōjiin</td>
<td>Tōjiin</td>
<td>Tōjiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3:** Graphical genealogy of Tōjiin and Tōjiji’s history. Tōjiji remained functional in Shimogyō until the late 16th century, after which it ceases to appear in textual and pictorial sources. Tōjiin remains functional today.
Shinkō has shown, however, that the original temple of Jōkain, Tōjiji’s physical antecedent, occupied only a small plot of land northeast of the Sanjō bōmon—Takakura intersection.32 City blocks in Kyoto at this time were of considerable size, about 14,400 square meters or 3.6 acres. There would have been ample space to build a residential complex on the same block and, as we shall see, this appears to be precisely what Tadayoshi did. There is a convincing body of textual and pictorial evidence suggesting that the palace and the temple not only shared the same block, but that they were, in fact, integrated entities. They were a single temple-palace complex.

The following is an entry from the journal of nobleman Nakahara Moromori 中原師守 that refers to the holding of a “Hakkō” memorial ritual at Tōjiji in the 9th month of 1339. Hakkō is an abbreviation for Hokke Hakkō 法華八講, an esoteric memorial ritual that became popular among elite families during the Heian 平安 era (794–1180s). The name can be translated as “the eight lectures of the Lotus Sutra.”33 Here, the ritual was held to mark the seventh anniversary of the death of Ashikaga Sadauji 足利貞氏, the former Ashikaga patriarch and father of both Takauji and Tadayoshi. It was the first of many high profile, public memorial rituals to be held at Tōjiji:

I hear that a Hakkō ceremony will begin today at the Sanjō bōmon palace of the lord general [Ashikaga Tadayoshi]. It is a Buddhist service for his father. I understand that it will be held at Tōjiji and will continue for five days.34

Notice the ambiguity regarding the venue of the Hakkō ritual. The author makes no distinction between the Sanjō bōmon palace and Tōjiji (appearing here, as in all documents until 1342, as “Tōjiin”). Many other sources exhibit the same ambiguity. Consider, for example, the following five, of which the final two are perhaps the most illustrative:

1. Having been summoned, I went to the Sanjō bōmon palace and received an audience (taimen 対面) [with Tadayoshi] at Tōjiji.35
2. Having been summoned, I went to the Sanjō bōmon palace. I took a meal at Tōjiji before proceeding out through the temple gate.36
3. A ceremony to install a Rāgarāja image took place at the Sanjō bōmon palace... The master of the house attended [the ceremony] at Tōjiji.37
4. Ashikaga Sadauji has been [posthumously] granted the imperial rank of Junior Third Grade (jūsanmi 従三位). An imperial messenger brought the official edict to the [Ashikaga] familial headquarters (honjo 本所) of Tōjiji temple, located at the Sanjō bōmon palace. The imperial messenger placed the edict on the altar before the devotional icon, then took his leave.38
5. Today, a mandala memorial ritual was held at the Sanjō bōmon palace’s Tōjiji temple (Sanjō bōmon dai no Tōjiin 三条坊門第ノ等持院).39

These several texts are suggestive, but it is a pictorial source from the period that confirms decisively that Tōjiji and the Sanjō bōmon palace were indeed a single, integrated architectural complex.

Tōjiji ezu 等持寺絵図 is a plan-elevation hybrid depicting Tōjiji temple and its immediate surroundings, produced in about 1352.40 This illustration constitutes the single best extant source of information on the appearance of early Tōjiji. From it, we are able to determine the temple’s location, size, orientation, architectural styles, and layout. The property, as depicted,
covered an area equal to two city blocks (about 14.2 acres) and was surrounded by a high, packed-earth wall, punctuated by three minor gates and a primary gate that opened to the east. According to the illustration, Tōjijō was about twice the size of the imperial palace, inordinately large for an urban temple of this period.41

A critical detail of the illustration is the depiction of interior walls that partition the property into three discrete subsections, each with a distinct material character.42 Figure 5 indicates these three sections with the letters A, B, and C. Area “A” in the northeast included the abbot’s hall (hōjō 方丈), the Kannon hall (Kannon dono 観音殿), and one other unmarked structure. The two primary structures face east and overlook a landscaped garden. Judging from the architecture, layout, and composition, this area was probably the private, residential realm of Tōjijō’s abbot.

Area “B,” much larger than the first, traversed the property diagonally from northwest to southeast and included a storehouse (kozō 庫藏), toilet house (tōsu 東司), kitchen office

Figure 4: Tōjijō ezu (detail). (Property of Tōjiin temple, Kyoto. Reproduced with the generous permission of Tōjiin. Image is from Museum of Kyoto, ed., Kyōto, gekidō no chūsei, pp. 30–31.)
(kuin 庫院), monks' hall (sōdō 僧堂), and Buddha hall (Butsuden 仏殿). This central part of the complex, consisting of the temple's primary monastic structures, was probably Tōjiji's main venue of religious practice.

Finally, there is area “C” which, in terms of layout and architectural style is strikingly distinct from the other two. All the structures depicted in both areas “A” and “B” (except for the Kannon hall, which was probably a remnant of the site’s earlier incarnation as Jōkain) would have been typical fixtures of a Zen temple from the period. The structures in area “C,” however, fit no monastic model. They constitute an anomaly; their respective functions, a mystery. What appears to be the primary structure is labeled “minor palace” (kogosho 小御所), but such an appellation only obfuscates interpretation because a palace, minor or otherwise, would have had no place on the grounds of a Zen temple from this period. A possible explanation is that area “C” was not an integral part of Tōjiji at all. I would suggest that it was the Sanjō bōmon palace.

Area “C” exhibits the hallmark traits indicative of an elite residence from this period. The “minor palace,” for example, is five bays (ken 間) wide and three bays deep, punctuated by a series of top mounted swinging lattice shutters (shitomido 部戸 or hajitomi 半蔀). The hipped
gable roof (irimoya hafu 入母屋破風) is thatched in cypress bark and topped with a heavy tile ridge. Each of these characteristics are key features of a shinden 寝殿, the central structure of a residence from this period, built in the elite shinden zukuri 寝殿造 style. A corridor extending to the south of the presumed shinden leads to a fishing pavilion (tsuridono 釣殿). The attached building to the west corresponds to a tainoya 対屋, an architectural element common to elite residences, generally used for the holding of audiences, entertaining guests, or simply as a place to conduct household affairs. The greater of the two anterior structures possesses both lateral and horizontal shitomi shutters (as is true of the tainoya). It has a cusped gable roof line (kara hafu 唐破風) and exhibits a broad hurdle veranda (sunokoen 篁子園), which opens onto what appears to be a carriage dock (kurumadome 車止). According to the architectural protocol of shinden zukuri, this anterior structure was equivalent to a kugyōza 公卿座, a venue of official household business (where, for example, meetings of a mandokoro 政所 or administrative corps might take place). The structures in area “C” were unmistakably both residential and administrative in function, a description that fits the Sanjō bōmon palace precisely.

The gate pictured along the southern wall, opposite the minor palace, is a critical element of the illustration that, while at first problematic, substantially strengthens the current argument. By convention, elite residences in premodern Kyoto almost never possessed gates that opened to the south. Such an architectural device was reserved for temples and the imperial palace alone. Because we can be certain area “C” was not the imperial palace, the inclusion of a gate leads to the conclusion that the area must have been an integral part, albeit an odd one, of the temple. In fact, however, a passing comment in the journal of nobleman Tōin Kinkata 洞院公賢 (1291–1360) from 1344 shows that Tadayoshi might have disregarded accepted norms and built a south facing gate at his Sanjō bōmon palace. Kinkata received a messenger from Tadayoshi inquiring about architectural precedent in the wake of a fire that destroyed his palace in the 12th month of 1344. He recounted the conversation in his journal:

Tadayoshi’s messenger asked me about building a gate that faces south. I answered that it is unheard of for any [elite] structures besides the imperial palace to have a southern gate but that there is not actually a rule prohibiting it. Illustrated several years after this journal entry, Tōjiji ezu depicts precisely the kind of gate about which Tadayoshi inquired: south facing and at a residential compound. If Kinkata’s assertion is accurate and such a combination was, in fact, “unheard of,” these several sources, in concert with the texts introduced above, add weight to the argument that the southwestern section of the complex depicted in Tōjiji ezu (area “C”) was, most likely, the Sanjō bōmon palace. The historical record’s silence on certain issues is just as revealing about the integration of the Sanjō bōmon palace and Tōjiji temple. Take, for example, the common convention of diarists from this period to record in detail the movements of prominent members of society. The visit of a retired emperor to a temple or the shogun’s processions to the home of a court official, for example, were spectacles of profound public interest, subjects of scrutiny in the detailed journals of the Kyoto elite. As a leader of the shogunate, Tadayoshi was among those who appear frequently in such accounts. Interestingly, however, nowhere in extant sources can we find mention of his visiting Tōjiji. We know he used the temple frequently to host both public and private events. Never, however, does a single one of the several noble and priestly diarists who copiously catalogued Tadayoshi’s every move indicate a “visit” to Tōjiji (sankei 参
The Sanjō bōmon Temple-Palace Complex

The evidence, once synthesized, supports the argument that the Sanjō bōmon palace and Tōjiji temple together constituted an integrated physical complex located north of Sanjō bōmon avenue, roughly between (but also overlapping) Takakura and Made no kōji. Moreover, as the operating center of the shogunate’s Council of State and Judicial Board, and the primary venue of Ashikaga memorial rituals, this temple-palace complex was the earliest base of Ashikaga administrative and ritual authority in Kyoto. Only in light of these findings are we able to formulate a narrative capable of correctly explaining the complex relationships between Tōjiin, Tōjiji, and the Sanjō bōmon palace, and in so doing, progress toward a better understanding of the material context of the early Ashikaga presence in medieval Kyoto.

The revised narrative reads as follows: Tōjiin, the earliest of the three sites, was founded by Takauji outside Kyoto shortly after Go Daigo’s imperial restoration in 1333. The future shogun probably harbored no grand plans for the temple because he was not, at this point, intent upon making the capital home. Circumstances changed in 1336, however. Following the collapse of Go Daigo’s regime that year and the subsequent establishment of the Ashikaga shogunate, Kyoto became the base of Ashikaga military, political, and familial operations. Due to his engagement in continued provincial warfare, however, Takauji remained largely absent from the city. His brother Tadayoshi, meanwhile, established a residence and de facto shogunal headquarters at Sanjō bōmon, then, a few years later, began holding high profile, public memorial rituals at the attached temple of Tōjiji. The physical integration of these two entities, the palace and the temple, deserves explanation. Tōjiji was, as we have seen, founded in Shimogyō through the conversion of preexisting structures belonging to the temple of Jōkain. It is possible that one or more of the Jōkain buildings served as Tadayoshi’s earliest Kyoto residence, and that what appears in documents during the period 1336–1339 as the Sanjō bōmon palace was, in fact, a converted portion of that temple. For Tadayoshi to find his earliest accommodations at a local religious institution would have been consistent with the actions of many other warriors, including Takauji himself who, when in Kyoto, stayed most frequently at Jōzaikōin and Tōji. Having converted at least part of Jōkain into a residence, Tadayoshi probably expanded the complex to accommodate both a lifestyle befitting his status, as well as the offices of the new shogunate’s bureaucracy. Then, when the important seventh anniversary of the death of Sadauji arose in 1339, it became incumbent upon the Ashikaga, as a family belonging to the ruling elite, to build or designate a family mortuary temple in the area. In this endeavor, Tadayoshi clearly took the initiative. Rather than building from scratch, however, it appears he simply rededicated some or all of the structures of Jōkain, assigning to them the name of the first Ashikaga sponsored temple in the capital region: Tōjiin. Such a conversion, albeit dramatic, did not precipitate Tadayoshi’s removal from the site. All evidence suggests, in fact, that he transformed the two block area into an integrated, multi-functional complex that accommodated both the temple and his residence, as well as the functioning headquarters of the Ashikaga shogunate.

Tōjiji’s Function and Tadayoshi’s Status

The Hokke Hakkō sponsored by Tadayoshi in 1339 was the first of a diverse repertoire of memorial rituals held at Tōjiji. This diversity has received the attention of several scholars.

Harada Masatoshi argues that the esoteric and exoteric services sponsored by the Ashikaga functioned as a means for that historically provincial family to elevate its standing vis-à-vis members of the court aristocracy, among whom such rituals were orthodox. In doing so, he claims, they became participants in “rituals of state” (kokkateki girei 国家的儀礼), a mode of elite pageantry synonymous with traditional authority. Among the memorial rituals (tsuizen butsuji 追善仏事) sponsored by Tadayoshi at Tōjiji, the Hokke Hakkō appears to have been the most common. An examination of its public function and implications suggests that Tadayoshi was casting himself as familial head and, by default, defining his temple-palace as the formal headquarters (honjo) of the Ashikaga family.

On the relationship between elite family status and public rituals, the research of Satō Kenji is instructive. Satō has demonstrated that there were two distinct yet interrelated types of memorial rituals conducted by the Hino 日野 and Kajūji 勧修寺 houses of high nobility: those held during the week immediately preceding the anniversary of an ancestor’s death, and those held on the anniversary itself. The former usually consisted of public Hokke Hakkō rituals performed in turns over the course of five days by priests from several temples. The capital’s most prominent families were invited to attend what might better be characterized as animated social events than solemn religious observances. Customarily hosted by family heads (katoku 家督) and held at familial headquarters, the primary function of these rituals, according to Satō, was to create a context in which a host could put on public display the sustained viability of his household. Displays of this sort were of particular importance following the death of a patriarch. In such cases, they signaled the successful passing of familial authority to a new head, the ritual’s host, and the establishment of a new or renewed familial headquarters, a physical monument to contiguous legitimacy. In contrast, those memorial rituals held on specific death anniversaries were far more intimate affairs. Open only to the deceased’s most immediate family members, these tended to be held at private mortuary temples in a mode consistent with the sponsoring house’s deepest spiritual convictions. Satō states that this kind of two-tiered memorial repertoire was not limited to the Hino and Kajūji houses. In fact, it was practiced widely among elite Kyoto families.

The memorial rituals held by Tadayoshi at Tōjiji bear a striking resemblance to the pattern described by Satō. Here too we find several cases of very public Hokke Hakkō services being held over the course of five days prior to the anniversary of a patriarch’s death. These were then followed by private, much more exclusive, Zen services on the death anniversaries themselves. This pattern matured and crystallized during successive shogunal reigns to the point where memorial rituals held at Tōjiji eventually came to mimic exactly the aristocratic model described by Satō.

As Harada points out, the Ashikaga probably embraced the pageantry and symbolism of esoteric rituals as a way of mimicking elite capital norms and to assert moral legitimacy amidst the aristocracy they sought to infiltrate. Tadayoshi’s energetic adoption of the Hokke Hakkō should be interpreted within this context. Satō’s thesis about the close relationship between public rituals and lineage sustainability suggests that members of the Kyoto elite who attended were tacitly recognizing the Sanjō bōmon complex as the Ashikaga familial headquarters and, quite possibly, Tadayoshi as the acting family head. An imperial record from 1343 implies precisely this by referring to the Sanjō bōmon complex as the Ashikaga honjo:

Ashikaga Sadauji has been [posthumously] granted the imperial rank of Junior Third Grade. An imperial messenger brought the official edict to the familial headquarters of
Tōjiji temple, located at the Sanjō bōmon palace. The imperial messenger placed the edict on the altar before the devotional icon, then took his leave.\textsuperscript{51}

While this document, like so many from the period, fails to make a clear distinction between the palace and the temple, it is unambiguous about the site’s status as the headquarters of the Ashikaga family. To be sure, an edict of this nature and importance could only properly be delivered to the familial headquarters of its recipient. Branch estates, the homes of collateral lineages, or retreat villas outside the city would not have been appropriate. What makes this point significant is that, at this stage, the Sanjō bōmon complex was the exclusive realm of Ashikaga Tadayoshi. Takauiji, who was both shogun and elder brother, played no significant role in this site’s founding or in its administrative and religious affairs. He did not live there nor did he even visit often. The picture that emerges is one of Tadayoshi having established an autonomous base of power, whose functions and institutions endowed him with publically recognized political, religious, and familial authority unrivalled in his house.

A Warrior Enclave in Shimogyō

So central was the Sanjō bōmon complex to early shogunal authority that by 1350 it had become the nucleus of a substantial warrior enclave. The research of Tasaka Yasuyuki 田坂泰之 has identified the homes of the Ashikaga shogunate’s most prominent officers (see Figure 6). His findings reveal that there was a clear tendency for top officials to live in relatively close proximity to Sanjō bōmon.\textsuperscript{52} Only two, in fact, occupied palaces in the vicinity of Takauiji’s residence in Kamigyō 上京, both of whom, not coincidentally, constituted the core of a faction that later joined the shogun to oppose Tadayoshi.\textsuperscript{53}

Tax records from the period suggest that the clustering of warrior residences around the Sanjō bōmon complex was probably not limited to members of the shogunal leadership. Figure 6, which is based on tax records, shows the locations of sake brewers, pawn shops, and oil retailers, as well as the neighborhoods that maintained floats for the annual Gion festival (Gion matsuri 祇園祭). These urban taxpayers are the mappable beacons of a dynamic commercial and commoner demographic that, by the fourteenth century, had come to distinguish Shimogyō from Kamigyō, its more aristocratic counterpart to the north. Examining the distribution of these elements reveals that commercial development was conspicuously absent in the immediate vicinity of the Sanjō bōmon complex.\textsuperscript{54} This geographical hole in the tax rolls can be read as the silhouette cast by a dense conglomerate of warrior residences around Tadayoshi’s power base; it was an enclave that displaced commercial development.

Evidence such as this that suggests rank and file warriors clustered around Sanjō bōmon challenges the standard interpretation of Tadayoshi’s standing within the warrior community. The standard historical narrative depicts Tadayoshi as an administrator par excellence, the one to credit for managing bureaucratic institutions and nurturing favorable relations with traditional bodies of capital authority such as the civil aristocracy and Buddhist establishment. Takauiji, in contrast, is seen as a warrior’s warrior, a boorish provincial whose martial aptitude and charisma made up for a general lack of refinement. These simplistic yet dominant caricatures imply that Tadayoshi held sway within the halls of elite capital power, while Takauiji commanded respect through his place at the head of a lethal shogunal army. While these impressions might not be incorrect on the whole, the findings presented here suggest that Tadayoshi too might have enjoyed a degree of influence and respect among the fighting masses, who either chose, or were compelled, to live in the immediate vicinity of his Sanjō bōmon complex.
Supplanting Tadayoshi

The Sanjō bōmon complex was so central to the shogunate’s institutional authority that, from about 1340, Takauji seems to have realized that his own physical and political dislocation from the site was a liability. He had become an outsider to the functioning administrative and religious core of a shogunate he ostensibly led, an untenable situation that he and his supporters tried desperately to change. The result was the unfolding of a dizzying drama of intramural struggle that, among other things, included a battle over control of the Sanjō bōmon complex.

An early bid by Takauji to undermine Tadayoshi manifested as an attempt to deemphasize
Tōjiji’s symbolic importance. In 1342, the shogun insisted that his mother be buried at the original temple of Tōjiin in Kinugasa, and that a grand memorial service be held there a year later. Clearly, the shogun was seeking to establish a ritual venue alternate to Tōjiji, within which he could serve as the primary sponsor of a public Ashikaga memorial service. Doing so, he must have hoped, would create the conditions by which he could carry out the ritual duties expected of a family head, just as Tadayoshi had been doing for the previous four years. Unfortunately for him, the Sanjō bōmon complex was simply too well established in the minds of contemporary observers for impressions to change quickly about the real base of Ashikaga power. Records dating to the time of the memorial service held in 1343 refer to Tōjiin as a branch temple (betsuin 別院) of Tōjiji, suggesting clearly its subordinate status.

The next year, in what is perhaps best interpreted as a move aimed at asserting his relevance in the capital, Takauji finally established a permanent domicile in the city. For the previous eight years, since the Ashikaga regime began functioning in 1336, he had remained an elusive figure in Kyoto, showing up for important events, staying occasionally at nearby temples, yet never lingering long enough to make a meaningful impression. At last, he sought to change that by taking the symbolic step of making a material commitment to the capital. But if we are to read meaning into location, it is notable that Takauji’s new palace was built in the elite district of Kamigyō. Most significant is not the fact that it was near to the imperial palace, but rather that it was so distantly removed from the established center of warrior administration, ritual, and residence in Shimogyō (Figure 1). Takauji was either unable or unwilling to go there, at least for a few more years.

In late 1349, an armed confrontation broke out between Takauji and Tadayoshi over which of their vassals would become the shogunate’s chief administrative officer (shitsuji 執事). This struggle, known as the Kannō disturbance (Kannō no jōran 観応の擾乱), was resolved only after Tadayoshi agreed to cede the Sanjō bōmon complex to Takuji’s son, Yoshiakira 義詮 (1330–67). Interestingly, exactly coincident with his assumption of residence at the Sanjō bōmon palace, Yoshiakira was granted the imperial post of Lord General of the Left (Sahyōe no kami 左兵衛督), precisely the post held by Tadayoshi theretofore. It seems there existed a dynamic relationship between residential location and court office, a phenomenon sorely in need of further investigation.

Despite Takauji having gained proxy control over Sanjō bōmon through his son’s occupancy, it appears he still felt the need to diminish the importance of Tōjiji and, by association, Tadayoshi’s ritual legacy. The following is a letter addressed from the shogun to Musō Soseki dated to 1351, just after the latter took on the abbotship of Tenryūji temple 天竜寺. The intent to shift the locus of Ashikaga religious ritual away from Tōjiji is obvious, as is the implicit dismissal of Tadayoshi’s ritual legacy:

It is my wish to revere your temple, now and into the future. Accordingly, it is my desire that my descendants and all people of my lineage, unto the last generation, become devotees. They are to be earnest about dedicating themselves to the flourishing of the temple and its holdings. Non-adherents will be disavowed forevermore. With fearful respect, I implore your acknowledgement of this wish.

Despite such strong words, Takuji’s efforts to undermine Tōjiji were again unsuccessful. Yoshiakira himself continued the tradition of holding public Hokke Hakkō memorial services there, thus maintaining the site’s status as the ritual center and headquarters of the Ashikaga family. Hokke Hakkō services had, by this time, become a staple of Ashikaga religious practice,
used to mark the anniversaries of deceased members of the family well into the reign of the tenth shogun, Yoshitane (1466–1523). In circumstances that are far from clear, Tadayoshi tried to retake the palace the following year but failed, and was forced instead to reside at a site to the northwest. Dwindling support finally precipitated his outright expulsion from Kyoto in early 1352. He was found dead two months later in Kamakura, probably poisoned by order of Takauji.

While Takauji and his army were away from the capital during the intercalary 2nd month of that year, forces loyal to exiled emperor Go Daigo captured the capital. During the initial battle, the attacking army torched the Sanjō bōmon complex, reducing it to ashes. Nobleman Tōin Kinkata recounted the grisly events of the day in his journal:

“The world has been in great chaos from very early this morning. Lord Yoshiakira has fled to the vicinity of Tōji—attackers all around. I hear it is the forces of general Kusunoki [of Go Daigo’s court]. At noon there was a fire. Lord Yoshiakira’s Sanjō bōmon fort (yakata 館) was lost. The palace was set ablaze by soldiers.”

Shogunal troops retook Kyoto the following month, after which Takauji moved immediately to occupy the former Sanjō bōmon site. Plans were quickly drawn up to rebuild Tōjiji and the several administrative structures. By the end of 1353, the shogun had built a new palace just southwest of the Nijō—Made no kōji 二条万里小路 intersection, adjacent to the new temple. In rebuilding Tōjiji, Takauji made good on a promise to Musō Soseki, who had died the previous year, to transform it into a branch temple (shin 子院) of Tenryūji. It was agreed that all future abbots of Tōjiji would hail from Musō’s Zen lineage.

With Tadayoshi removed from the political scene (and the world, for that matter), Takauji, perhaps for the first time, assumed direct control over the shogunate’s day to day operations. Rebuilding Tōjiji and taking over the administration of the institutions and rituals of the former Sanjō bōmon complex were elemental to this endeavor. His physical presence at the site enabled him to make regular use of the material apparatuses necessary to engage in the formalized rituals and administrative duties that had become the bedrock of Ashikaga institutional and familial authority. Finally, his presence at Sanjō bōmon put Takauji at the physical center of medieval Kyoto’s warrior population, a logistical detail whose importance should not be overlooked.

Takauji died in the spring of 1358 at the age of fifty three. With this, Yoshiakira suddenly and inexplicably moved away from Sanjō bōmon to a minor palace closer to the city’s geographic center. He was apparently in residence there when appointed shogun in the following 12th month. Eight months had gone by during which the post remained vacant, the interregnum being a stark indication of the shogunate’s continued weakness at this time. Yoshiakira never returned to the Sanjō bōmon palace. Instead, he built a new headquarters just southeast of the original complex into which he moved in the 2nd month of 1365 (Figure 7). Although distinct from the first, this complex too appears in documents as the “Sanjō bōmon dono.” Tōjiji remained at its original location, and documents such as the following which refers to it as a “palace,” confirm that it continued to function as an integral venue of shogunal affairs:

“Today I was required to go to the Tōjiji palace (Tōjiji gosho 等持寺御所). It is from there that orders are given.”

Yoshiakira died in the final month of 1367 having been shogun for nine years. He was succeeded thirteen months later by his ten year old son, Yoshimitsu (1358–1408). A year later, the new shogun moved into the Sanjō bōmon palace just in time to sponsor a Hakkō
The Sanjō bōmon Temple-Palace Complex

memorial service at Tōjī in honor of both Takauji and Yoshiakira. With this, Yoshimitsu took on the mantle of Ashikaga political and familial authority, and placed himself at the center of the regime. By this time, the structural and ritual formulae for Ashikaga legitimacy were set firmly. Yoshimitsu had inherited and perpetuated a repertoire of politico-religious actions and symbols first established by Tadayoshi at the Sanjō bōmon complex.

Conclusion

In the 3rd month of 1378, Yoshimitsu abandoned the Sanjō bōmon palace to take up residence in a newly built headquarters located in the heart of the capital’s elite district of Kamigyō. It was at this site where Yoshimitsu negotiated a reunification of rival imperial branches, consolidated shogunal authority, and generally ushered in the heyday of warrior power in Kyoto. Following Yoshimitsu’s suspicious death in 1408, his estranged son, the shogun Yoshimochi, choreographed a triumphant return to Sanjō bōmon—in what was a stark repudiation of his father’s legacy—followed by a dramatic and public demolition of Muromachi. The new palace in Shimogyō was to be used as the shogunal headquarters by successive shoguns until 1431, when Ashikaga Yoshinori (1394–1441) rebuilt the Muromachi palace and moved the shogunate back to Kamigyō. The twenty two years between 1409 and 1431 during which the Sanjō bōmon palace functioned without interruption as the
shogunal headquarters was the single longest period of locational stability in Ashikaga shogunal history. Such a circumstance highlights both the significance of the Shimogyo site, and the fallacy of “Muromachi” periodization.

A focus on Muromachi evokes images of Ashikaga power that are invariably positive. The palace’s appearance in texts and paintings such as Rakuchū rakugai zu 洛中洛外図 elicits images of wealth, stability, opulence, and warrior gentrification. It is important to remember, however, that just as only a small portion of the Ashikaga era had anything to do with “Muromachi,” so too did Ashikaga rule only occasionally exhibit such positive traits. In fact, as this study has sought to show, the regime was fraught with internal strife and factionalism from the very outset, a condition that did not necessarily improve over time. That said, to the extent that a semblance of order and unified leadership did exist during the early years, it was to be found at the Sanjō bōmon palace under the direction of Ashikaga Tadayoshi.
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NOTES

1 Built by Ashikaga Yoshimitsu, the Muromachi palace appears in documents variously as Muromachi dono 室町殿, Hana no gosho 花御所, and Muromachi dai 室町第.

2 Strictly speaking, a shogunate was not formally established until 1338 when Takauji (1358–1408) was granted the imperial post of shogun. In this essay, I have used 1336 to mark the shogunate’s advent because it was in that year, through the promulgation of the Kenmu shikimoku 建武式目 (Kenmu Formulary), that a discrete Ashikaga centered regime began functioning.

3 For work in Japanese and English respectively, see Satō, 1960 and 1977.

4 On Go Daigo and his “revolution,” see Goble, 1996.

5 The Rokuhara constable office (tandai 探題府) was established in 1221 to administer Kyoto and the western provinces. On the role and importance of Rokuhara, see part 1 of Takahashi, 1996.

6 Baishō ron, cited in Hosokawa, 1998, p. 40. Another favorite lodging place for Takauji in Kyoto was the temple of Tōji 東寺.

7 Precisely when Takauji used Jōzaikōin is not clear. However, Inryōken nichiroku 藍涼軒日録, Entairyaku 园太暦, and Monyōki 門葉記 make reference to his staying there in Genkō 3 (1333) and again in Kannō 2 (1351). All cited in Hosokawa, 1998, p. 58, n. 15. On Jōzaikōin’s earlier history, see Tamamura, 1971, vol. 5, p. 1240.

8 On Musō’s career and the respect he enjoyed among the capital elite, see Collcutt, 1997.


10 Takahashi, 1996, pp. 100–16. Warriors did reside within the city prior to the mid fourteenth century, but were not permitted to maintain formal domiciles there. On capital land zoning, see Yoshi, 1998, p. 211.

11 Taiteiki, book 12.

12 For documents on shitaku tenjō, see Rakuchū yadoriudo zaisho 文断簡. For comments on the severity of the policy and its impact on turning the population against Go Daigo’s regime, see Satō, 1960, pp. 150–51.


15 The Ashikaga capture of Kyoto in 1336.6 was accomplished after two previous attempts that year. For a detailed narrative see Hall, 1990, pp. 183–89. Go Daigo was forced into self-imposed exile in Yoshino 吉野.


17 Arimori kyō ki 在盛卿記, Eikyō 3 (1431). 11. 26 describes the construction of a “shogunal palace” (shōgun gosho 將軍御所) located in the northern district of Kamigyō 上京, created through the modification of the home of Takatsukasa Munemasa 鷹司宗稚, an exiled general of the Southern court. See Kugyō bunin 公卿補任, vol. 2, p. 623 for details on Munemasa. Two documents refer to events taking place at Takauji’s residence prior to 1344 but neither are specific about the location: children’s dance on 1340.6.18 (Moromori ki 師守記, vol. 1, p. 155) and the building of a reliquary (shari den 舍利殿) on 1341.6.15 (Buke nendai ki uragaki 武家年代記裏書, p. 377).

18 See Nochi kagami 後鑑, vol. 1, pp. 147–280 for a chronology of Takauji’s residence at several Kyoto temples before 1344.

19 The Sanjō bōmon palace appears in documents as Sanjō bōmon dono 三条坊門殿 and Sanjō bōmon dai 三条坊門第.

20 Baishō ron, p. 66. The same entry mentions Takauji’s presence at the temple of Tōji.

21 The existence of hyōjōshū and bikitsukake at Sanjō bōmon is documented in Hinamiki 日次記 (Jowa 4 (1348).7.17), quoted in DNS 6:11, p. 677; and Kenshin sōjo niki 賢俊僧正日記 (a) (Jowa 2 (1346).5.7), pp. 147–48. Also, see the following dates and texts for accounts of meetings of both institutions at Sanjō bōmon: Entairyaku, vol. 1, p. 245 (1345.2.21); Entairyaku, vol. 3, p. 104 (1349.8.25); and Moromori ki, vol. 5, pp. 125–26 (1349.8.25).

22 On the roles of the hyōjōshū and the bikitsukake, see Imatani, 1985; Imatani, 2000; Hall, 1990,
pp. 211–19; and Satō, 1977, pp. 47–49.

23 *Entairyaku*, vol. 1, p. 212, entry for Köei 3 (1344). 12. 22, writes “I heard the palace of the Lord General of the Left [Tadayoshi], [located] at Sanjō bōmon—Made no kōji, was lost to flames.” *Taiheiki*, book 27, part 7 refers to the “Sanjō bōmon—Takakura palace” into which Ashikaga Yoshiakira (1330–67) moved at the conclusion of a heated power struggle in 1349.

24 Tōjiin (formally, Man’enzan Tōjiin 万年山等持院), located in the Kinugasa hills northwest of Kyoto, continues to this day to function as the mortuary temple of the Ashikaga house. The temple figures prominently in the history of anti-Ashikaga nativism, popular in the mid nineteenth century. See Walthall, 1995.

25 Takauji built a residence at Nijō Takakura in 1352–53. Details are discussed below.


28 See the discussion in Imaeda, 2001, p. 441.


30 See Kamakami’s use of *Taiheiki* and *Nagaoki sukune ki* in Kawakami, 2002, p. 326.


32 Nakai, 1994, pp. 145–48; see the diagram on p. 147.


35 *Kenshun sōjō nikki*  憲秀宗相記, p. 132, entry for Jōwa 2 (1347). 1. 3. The Rāgarāja image appears in the document as Aizen myōō 愛染明王.

36 *Kenshun sōjō nikki*  憲秀宗相記, p. 145, entry for Jōwa 2 (1346). 6. 5.

37 *Kenshun sōjō nikki*  憲秀宗相記, p. 149, entry for Jōwa 2 (1346). 11. 13. The date of production is under scrutiny due to several internal discrepancies.


39 *Moromori ki*, vol. 1, p. 49 and *DNS* 6:5, p. 816, entry for Ryakuō 2 (1339). 11. 26. A mandala ritual was held in honor of emperor Go Daigo on the occasion of the hundredth day anniversary of his death.

40 *Tōjiji ezu*, ink on paper, 148 cm × 177.5 cm. Sometimes called *Tōjiji kozu* 等持寺古図. Reproduced in *DNS* 6:5, p. 602 leaf. For a color reproduction and short description, see Museum of Kyoto, 1996, pp. 30–31. The date of production is under scrutiny due to several internal discrepancies.

41 According to the illustration, Tōjiji’s property ranged from Sanjō bōmon avenue in the south to Nijō avenue in the north. From east to west, it extended from about 20 jō 丈 (approximately 60 meters or 1/2 a city block) west of Takakura and 20 jō east of Made no kōji.

42 The subsections discussed exclude the northern half of the property which, except for a small shrine (Kibisha 吉備社), appears to have been vacant.

43 On Ashikaga implementation of *shinden* style architecture, see Stavros, 2006.


45 The fact that the palace was destroyed by fire in 1344 and that Tadayoshi’s influence was waning during the years that followed might help explain the relative modesty of the complex as depicted.

46 See Öta, 2002, pp. 50–51 for discussion and a table enumerating Hakkō rituals held at Tōji after 1339.

47 Hosokawa, 2004; Iwamoto, 1987; Matsuo, 1981.


50 See Öta, 2002, pp. 50–51 for a table of rituals held at Tōji. Note the following pattern of memorial events especially: 1339. 9. 1–4 (public), 5th (private); 1344. 9. 1–4 (public), 5th (private); 1345. 9. 1–4 (public), 5th (private); 1346. 9. 26–Sept. 3 (public), 4th (undocumented), etc. Especially
detailed records are available from the seventh anniversary of Takauji’s death, held in 1367. See DNS 6:25, pp. 732–43.
53 See Figure 6. The two officer residences located in Kamigyō were occupied by brothers of the aforementioned Kō family, Moronao and Morofuyu 師冬.
54 For earlier consideration of this phenomenon, see Takahashi, 1993, pp. 86–87.
55 *Season oshō geroku* 雪村和尚語録, entry for Kōei 2 (1343). 12. 23, quoted in DNS 6:5, p. 600. Takauji’s mother was Uesugi Kiyoko 上杉清子.
56 For documents and analysis, see Imaeda, 2001, p. 436.
57 See footnote 18.
58 *Kugyō bunin*, vol. 2, p. 624.
59 On the relationship between location and status in medieval Kyoto, see Stavros, 2009.
60 *Tenryūji monjo* 天竜寺文書, entry for Kannō 2 (1351). 8. 16 quoted in *Kyōto shi no chimei*, p. 1081.
61 The first ritual was held on Kannō 1 (1350). 9. 5. See *Daijōin nikki mokuroku* 大乗院日記目録, quoted in DNS 6:13, p. 852.
62 See the table enumerating Hakkō ceremonies in Ōta, 2002, pp. 50–51.
63 The palace was at Oshi no kōji—Higashi no tōin 押小路東洞院. *Entairyaku*, vol. 3, p. 453, entry for Kannō 2 (1351). 4. 3 and 4. 25.
64 *Entairyaku*, vol. 4, p. 124, entry for Bunna 1 (1352). i2. 20.
66 Hall, 1990, p. 213.
67 *Moromori ki*, vol. 2, p. 290, entry for Kōei 4 (1345). 2. 21. The palace was called Rokkaku gosho 六角御所 for its location on Rokkaku avenue.
68 After Yoshiakira’s death in 1367. 11, the office of shogun was again left vacant, this time for 13 months. Immediate succession was not achieved until the reign of Yoshimitsu when Ashikaga shoguns began to retire from, rather than die in, office. Yoshimochi 義持, Yoshimitsu’s son and the fourth shogun, was an exception.
69 For detailed data on the location, size, and orientation of Yoshiakira’s “new” Sanjō bōmon palace, see *Arimori kyō ki*, p. 555, entry for Jōji 4 (1365). 2. 11; *Daigeki Moronatsu ki*, entry for Jōji 3 (1364). 8. 10, quoted in *Nochi kagami*, vol. 1, p. 700; and several other records in DNS 6:26, pp. 728–29.
71 For discussion, see Kawakami, 2002, p. 353.
72 After the Ōnin War (1467–1477), efforts to maintain the Muromachi palace largely failed. There is no evidence that its several structures existed after about 1532, the year Hokke sectarians took control of the city.

要旨
複合的建造群としての三条坊門殿：
中世京都における初期足利政権の本拠地

マシュー・スタブロス

本論文では、中世京都における建築と都市空間に注目し、足利政権初期の様相を検証する。特に、三条坊門殿と隣接する等持寺の重要性を明らかにし、これらが一つの複合的な建造群であったと結論
づけたい。この多機能的な建造群は足利直義の京都屋敷でありながら、足利政権の京都における最初の本拠地でもあった。また、この場所は足利家の本所であり、菩提寺として追善仏事も行われた。その後、1350年代には武士の集住地の中心地となるのである。こうした史実を基に、三条坊門殿と等持寺の起源、立地、空間構造および機能などを検証すると、京都における足利政権の基盤を作ったのは足利直義であったことが再確認できる。また、足利家の追善仏事の伝統が創設されたのもこの場所であり、その面でも直義の役割が大きかったことを論じる。