

Kishinron and Religious Policy in Early Modern Japan: Political Interests in Local Beliefs

Suzuki Takako

Introduction

Sometimes, characteristics and differences of each intellectual can be mirrored within their attitude toward unique issues. Such can be said within the *Kishinron* [鬼神論], a Neo-Confucian discussion on spirits, rites, and ghosts. Differences can be seen within the analysis concerned with ghosts and unusual events. Early modern Japanese intellectuals have left a quantity of works related to this Neo-Confucian topic on religion. The *Kishinron* itself contains a wide variety of statements ranging from the origin of the universe, explanations on life and death, guidelines for ancestral worship and a discussion on ghosts and unusual events. This indicates that emphasis on which subject is to be considered a matter of consequence will differ according to each intellectual. Some intellectuals simply ignored the topic of apparitions as superstitions while others took the path to a detailed analysis of the matter. The motive underlying such research must be understood not as mysticism but as a political awareness toward local religious beliefs. There is a need to indicate each intellectual's backgrounds of political needs and interests, because their political interests are mirrored in their interpretation.

There are grounds for practical political interest to emerge from this Neo-Confucian debate. It is clear that within the discussion on authentic ancestral rites, political awareness towards religious policy and social order took shape within the process of defining what was legitimate or licentious or not. Views toward local beliefs were influenced under such juridical interests. In order to pursue a comparative study of between intellectuals, analysis toward the level of political interest will provide a significant viewpoint to understand their aims and motives for concentrating on this murky subject. Evaluations on the level of political interest within each intellectual are necessary in order to understand how practical concerns toward local beliefs had worked as a catalyst in forming their ideas.

For this reason it is significant to verify the nature of religious policy of the Tokugawa regime in detail. When or which edict had influenced the religious outlook within society? Had there been a change of strategy concerned with the aim of maintaining social order? Therefore this paper will concentrate on the legal restrictions toward Buddhist temples and Shinto Shrines during the early modern period. There are two aims for this paper, one is to redefine how political interests toward religious institutions had developed and altered according to the change of society, the other is to reconsider the political background of the discussion in terms of legal restrictions toward

religion. Within the analysis, it will become clear that local religion had gradually been considered as a potential source for religious outbreaks and social chaos.

The framework of this paper consists of three sections in chronological order. Part one will focus on the early efforts of the Tokugawa religious policy, Part two will concentrate on the legal issues of the mid seventeenth to the former half of the eighteenth century. Part three will concentrate on the restrictions on funeral rites and evaluate the evidence on how Shinto sects had gradually gained socio-religious influence. Finally views on the political awareness toward local beliefs will be presented in the conclusion. Details on legal issues will be focused according to the *Tokugawa kinreikō* [徳川禁令考] and will follow the legal categorization according to this juridical anthology.¹⁾

I. Early Modern Japanese Religious Policy: An Overview

It is agreed that the religious policy of the Tokugawa bakufu had been completed by 1665. Reasons for this statement are based on the fact that two major religious restrictions were stated in this year. In the early stages of the Tokugawa regime, religious control tended to be directed toward religious institutions and sects. In other words, the main focus of religious policy had been on systematic pressure over religious groups. Here we will focus on three major religions and inquire the details of each regulation up till the year of 1665. Dates and details of significant edicts and restrictions will be shown in the order of Christianity, Buddhism and Shintoism.

1) Regulations toward Christianity

It is obvious that Christianity had been put in the front line of prosecution. The well known ban of Christianity came in 1613. The edict known as the *Jashūmon ginmi no koto* —*Go jomoku shūmon danna ukeoi no okite* [邪宗門吟味之事 御條目宗門檀那請負之掟] and the *Bateren tsuihōbun* [伴天連追放文] set forth the official concern and attitude of the matter, presenting the statement that Christianity is a dangerous religion and that missionaries and Japanese believers were to be put under severe prosecution.²⁾ This edict shows the basic methodology in order to put Christians under control. In order to diminish the movement, the members of the parish were required to register with a local Buddhist temple. The purpose for this systematic testimony was to prove that all members of the family were ‘Buddhist’ believers unengaged in dangerous beliefs. Births and deaths were to be reported, and funeral rites were to be held in registered temples, so as to ensure that citizens were law abiding within the existing social framework.

This family register system had functioned in two ways. On one hand, it was useful to identify citizens and the number of family members. On the other hand, it served as a system to use Buddhist temples as a bureaucratic department of the Bakufu. In other words, temples had begun to function as the census or the family register department of the Bakufu. The first step had been beneficial in a way that the birth and the death of citizens were to be recorded on behalf of the temples, a highly practical move to verify the number of population within the district. The Tokugawa statement on Christianity is straightforward, but the juridical details show a characteristic phase that is to be developed within other religious regulations. This two-dimensional method

consisted of granting political benefit and secular control. These two aspects had been the hallmark of the major strategy of early modern Japanese religious policy. This rigid control and political merit is clear in the restrictions of Buddhism. The details are to be analyzed in the following section.

2) *Regulations for Buddhist Temples*

The *Tokugawa kinreikō* shows that there were two types of restrictions: overall rules and specific regulations toward each institution. It is clear that the Bakufu had been making efforts to put each Buddhist institution under control, but succeeded by the time they established the edict in 1665. This 1665 edict is considered as the highlight or the completion of Buddhist regulations.³⁾ The details cover every aspect of monastic activity, and refer to trivial matters, too. The topic ranges from the financial bases of temples, ranks of monks and apprentices, satisfactory lifestyles, and intellectual activities. The edict in 1665, known as the *Shoshū jiin hatto* [諸宗寺院法度], reveals the official awareness of the matter.

The 1665 edict covers how Buddhist real estate and buildings should be maintained, and it strongly recommends proper financial management in cases of reconstruction.⁴⁾ Rank and certificate among monastery members were also put under restriction. It can be understood that secular administration had tried to control Buddhist institutions. Regulations are also encouraging intellectual activity and academic pursuits, in other words, to pray for the welfare of the government. It also warns Buddhist monks not to engage in military interests and similar activities.⁵⁾ Lifestyle and rules of daily affairs and routine were stated as well. There is a clear effort to maintain daily discipline and manners within the monasteries. Obviously, the officials considered that luxury and extravagance would lead to corruptive secularization.⁶⁾ The officials were also requiring temples to make sure not to harbor strangers or unauthorized civilians in the estates. Servants and parish members engaged in hard labor for the estate were required to have had their identity verified.

On the whole, the founders of the Tokugawa regime were cautious to prevent Buddhist temples from emerging as military or political threats. The Bakufu leaders had learned from history how temples were inclined to transform into potential threats to national officials. It is not surprising to see that a strong motive for gaining control can be seen through these regulations. At the same time, temples were granted status and security under conditions that they abided by the laws of the secular authority. To summarize, the Bakufu had formulated a two-pronged strategy to place the Buddhist temples under control. Through the certificate of political benefit and status officials had taken religious institutions within the ruling system and kept a close watch simultaneously. However, regulations toward Shinto shrines were a different matter. It is true that the officials took care to watch over the shrines, but they did not require a highly administrative role toward priests. The details of this are discussed in the following section.

3) *Regulations toward Shinto Shrines*

The religious regulations toward Shinto shrines reflect both the characteristics of Bakufu policy and the altering nature of the Shintoist movement during the Tokugawa

era. This section will concentrate on the regulations up to the mid seventeenth century and analyze the developments in the following chapters. Shinto connected regulations are distributed in the similar style of that of Buddhist regulations. Juridical order is stated toward specific shrines and an edict is set forth as a sign to indicate the common framework of the matter is completed. The edict toward Shinto shrines confirmed in 1665 was known as the *Shosha negi kannushi hatto* [諸社禰宜神主法度].⁷⁾

The 1665 regulations include topics similar to those in the *Shoshū jūin hatto*. The *Shosha negi kannushi hatto* has regulations on financial bases, the prohibition against the buying and selling of real estate, and regulations regarding expensive construction of new buildings within shrines. The ranks and statuses of priests were to be verified by legitimate license and memberships, and religious activity was restricted within the area of academic pursuits or praying for the welfare of the government. Priests were required to lead modest and simple lives and required a daily routine to keep the grounds of the shrines clean. Restrictions over servants are seen as well, as is the caution not to harbor strangers within the estate. Institutional jurisdiction was similar to that of the *Shoshū jūin hatto* for Buddhist temples.

However, there is a characteristic aspect related to Shinto regulations. Legal interest regarding Shinto shrines was centered on the priestly license and certificate given out by the Yoshida family and the Shirakawa family. Those who had received formal instruction and were granted the secret teachings of the family were given the certificate of a Shinto priest.⁸⁾ Trivial details and legal requests for performing *kagura* [神楽] or the legitimacy of newly given license for farmers are seen in quantity.⁹⁾

Legitimate license and certificate of shrines and priests were the main interests of jurisdiction of the Tokugawa regime. Early regulations were focused around the issue of redefining the status of each specific shrine. The main interest was to establish and maintain a social alliance with these religious counterparts. This situation will change according to the end of the nineteenth century. This paper will focus on the changes reflected within Shinto regulations in the following sections; the details reflect the emergence of the social influence of Shintoism in early modern Japanese society.

II. Changes at the Turn of the Eighteenth Century: Post-1665 Regulations

Once the 1665 edict had taken shape, the Bakufu officials had fundamental guidelines for dealing with religious movements. Officially, religious regulations were put under control and religious policy had developed into a sophisticated legal system. However, this did not mean that the officials were free of trouble and anxiety. The regulations after 1665 imply that religious concerns had changed and policy had shifted to a new degree of awareness.

Until 1665 the main concern had been to place institutions under control. Now the threat had changed to caution toward spontaneous religious outbreaks. This change of awareness is reflected by the details of the restrictions around the beginning of the eighteenth century: regulations toward religious groups had changed. Here the focus will be on two subjects: regulations toward religious institutions and regulations toward freelance religious activity outside institutional systems. The details reflect the social dynamics of the period as well as the shift within juridical interests.

1) *Regulations toward Religious Institutions*

By and large, the main juridical awareness toward Buddhist temples had developed along the lines of unauthorized ceremonies and social events held within the estate. Once officials had felt secured that Buddhist institutions were not agitating an anti-governmental message, they did not press further control over religious teachings as such. However, officials were concerned with non-religious activity conducted within the temple grounds.

An edict in 1709 emphasized that overnight mourning ceremonies with mixed members of both sexes were not to be held.¹⁰⁾ The concern is directed toward moral hazards, not theological interpretations. In 1714, extravagant events, such as puppet theater performances, held within the estate were banned. In the same year prostitution on the Buddhist estate was placed under a strict ban.¹¹⁾ These edicts are early evidence of banning unauthorized events, ceremonies, and prostitution. The main intention was to maintain social order as well as preventing temples from reaping extra profit from these secular events. Obviously the officials were aware that social events could be used as an opportunity for raising funds and gaining extra income. In addition, there had been a keen concern to prevent religious estates from developing into a shelter for lawbreakers, tramps, and vagabonds.¹²⁾

Toward the end of the Tokugawa regime, unauthorized events such as festivals, puppet theater performances, kabuki performances, dancing events and sumo wrestling matches were frequently placed under a strict ban.¹³⁾ In order to prevent religious institutions from being lured into fund raising activities, officials stressed that a luxurious lifestyle would become the catalyst for crime. Bakufu officials made efforts to maintain the morale of monks in monasteries. Through regulations in 1722, they required monks to lead a stoic and simple life style, not to pursue comfort and luxury but to endeavor to reduce expenses.¹⁴⁾ It is clear that views toward religious institutions had changed since the 1665 edict. The administrative level of awareness had emerged as a major interest. Before proceeding to the next section, it should be reiterated that a similar attitude had been taken toward religious activities other than Buddhist and Shinto institutions. Freelance religious activity or popular religion was to be controlled. And a new genre of jurisdiction had emerged: religious festivals and events in general. Religious circumstances now differed compared with those of the founding stages of the regime.

2) *Regulations toward Religious Social Activities*

It must be noted that freelance religious activity outside institutions were also subjects of political awareness and placed under control. The two major parties were the *Fukeshū* [普化宗] and *Shugendō* [修験道], both usually understood as popular religions or mountain Buddhism. Regulations toward *Shugendō* are seen as early as 1609 and through 1806. The same can be said in the case of the *Fukeshū*, in which the regulations are dated from around 1614 to 1858.¹⁵⁾

What is characteristic about these groups is the fact that regulations see an increase toward the end of the Tokugawa regime. The early stages were focused on license and permission from the headquarters. However, the group became a hideout for those who were escaping social obligations, usually financial debts and poverty. As seen in

records dated around the end of the eighteenth century, officials were concerned with how poverty-ridden citizens tended to become recruits of freelance priests, eventually turning away from the formal administrative register.¹⁶⁾

Around the mid-nineteenth century, officials were tightening restrictions regarding the *Fukeshū* movement. They issued a warning that *Fukeshū* members tend to threaten citizens to pay alms and offerings, and were much more bandits than priests.¹⁷⁾ It is obvious that the main legal concern was to maintain social order. This political awareness had gradually spread toward general religious activities as well. Regulations toward festivals and religious events are seen in quantity within the *Tokugawa kinreikō*. It must be noted that the regulations cover both Buddhist and Shintoist festivals, in other words, a neutral attitude had taken shape in juridical affairs.

Details of laws concerned with festivals have two major statements, unauthentic festivals are not allowed and luxurious ceremonies are prohibited. Officials were firm on their point that festivals were to be authentic and traditional, not a pretext for expensive merrymaking. An early regulation on the use of drums can be seen; drums were to be used on the specific date of the festival, the reasons were based on the fact that the sound of drums were noisy and could be confused for fire alarms.¹⁸⁾ Restrictions toward large-scale *nerimono* [練り物] or parades in 1721 provides warnings about unruly festivals.¹⁹⁾ Expensive costumes, food vendors, live performances and obscene decorations were strictly prohibited.

Gokaichō [御開帳], or a public exhibition of religious treasures both of Buddhist and Shinto origin, were placed under control as well. Unauthorized public viewings were banned in 1780, 1794, and 1802.²⁰⁾ A direct statement of the matter is displayed within the restriction on costly shows in 1827. Officials made it clear that festive events were to be held in regard of discipline. They knew that religious events tend to provide an occasion for fights and disputes, a potential hazard for social chaos. An occasion of sacred reverence could succumb to secular violence.²¹⁾ Within the final decades of the Tokugawa regime in 1842, authorities were concerned that gorgeous religious ceremonies could become occasions for chaos and riots. Alert toward drunken fights and lax security can be seen in the edicts.²²⁾ Officials were well aware that festivals tended to run out of control, and based upon this realistic perspective they made efforts to continuously remind that ceremonies were to be held according to authentic traditions. New attempts at festive events were condemned as non-traditional and banned in 1727.²³⁾ It is interesting to note that locally based Shinto movements were also put under warning. In the mid-nineteenth century the Bakufu had issued an edict restricting the *Fujikō* [富士講], a popular religious movement for revering Mt. Fuji. In the 1849 edict, it claimed the movement was non-traditional, and claimed that the movement was a rationale for collecting large amounts of funds and recruiting followers to travel long distances.²⁴⁾

To sum up, the officials were realistic enough to understand that huge festivals were potential causes of social chaos. Their interest had been meant to prevent religious groups from gaining political influence and economic power. It is interesting to see how acute their awareness toward maintaining social order had been: they were aware that huge crowds would cause chaos whether religious or not. After the edict in 1665, it must be noted that details toward various urban activities were put under legal con-

trol. Kabuki theaters, for example, were placed under strict control in 1714.²⁵⁾ It is obvious that legal officials were aware that economic profit drew large crowds and social attention. Spontaneous fanatic movements could possibly emerge in the scene of big events and crowds. It was essential to prevent crowds from developing into mobs and riots, which could lead to nationwide chaos. This shift of interest must be understood as a change of strategy in religious policy. Awareness toward religious movements pursued outside organizations had taken shape. Concern over maintaining social order had become a matter of consequence, and not the institutions or religious teachings. The turning point in the policy emerged after the restrictions of 1665, and brought new interests and political awareness of social order. Political control and caution had expanded outside religious institutions, seeking to adjust to new religious circumstances.

Seen within the details of legal records, Tokugawa society had experienced a dramatic change. Economic growth and the steady increase of the urban population had introduced new problems for officials. Attitudes toward religious beliefs had changed as well, introducing new styles of religious practices. In the next part we will analyze the changes and developments concerned with Shinto. What types of evidence can be seen through the regulations?

III. Funeral Rites and Shinto: The Later Stage of Religious Policy

As mentioned at the end of part one, funeral rites had functioned as a highly administrative issue linked with the family register through Buddhist temples. It must be noted that practical concerns of authentic license and control over public welfare were the main concerns of the officials. Neither theological nor religious attacks are contained within the documents. Early stages of jurisdiction are full of bans of expensive and extravagant funerals. An example of this type of edict can be seen in an early regulation of 1742 regarding putting money into the coffin, an act of mourning resulting in the waste of precious minerals and public wealth.²⁶⁾ Laws also restricted commoners from using expensive goods for funerals, from putting long *kaimyō* [戒名] for the deceased, and from erecting over-large tombstones. The official statement of such extravagant mourning was unauthentic and an act of usurping ritualistic dignity.²⁷⁾ At the same time, officials made sure that funeral rites were to be performed properly without delay. In a 1792 edict, the officials are making it clear that in cases of deceased homeless, the temple of the district had the responsibility to hold proper funerals.²⁸⁾ The point was to obtain an accurate record of the area, in other words, a need to maintain administrative accuracy.

However, from the mid-eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century juridical changes emerged in the shape of requests for Shinto style funerals. Considering the legal documents in the *Tokugawa kinreikō*, the turning point seems to begin around 1789 to 1791. Early cases are seen in 1791.²⁹⁾ The 1791 inquiry mentions the case of a priest who had received a funeral license from the Yoshida family. The issue was whether this status should be considered legitimate or not. It reveals two questions: one was whether to permit the practice of Shinto funerals or not; the other was to consider whether other family members were to abide by the Buddhist style funerals required by the family register system.³⁰⁾

A new social practice had been taking shape in this period. A similar case is seen in 1819. This time the family had been registered but wished to hold funerals according to the Shinto style.³¹⁾ Similar inquiries are dated from around 1819 to 1826. Clearly, Shinto-style funerals were gradually accepted by the 1830's. Although it had not been officially recommended, the villagers and the local temples were accepting the de facto situation.³²⁾ Various cases on funeral rites are dated in this period. An inquiry on a *Shugendō* priest's funeral can be seen in 1819. The question was meant to decide what style of funeral should be considered legitimate.³³⁾

A characteristic change concerned with funeral rites can be attributed to the fact that Shinto had begun to gain popularity among citizens. In other words, Shinto had begun to emerge as an authentic Japanese religion and discourse. Another cause for this change can be attributed to the fact that from the mid-seventeenth century and onward, Shinto scholars as well as Buddhist and Neo-Confucian scholars had begun to engage in a discussion on death and funeral rites.³⁴⁾ Prior to the early modern period, death had been considered a taboo for Shinto priests. Death was a major cause for religious pollution and priests were required to follow a strict process of ritual purification. It is clear that Shinto priests had begun to be more preoccupied with daily practice than with ritual purification. Furthermore, Shinto intellectuals had become engaged in the discussion of death and afterlife. Interest in authentic Japanese style funerals had become the debate for intellectuals. Due to both the discourse of Neo-Confucian afterlife and authentic ancestral worship and the rise of the *Kokugaku* [国学] movement, Shinto scholars were inspired and encouraged to inquire into the matter. It can be said that attitudes had changed under the Tokugawa social structure, but that is a topic to be discussed in another opportunity.

Conclusion

Seen from these details of the religious jurisdiction of the Tokugawa Bakufu, it is necessary to accept that a change of awareness is evident around the end of the seventeenth century. Religious policy had been established from an administrative point of view to maintain social order. In the early stages of the regime, the main strategy had been to put religious institutions under systematic control. Regulations were established according to religious beliefs and specific sects. The climax of such juridical organizing could be seen in the edict in 1665. After the 1665 edict, the political awareness regarding religious policy developed into an interest in spontaneous religious activities, in other words, religious activity pursued outside existing institutions. Ceremonies, festivals, and social performances were to be held according to authorization. Such changes are to be understood as reflections of awareness toward local religious activity. Change in society, the growth of economic wealth, an increasing population, and the development of urban lifestyles had influenced the religious atmosphere of the time. It is not surprising to see a heightened awareness in the level of religious jurisdiction. During each phase of the Tokugawa period, religious policy had changed and developed, introducing new awareness and problems. Seen from this point, it must be considered that political concerns have been mirrored in the works of intellectuals. Those who were aware of religious order and administrative needs were alert to the changes of society and policy making.

In comparing the *Kishinron* of early modern intellectuals, this shift of religious policy must be understood as a key point when trying to understand the text. Religious circumstances differ according to each intellectual. It is not surprising to see how the level of political attitude differed according to each intellectual. Those who were engaged in the debate of authentic Neo-Confucian rites and ancestor worship were obliged to shape their interests within the problems of the day. It is quite natural to see how religious concerns of the day had influenced or worked as a catalyst toward their motives to pursue the topic. For the early generation of intellectuals, criticism of existing Buddhist temples was a major priority in terms of religious order. For the next generation of scholars, local beliefs and spontaneous religious activities were of major concerns in religious policy. The difference of the attitude in which they treated the topic of local religion can be understood from this perspective. A comparative analysis of each intellectual is necessary, but that too is a topic to be discussed and developed in another paper.

Notes

- 1) Ishii Ryōsuke 石井良助 ed., *Tōkugawa kinreikō* 徳川禁令考, vol. 5, (Tokyo: Sōbunsha 創文社, 1959).
- 2) *Ibid.*, 78–81.
- 3) *Ibid.*, 20–21. Since this paper will focus on the details of jurisdiction, I will not discuss the details of how the head and branch hierarchy system had emerged. I will note that it is a significant aspect for understanding how unauthorized minor Buddhist temples were assembled into a system. See Duncan Ryuken Williams, “Religion in Early Modern Japan,” in *Nanzan Guide to Japanese Religions*, ed. Paul L. Swanson and Clark Chilson, (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2006), 188–191. Williams’ survey provides the outline of how Buddhism had emerged in the level of social practice and administration. Also see Wakatsuki Shōgo 若月正吾, “Edo jidai ni okeru bakufu no shūkyō seisaku to sono haikai 江戸時代における幕府の宗教政策とその背景,” *Komazawa Daigaku bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒沢大学仏教学部研究紀要 29 (1971:3), 32–45.
- 4) *Ibid.*, 21–22. Further details on regulations for Buddhist estates are in *ibid.*, 22–27. See also *ibid.*, 87–88.
- 5) *Ibid.*, 20–21. The notorious armed monk headquarters of Hieizan is in the Tendai sect. Similar warnings are seen within Tendai regulations (*ibid.*, 31–34). It must be noted that Hieizan, the central temple of the Tendai sect, had been the headquarters of the medieval armed monks.
- 6) *Ibid.*, 84–99, on the required manners of monks.
- 7) *Ibid.*, 6–7.
- 8) For details on Yoshida Shinto, see Taira Shigemichi 平重道, “Kinsei no shintō shisō 近世の神道思想,” *Nihon shisō taikei* 日本思想大系, vol. 39, (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1972), 520–521. Taira explains how the license and rank system had enabled the Yoshida family to become Shinto authorities. Only after being given permission to receive the Gnostic knowledge of the deities and rites would one be accepted to become a Shinto priest.
- 9) On *kagura* see *Tōkugawa kinreikō*, 7–10. On giving new memberships to farmers see also pages 11–12.
- 10) *Ibid.*, 25.
- 11) *Ibid.*, 25–26.
- 12) *Ibid.*, 25.
- 13) *Ibid.*, 120, on unauthorized sumo matches. This is a regional ruling, but it shows evidence of how local authorities were concerned with social order and unruly youth activity. See also *ibid.*, 353–354, 356–357.
- 14) *Ibid.*, 26–27.
- 15) On *Shūgendō* see *ibid.*, 63–68. On *Fukeshū* see *ibid.*, 69–75.
- 16) *Ibid.*, 66–68. See also *ibid.*, 98–99.
- 17) *Ibid.*, 74–75.

- 18) Ibid., 117.
- 19) Ibid., 117–118, 359.
- 20) Ibid., 118. Rural incidents show interesting evidence in detail. The Zenkōji temple had held exhibitions outside the district, and another local temple held an exhibition including child dance performances (ibid., 119). In addition, a prolonged schedule of exhibits was prohibited. It is clear that officials were aware that religious events tended to provide a pretext for unruly behavior.
- 21) Ibid., 119–120.
- 22) Ibid., 121–122. It must be noted that a disastrous famine broke out during this period. Social anxiety had heightened to an alarming level.
- 23) *Tokugawa kinreikō* 徳川禁令考, *koshū* 後集, vol. 1, 170–172. In particular, details on pages 172–173 are interesting. On pages 176–178 is an incident of a new religious teaching in 1847. Obviously the preacher had embedded political criticism against the government in his religious message of the Japanese gods. This was considered as a dangerous heresy. Three people were convicted and sentenced.
- 24) *Tokugawa kinreikō*, vol. 5, 17–18. For similar restrictions on popular religion, see ibid., 359.
- 25) Ibid., 454–455. Architecture of the theater site, number of rooms, seats, services and performing hours were considered in detail. There is a section of kabuki edicts in chapter 57 of the *Tokugawa kinreikō*. Kabuki regulations are seen from around the Genroku period, and peaked in the Shotoku period, in the early eighteenth century when Arai Hakuseki was political advisor (ibid., 451–460).
- 26) Ibid., 122.
- 27) Ibid., 122, 123–124. A restriction on farmers using the high rank *Ingō* 院号 and *Kojigō* 居士号 in *kaimyō*. It is a warning to newly prestigious families not to usurp religious status. From a religious perspective, economic wealth and social success had been poor reasons for altering religious practices. In reality, this new style of *kaimyō* became a common practice.
- 28) Ibid., 123.
- 29) Ibid., 123.
- 30) Ibid., 123.
- 31) Ibid., 124–125.
- 32) Ibid., 124–127. However, dates are missing or unverified on pages 126–127.
- 33) Ibid., 124.
- 34) This was pointed out by Asoya Masahiko 阿蘇谷正彦. See his *Shintō no seishikan: Shintō shisō to shi no mondai* 神道の生死観 神道思想と「死」の問題, (Tokyo: Perikansha ぺりかん社, 1989), quoted by Motomura Masafumi 本村昌文, “Hayashi Razan no Bukkyō hihan: shiseikan o chūshin toshite 林羅山の仏教批判 死生観を中心として,” *Nihon shisōshigaku* 日本思想史学 33 (2001), 128. In general, early modern Shinto had become preoccupied with daily practice and the welfare of the people. This was quite different compared with the aristocratic attitude of medieval Shinto.