

SPECIAL SECTION, edited by Bernhard Scheid, Stefan Köck, and Brigitte Pickl-Kolaczia
Domain Shinto in Tokugawa Japan

Domain Shinto: Religious Policies, Guiding Ideas, and Historical Development

INOUE Tomokatsu*

This article argues that the restoration of ancient shrines initiated by Tokugawa Yoshinao in the 1630s should be regarded as the starting point of Domain Shinto. It demonstrates that Yoshinao's constructive Shinto policies were grounded on the same ideology that we find at work in the more famous and primarily destructive Domain Shinto policies of the Kanbun era. The article presents lesser-known examples before and during the Kanbun years that also fit into this ideological pattern. In this period, Shinto and Confucianism were regarded by many political agents as identical and of equal value, which also explains the daimyos' simultaneous interest in Shinto and Confucian ritualism. In conclusion, this article proposes defining the end of Domain Shinto as the time when Shinto-Confucian ideologies no longer inspired Shinto reforms, that is, the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Keywords: *shinju itchi*, Tokugawa Yoshinao, Hayashi Razan, Hayashi Gahō, *shikinaisha*, shrine restoration, *inshi*, Confucian rituals

During the Kanbun 寛文 era (1661–1673), the three domains of Aizu 会津, Mito 水戸, and Okayama 岡山 pursued distinctive religious policies that aimed at the reduction and retrenchment of temples and shrines. In a recent edited volume examining early modern Shinto and this issue, Bernhard Scheid and his team introduced the label “Domain Shinto” for these policies.¹ This new academic term does not refer to a specific Shinto school or school of thought, but to a “cluster of religious policies and ideas that were directly or indirectly related to Shinto,” putting the emphasis not only on intellectual but also on institutional history.²

* Inoue Tomokatsu is a professor at Saitama University and a leading expert on early modern Shinto. Research for this article was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP20K20676. This article was translated by Bernhard Scheid.

1 Köck et al. 2021.

2 See the introduction to this Special Section.

This article provisionally adopts Scheid's definition of Domain Shinto while accepting that the concept is still relatively young and undeveloped. This makes it essential to further refine the concept. I will therefore examine the essence of Domain Shinto policies, the ideas from which they originated, and whether they varied from period to period. Moreover, I will analyze the Shinto-Confucian concepts that constitute the intellectual underpinnings of Domain Shinto and their expression in new forms of ritualism. Finally, in my conclusion, I address the question of which period might be considered the end of Domain Shinto. Let me start, however, with a few thoughts on the applicability of the term itself.

Shinto or Shinto Policy?

Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助 (1877–1955) was the first to explain the Kanbun policies in Okayama, Mito, and Aizu as a “retrenchment of Buddhist temples” (*jiin seiri* 寺院整理) based on an anti-Buddhist ideology (*haibutsu ron* 排仏論).³ This interpretation was taken up by Tamamuro Fumio 圭室文雄, leading to a general understanding that Buddhism was the main target of these policies.⁴ As I will try to demonstrate in this article, however, the Kanbun reforms were actually grounded in a particular Shinto ideology and primarily targeted shrines. In this regard, of preeminent importance were the teachings of Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583–1657), Yoshikawa Koretaru 吉川惟足 (1616–1695), and Yamazaki Ansai 山崎闇斎 (1619–1682).⁵ Although these intellectuals disagreed in many details, their ideas are all based on the axiomatic premise that Shinto and Confucianism were identical (*shinju itchi* 神儒一致).

Within the intellectual identification of Shinto with Confucianism, Razan's idea that “the Way of the Gods is the Way of Rulership” (*shintō soku ōdō* 神道即王道) is of particular importance.⁶ This not only influenced several leading daimyo in their development of Domain Shinto, but also justifies the term “Domain Shinto” itself. As Domain Shinto refers to both religious policies and the ideas guiding them, it might seem more correct to speak of “domain Shinto policies.” However, inasmuch as these policies were based on Razan's dictum that Shinto is the Way of Rulership, these policies can be seen themselves as “Shinto” in practice. From Razan's point of view, Shinto policy is in fact Shinto. Since the promoters of this “Shinto *qua* Shinto policy” were feudal lords rather than the shogunate, their practice of Shinto was confined to their domains. Therefore, as far as religious policies by feudal lords accorded to “the Way of the Gods is the Way of Rulership”, they can indeed be labeled Domain Shinto.

Put differently, the applicability of the term Domain Shinto depends on the suppositions that (1) early Tokugawa Confucian intellectuals like Hayashi Razan harbored a genuine interest in Shinto, and that (2) this interest influenced the religious policies of certain domains. This article attempts to verify these suppositions.

3 Tsuji 1953, pp. 331–336; Tsuji 1955, pp. 339–399.

4 Tamamuro 1971; Tamamuro 1987.

5 All of them founded Confucian Shinto schools: Ritō Shinchi Shinto 理当心地神道 (Razan), Yoshikawa Shinto 吉川神道 (Koretaru), and Suika Shinto 垂加神道 (Ansai).

6 This idea is mentioned, for instance, in Razan's *Shintō denju* 神道伝授; see Taira et al. 1972, p. 19; also Ooms 1985, p. 93.

Domain Shinto during the Kanbun Era

We start with a brief outline of the most typical examples of what we call Domain Shinto, the religious policies in Mito, Aizu, and Okayama, which are covered in more detail in the other articles of this Special Section. A discussion of these cases is necessary in order to compare them with a number of similar examples which show that Domain Shinto also manifested itself in the reforms of individual religious institutions and did not necessarily affect an entire domain.

The Cases of Mito, Aizu, and Okayama

Under Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀 (1628–1700), daimyo of Mito domain in Hitachi Province, religious reforms started with a survey of temples and shrines in 1663.⁷ Based on this survey, Mito streamlined its religious institutions from 1666 until the end of the century, a retrenchment involving the destruction and consolidation of both temples and shrines. With regard to Buddhist institutions, 1,433 temples—more than 50 percent of the 2,377 temples in its territory—were eliminated.⁸ With regard to Shinto, Mitsukuni strived for a system of a single tutelary shrine per village. The number of tutelary village shrines (*chinjusha* 鎮守社) was increased from 186 in 1663 to 551 around 1700.⁹ Yet, Buddhist shrine monks (*shasō* 社僧) were dismissed in the process. Moreover, shrines that were deemed to have no adequate historical pedigree according to the survey were considered “illicit shrines” (*inshi* 淫祠) and extirpated. These measures continued until the last year of Mitsukuni’s reign, 1696, when Buddhist elements were still being thoroughly expunged from village shrines.¹⁰ Mitsukuni also restored Shizu Jinja 静神社 and Yoshida Jinja 吉田神社, the traditional second (*ninomiya* 二宮) and third (*sannomiya* 三宮) shrines of Hitachi Province in 1667, while defrocking their Buddhist clergy. Both shrines were *shikinaisha* 式内社, that is, state-sponsored shrines of the Heian 平安 period (794–1185) included in the *Engishiki jinmyōchō* 延喜式神名帳 (List of shrines in the regulations of the Engi era) compiled in the tenth century. With regard to Shinto ritualism, Mitsukuni sent Mito priests to Kyoto to study under the Yoshida-Urabe 吉田卜部—at that time the foremost authority in shrine matters.

In northern Aizu, Hoshina Masayuki 保科正之 (1611–1673) ordered local temples and shrines to submit their histories (*engi* 縁起) to the domain in 1664.¹¹ Based on this investigation, Masayuki had new temples and “illicit shrines” torn down. Moreover, Buddhist elements were removed from shrines and smaller shrines were merged. On the other hand, he revived *shikinaisha* that had fallen into disuse. The results of this reorganization, completed by 1672, were documented in two registers of local shrines, *Aizu jinja-shi* 会津神社志 and *Aizu jinja sōroku* 会津神社総録.¹²

In the west of Japan, Okayama’s Ikeda Mitsumasa 池田光政 (1609–1682) initiated religious reforms in 1666 that also led to massive destruction and the consolidation of local

7 The following data on Mito is taken from Tamamuro 1968, pp. 858–870; Tamamuro 2003, pp. 3–6; and Pickl-Kolaczia 2021, pp. 179–185.

8 Pickl-Kolaczia 2021, p. 180.

9 Pickl-Kolaczia 2021, p. 184.

10 For notable exceptions, see Brigitte Pickl-Kolaczia’s contribution to this Special Section.

11 Kasei Jikki 1976, p. 182; other data on Aizu is from Aizu Wakamatsu-shi 1965, pp. 362–363.

12 *Aizu jinja-shi*, completed in 1672, contains a list of the 268 main ancient shrines of Aizu domain; *Aizu jinja sōroku*, completed after Masayuki’s death in 1673, contains the names of 1,418 shrines confirmed by the domain administration.

religious sites.¹³ As of 1667, 563 of the 1,044 temples in the territory had been eliminated. By 1675, the number of destroyed temples had risen to 598. With regard to shrines, only tutelary village shrines (*ubusunagami* 産土神) and shrines of long pedigree were retained, while small shrines dedicated to syncretic deities such as *Kōjin* 荒神 were deemed “illicit.” All in all, 10,572 “illicit shrines” were merged into seventy-one collective shrines called *yosemiya* 寄宮, which were put under the jurisdiction of their respective district offices. This large-scale project was endorsed by the Yoshida in Kyoto. As in Mito and Aizu, *shikinaisha* gained privileged status in Okayama as well.¹⁴ Moreover, Mitsumasa altered the widely practiced *terauke* 寺請 system—the confirmation of non-Christian affiliation by Buddhist temples—and replaced it with *shintō-uke* 神道請 (also called *shinshoku-uke* 神職請), that is, confirmation of non-Christian status by the Shinto priesthood.

The Case of Takamatsu Domain

Matsudaira Yorishige 松平頼重 (1622–1695) is another lord who carried out Domain Shinto policies during the Kanbun era in his domain of Sanuki Takamatsu 讃岐高松, albeit in a less radical fashion than his younger brother, Tokugawa Mitsukuni of Mito.¹⁵ In 1668, Yorishige erected “collective shrines” (*yosemiya*) similar to those in Okayama, and in 1669, he ordered the headmen (*ōjōya* 大庄屋) of each district to investigate the origins of their shrines and temples, and to submit their findings to him. Already some years earlier, in 1664, Yorishige had come to the conclusion that the Tsuruuchi Hachimangū 鶴内八幡宮—a typical syncretic shrine within his domain—was identical to a certain Shirotori Jinja 白鳥神社 (white bird shrine) mentioned in a medieval war tale and dedicated to the mythological hero Yamato Takeru no Mikoto 日本武尊.¹⁶ Subsequently, Yorishige had the shrine’s administrative temple (*bettōji* 別当寺) and other Buddhist elements removed, and asked priests of the Urabe 卜部 family in Kyoto to install a shrine priest (*kannushi* 神主) and to rename the shrine Shirotori Jinja.¹⁷ In the following year, he requested the shogunate to grant the shrine a vermilion seal estate of two hundred *koku* and fortified the non-Buddhist nature of the shrine in a code (*hatto* 法度) of thirty-six rules.

However, Yorishige did not plan to abolish Buddhism altogether. When he retired from his lordship of Takamatsu domain in 1673, he clearly expressed his position regarding Shinto and Buddhism to Shogun Ietsuna 家綱 (1641–1680), a son of his cousin Iemitsu, in the following words of advice:

13 Data on Okayama is taken from Taniguchi 1964, pp. 573–602. For details, see also Köck 2021 and Stefan Köck’s contribution to this Special Section.

14 Inoue 2007, p. 3.

15 My analysis of Yorishige’s shrine policies is based on his biography in Matsudaira Kōekikai 1964, pp. 180–184, 296–308, and upon Kagawa-ken 1989, pp. 569–571.

16 This identification was based on medieval sources like the *Genpei jōsuiki* 源平盛衰記, but while that text mentions a white bird shrine in Sanuki Province, it does not specify its location. The oldest sources on Yamato Takeru no Mikoto, *Kojiki* 古事記 (712) and *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 (720), mention the legend that he assumed the form of a white bird when he died. These sources also mention several white bird shrines in his honor but do not describe any of them as situated on Shikoku.

17 In fact, he turned to the Hirano 平野 branch of the Urabe, who were collateral relatives of the famous Yoshida-Urabe mentioned above.

Japan is a divine country, but in recent times it has lost [its relation to the gods]. You should command the lords of provinces (*kokushu* 国主) and domains (*ryōshu* 領主) to abolish useless shrines, and to restore shrines of ancient reputation in a simple way. Shrines of pure ancient origin (*sōgen* 宗源) should be run by shrine priests (*shanin* 社人). In shrines of dual origin (*ryōbu shūgō* 両部習合), however, priests should perform their duties together with the Buddhist administrators (*bettō* 別当) of the shrine's original Buddha hall (*honjidō* 本地堂).¹⁸

Thus, Yorishige recommended the removal of Buddhist oversight from those shrines originally run without Buddhist supervision. Shrines that had originated within Shinto-Buddhist syncretism, however, should continue their mixed traditions.

This comparatively tolerant attitude towards Shinto-Buddhist syncretism became visible in practice in 1666, when Yorishige ordered the restoration of Iwaseo Hachimangū 石清尾八幡宮, a famous local shrine close to his residence in Takamatsu town. Here, the shrine's administrative Buddhist temple was not torn down, while the hall of its *honji* Buddha was restored. Thus, the Shinto-Buddhist layout of the site was fully maintained.

Izumo, Ise, and Other Examples of Domain Shinto Practice

The restoration of the Izumo shrine of Kizuki Taisha 杵築大社 (today's Izumo Taisha 出雲大社) was completed in 1667 and funded by the *bakufu* in the name of Shogun Tokugawa Ietsuna.¹⁹ However, his role was limited to approving the construction and paying the costs. The restoration itself was in many respects a typical Domain Shinto project by the new daimyo of Izumo Matsue domain, Matsudaira Naomasa 松平直政 (1601–1666), a grandson of Tokugawa Ieyasu.

Already in 1638, when he took over the domain, Naomasa had laid down new guidelines for Izumo Shrine's management in the Kizuki Taisha Hatto 杵築大社法度.²⁰ In subsequent years, Naomasa appealed to the shogunate for permission to rebuild the shrine, which was granted in 1646. However, the project had to wait another fifteen years, starting only in the first year of Kanbun, 1661. The reconstruction project included the removal of Buddhist pagodas, temple halls, and sutra repositories, most of which had been installed in the shrine precinct under the Amago 尼子, the daimyo who had controlled the Izumo region from 1486 to 1566. The anti-Buddhist measures of 1661 are generally attributed to Naomasa, but they were also advanced in large part by the Kizuki shrine priests. The priests were in turn influenced by Kurosawa Sekisai 黒澤石斎 (1612–1678), who served as the domain's Confucian scholar from 1653 to 1666. Kizuki priests who became familiar with his work soon shared his deep dissatisfaction with Shinto-Buddhist practices, a criticism that derived ultimately from Sekisai's teacher, Hayashi Razan.

Further support for Izumo's anti-Buddhist policy came from Inoue Masatoshi 井上正利 (1606–1675), who served from 1658 to 1667 as the shogunate's magistrate for temples and shrines (*jisha bugyō* 寺社奉行). Besides his official duties, he was a disciple of Yamazaki Ansai,

18 Saiki 1979, p. 123. Terms for the classification of shrines such as *sōgen* and *ryōbu shūgō* were originally coined by Yoshida Shinto; on this topic, see Scheid 2003 as well as his contribution to this Special Section.

19 Data on the rebuilding of Izumo's Kizuki Shrine are taken from Nishioka 2002. For recent studies in English, see Zhong 2016, pp. 39–46, and Teeuwen 2021, pp. 154–157.

20 Reproduced in Murata 1968, pp. 362–367.

the founder of Suika Shinto. It is said that he was the one who introduced Ansai to Hoshina Masayuki. He was also a fierce critic of syncretic concepts such as *ryōbu shūgō* and *honji suijaku*, and strongly supported the elimination of all Buddhist elements from shrines.²¹

During the Kanbun era, the Ise Shrines also experienced a series of anti-Buddhist measures.²² The most striking case affected the nuns of Keikōin 慶光院, a Buddhist nunnery in Ise. They had put immense effort into raising funds for the ceremonial rebuilding of the shrines (*shikinen sengū* 式年遷宮). When this rebuilding tradition was finally revived in 1669, however, the nuns were excluded from the ceremonies due to their Buddhist affiliation. Another case resulted from a fire in Ise's pilgrimage town of Yamada 山田 in 1670. Although 189 Buddhist temples were destroyed, only 142 were allowed to be rebuilt in the following year. Yet another anti-Buddhist act occurred in 1671, when the priesthood of Ise's Outer Shrine was urged to remove all Buddhist elements (*ryōbu* 兩部) from their precincts. Since the town of Yamada was under the direct administration of the shogunate, such anti-Buddhist measures were executed by the local magistrate (*Yamada bugyō* 山田奉行) on shogunal orders. Ise is therefore not an example of *Domain Shinto* in the strict sense. Indeed, the exclusion of the Keikōin nuns is often attributed to Shogun Ietsuna. He is said to have believed that “ancient law” demanded the administration of Ise without Buddhism. According to *Chitose no matsu* 千載之松, however, these measures reflected the intentions of Hoshina Masayuki, Ietsuna's erstwhile guardian, whom we encountered above as one of the most typical representatives of *Domain Shinto*.²³ Regardless of who was ultimately responsible, the example of Ise tells us that the separation of Shinto and Buddhism or the retrenchment of Buddhist temples was certainly not at odds with shogunal religious policies during the Kanbun era.

Other shrine-centered projects of this period include the “renovation of old shrines” (*kogū saikō* 古宮再興) project of Tosa Kōchi 土佐高知 domain; the shrine restorations of Iyo Matsuyama 伊予松山 domain; the revival of Ninomiya Ono Jinja 二宮小野神社 in the Shinshū Matsumoto 信州松本 domain; and the restoration of Wakamiya Hachiman-sha 若宮八幡社 in the castle town of Nagoya 名古屋, where Tokugawa Mitsutomo 德川光友 (1625–1700) replaced Buddhist *shasō* with non-Buddhist Shinto clergy (*shinshoku* 神職).²⁴ In a similar vein, Tokugawa Mitsusada 德川光貞 (1627–1705) of Wakayama removed a Buddhist *bettō* temple from Kuzu Daimyōjin 九頭大明神 in 1678.²⁵

As in the *Domain Shinto* cases of Mito, Aizu, and Okayama, these projects did not necessarily aim at eradicating Buddhism. Rather, their common feature is a religious policy that applied the separation of Shinto and Buddhism to social reality. In the next section, I will take a closer look at the ideas and concepts upon which this policy was based.

21 Later, Hoshina Masayuki also eliminated Buddhist *shasō* from shrines in his domain, such as from Tōdera Hachimangū 塔寺八幡宮; see *Chitose no matsu* 千載之松 in Ganban 1916, p. 57. *Chitose no matsu* is a record of Hoshina Masayuki's sayings and deeds. It was compiled in 1828 based on firsthand reports by Masayuki's vassals.

22 The following synopsis of the case of Ise is based on Inoue 2009. See also Teeuwen 2021, pp. 160–161.

23 According to *Chitose no matsu*, it was Masayuki himself who proposed the relocation of Keikōin across the Miyagawa 宮川, the river which marked the borders of Ise, in 1666; see Ganban 1916, pp. 55–56.

24 On the Ninomiya Ono shrine, see Inoue 2007, pp. 5, 13–14, 16. For Nagoya, see Hayashi 1999, p. 685.

25 Tsuji 1955, pp. 339–340. Interestingly, Tsuji Zennosuke considered the case of Wakayama to be “one of the earliest cases of so-called *shinbutsu bunri*,” a perception corrected by subsequent research.

Domain Shinto's Guiding Ideas and Their Origins

With regard to the guiding ideas of the reforms by Tokugawa Mitsukuni in Mito and Hoshina Masayuki in Aizu, we are fortunate to have a few texts that not only document their policies, but also legitimate and explain the goals of their measures. In this section, I will introduce two of these works and compare them to a treatise written a generation earlier, a treatise that, in my opinion, was the inspiration for each of the Kanbun enterprises.

Mito Religious Concepts in the Shintō shūsei

The ideas upon which the religious policy of Mito was founded during the Kanbun period are expressed in the preface of *Shintō shūsei* 神道集成 (Compilation of writings on Shinto), a twelve-volume compendium of various matters related to Shinto. It was compiled by a group of Mito retainers headed by Imai Ariyori 今井有順 (1646–1683, also Tōken 桐軒) and saw its first edition in 1670.²⁶ In it we read:

After yin and yang separated from the original chaos, order was established in the world by the heavenly and the earthly deities, the Five Virtues, and the separation of sovereigns and vassals. The people were upright, and the Great Way was clear. . . . This Way was called the divine way (*shintō*), its teachings were called the divine teaching (*shinkyō* 神教), and its laws were called the divine law (*shinpō* 神法). The rulers naturally governed the realm and those who were ruled observed it by never ever departing from this Way.²⁷

Thus, the preface describes the creation of an ideal society in accordance with Shinto. It then laments the fact that this ideal society deteriorated in subsequent ages: As the imperial government (*ōkō* 王綱) fell into disarray, manners and customs declined, and dubious discourses appeared like “rising clouds and gushing fountains.” Furthermore, Buddhists such as Prince Shōtoku and Kūkai emerged and, through eloquent phrases, turned wrong into right. They explained *kami* as incarnations of buddhas, thus “muddying the sparkling purity of the original source (*sōgen*, or Shinto) with the filthy defilement of the dual parts (*ryōbu*, or syncretism).”²⁸ According to the text, the decline continued as records about antiquity were lost or misused by dubious religious figures. Therefore, those who wanted to know more about the ideal society of old and its “divine way” could not find any clues and their endeavors ended in frustration. Into this society came Tokugawa Mitsukuni, a highly virtuous, learned, and intelligent leader. Between his political duties, he read the “classics of foreign countries” (that is, the Confucian classics) and felt increasingly drawn to the “divine law” of Japan. Deploring the decline of the divine way, he searched for the means to restore it. The preface thus insinuates that Mitsukuni’s passion for Shinto was strengthened by his reading of Confucian texts, presenting him as an exponent of Shinto-Confucian unity.

The text goes on to report that Mitsukuni, determined to eliminate “heterodoxy” and clarify the “original source,” ordered his retainer Imai Ariyori and others to compile the *Shintō shūsei*. As explained elsewhere in the text, “heterodoxy” refers both to Buddhism and

²⁶ After 1670, more content was added and the work was finally completed in 1730. My analysis is based on the edition in ST 1.

²⁷ ST 1, p. 4.

²⁸ ST 1, p. 4. On the terms *sōgen* and *ryōbu*, see also Scheid’s contribution to this Special Section.

to the teachings of “shamans” (*fugeki* 巫覡).²⁹ Mitsukuni therefore believed that Buddhism as well as shamanism were responsible for disturbing the formerly ideal order of Shinto. As we have seen, the centers of activity of these religious currents—Buddhist temples and “illicit shrines”—indeed became the main targets of Mito’s religious retrenchments.

Aizu Religious Concepts in the Aizu jinja-shi

Next, let us examine the religious ideas of Aizu domain as they can be gathered from the preface to *Aizu jinja-shi* (1672), written by Hayashi Gahō 林鷲峰 (1618–1680), a son of Hayashi Razan. Gahō writes:

Kami exist; therefore we have to build shrines to worship them. This is the reason why at the Zhou 周 court in China . . . the emperor worshiped the deities of Heaven and Earth, the lords worshiped the deities of their realms, while bureaucrats and all kinds of people below them conducted rites specific to their roles and ranks. This is a law (*hō* 法) applying to past and present. [According to this law], in Japan we have revered Shinto since the beginning of time.³⁰

It is important to note that the Chinese Zhou dynasty, the ideal society according to Confucian thinking, is contrasted here with Japan. Nevertheless, both societies share the same “law.”

This state of affairs, however, came to an end when Buddhism appeared, and new shrines were created under its influence:

In some places, shrines from the Engi era (*shikinaisha*) still exist, but they are in ruins and hard to identify, while at other places evil illicit shrines (*jain no bokora* 邪淫之祠) are deluding people, causing harm.³¹

Thus, in the eyes of Gahō, “evil illicit shrines” or *inshi* are detrimental to ideal society in the same way as Buddhism is. Moreover, he identifies *inshi* with “new shrines,” that is, shrines that lack ancient origins, contrasting them with the *shikinaisha*. Even if they have become difficult to identify, *shikinaisha* shrines enable us to gain insights into the ideal society of the past.

Gahō continues by pointing out that it was Hoshina Masayuki who challenged this state of affairs through his “deep belief in Shinto.” He had envoys explore the histories (*engi*) of “thousands of shrines” in his domain, and on the basis of this investigation restored shrines of ancient pedigree and moved shrines on “defiled ground” (that is, shrines close to Buddhist structures) to better places. He defined “chief deities” (*shushin* 主神) for each district and merged small village shrines with them.³² Thus, the text illustrates quite concretely that Masayuki’s religious policies included restoring dilapidated *shikinaisha*, separating Shinto and Buddhism at sites that followed syncretic patterns, and establishing collective shrines,

29 ST 1, p. 4.

30 ZST 27, *Ronsetsu hen 2*, p. 100.

31 ZST 27, *Ronsetsu hen 2*, pp. 100–101.

32 ZST 27, *Ronsetsu hen 2*, p. 101.

like in Domain Shinto as practiced in Okayama. In conclusion, Gahō praises Masayuki's religious policies as the work of an exceptional domain lord as follows:

Building shrines and worshipping the *kami* is a matter of national importance; preserving things of old and restoring things abandoned is a matter of good government; venerating the original source (*sōgen*) accords to the propriety of this country; abolishing illicit shrines is a sign of wise political judgment.³³

Comparing the ideas on which Kanbun religious policies in Aizu and Mito were founded, we encounter a number of similarities. Both envisioned an ideal society existing in accordance with Shinto, and blamed Buddhism and illicit shrines for its decline. On the other hand, they stress the importance of *shikinaisha* as symbols of the ideal society. This retrospective utopia recalls the example of Matsudaira Yorishige, who had advised Shogun Ietsuna that while Japan was a “divine country,” the real state of this divine country had ceased to exist a long time ago.

The Source of Domain Shinto Concepts

The concepts discussed in the preceding sections did not suddenly appear during the Kanbun period. They can be traced back to a text written as early as 1646, namely the preface to *Jingi hōten* 神祇宝典 (Treasure books of the deities of heaven and earth), compiled by Tokugawa Yoshinao 徳川義直 (1601–1650), daimyo of Owari Nagoya 尾張名古屋 domain.³⁴ The *Jingi hōten* itself aims at identifying deities worshiped at *shikinaisha* and other famous old shrines.

The preface to the *Jingi hōten* can be summarized as follows: (1) Japan is a divine country created and inhabited by divine spirits; it follows the Way of the Gods (*shintō*). (2) During the reign of Emperor Daigo 醍醐天皇 (r. 897–930), illicit shrines were eliminated, and a system of shrine rules based on the 3,132 deities listed in the *Engishiki* emerged; it was similar to the system of shrines and offices established by the Zhou dynasty. (3) However, due to the spread of Buddhism, native *kami* were regarded as “traces” of the buddhas, leading to the idea of *honji suijaku* 本地垂迹. (4) When *kami* lose their names, they also lose their divine powers (*shintoku* 神徳), becoming merely spirits without a soul. (5) Having resented this for many years, Tokugawa Yoshinao did research on the deities enshrined in *shikinaisha* and prominent non-*shikinaisha* shrines based on classics such as the *Nihongi* 日本紀 and its explanations by Nakatomi 中臣 and Urabe priests; (6) demonstrating that Shinto is equivalent to Confucianism and the Way of the Sages.³⁵

These points are almost identical to the contents of the abovementioned prefaces of *Shintō shūsei* and *Aizu jinja-shi*. All texts agree that *shikinaisha* shrines are the embodiment of an ideal divine country (*shinkoku*) based on Shinto; that this country was comparable to the Zhou dynasty in China; that it was weakened and disturbed by the introduction of Buddhism; and that *shikinaisha* and other old shrines must be restored in order to revive the divine country. All this was based on the identification of Shinto with Confucianism. A point

33 ZST 27, *Ronsetsu hen* 2, p. 101.

34 The *Jingi hōten* consists of ten volumes. Volumes one through nine are a compilation of sources on ancient shrines. The tenth volume is devoted to illustrations of ritual tools.

35 *Jingi hōten*, in ST 38, *Jinja hen* 3, pp. 3–5.

of note is the mention of “illicit shrines,” which were removed, according to the *Jingi hōten*, when Emperor Daigo established the shrine rules of the *Engishiki*. This reveals that “illicit shrines” were also regarded as obstacles to an ideal society. Thus, all of the ideas that guided the Domain Shinto policies of the Kanbun era were already mentioned in the *Jingi hōten* preface.

While written in the name of Yoshinao, this preface was actually drafted by the official Confucian teacher of the *bakufu*, Hayashi Razan, who was also Yoshinao’s personal instructor in Confucian matters.³⁶ The text is clearly influenced by Razan’s specific Confucian interpretations of Shinto, but this does not mean that the work disregarded Yoshinao’s intentions. Its guiding ideas were in fact the product of both a feudal lord and a Confucian scholar.

Tokugawa Yoshinao was the ninth son of Tokugawa Ieyasu and therefore an uncle of Tokugawa Mitsukuni and Hoshina Masayuki. It is known that he wielded considerable influence over the scholarly interests of Mitsukuni in particular.³⁷ It is therefore quite plausible that a direct relationship existed between the *Jingi hōten* and *Shintō shūsei*, and that the *Jingi hōten* was indeed the inspiration for the distinctive religious policies developed in various domains during the Kanbun era. As the next section demonstrates, circumstantial evidence for this relationship can be also gained from certain key terms shared by Domain Shinto texts.

“Restore What Was Lost, Rejoin What Was Disconnected”

The first practical consequences of Tokugawa Yoshinao’s interest in shrines can be traced back to 1631, when he restored Masumida Jinja 真清田神社, the traditional first shrine (*ichinomiya* 一宮) of the province of Owari. Among this shrine’s rituals, we find a *norito* 祝詞 prayer praising the fact that Yoshinao “restored the lost [past] and rejoined disconnected [traditions]” (*sutaretaru o ba osame, taetaru o ba okoshite* 癡乎波修賣絶乎波興志亘).³⁸ In its Sino-Japanese reading, *kōhai keizetsu* 興廢繼絶, this phrase can also be found in other compilations by Yoshinao, for instance in a text called *Seikōki* 成功記 (Record of success).³⁹ It even appeared a hundred years later, when Masumida priests praised Yoshinao as the one who “rejoined the disconnected rituals and restored the abandoned halls and offices” (*keizetsu saishi, kōhai kyūkan* 繼絶祭祀、興廢宮館).⁴⁰ Interestingly, variations of this phrase can also be found in several subsequent cases of Domain Shinto that we introduced above:

- In Izumo’s shrine laws (Kizuki Taisha Hatto) of 1638, we encounter the expression “rejoin what was disconnected, restore what was lost” (*keizetsu kōhai* 繼絶興廢) in article nine, referring to the shrine’s repair.⁴¹
- In 1644, two years after Matsudaira Yorishige took over rulership in Takamatsu, he ordered repairs to the abovementioned Iwaseo Shrine. A memorial plaque (*munafuda* 棟札) at this shrine reminds us that, thanks to Yorishige’s benevolent administration, “all

36 Kyōto Shisekikai 1918, pp. 114–116.

37 Nishimura 1910, p. 79.

38 *Masumi tantōshū* 真清探桃集, in Masumida Jinja-shi 1995, p. 187.

39 Masumida Jinja-shi 1994, pp. 307–310.

40 *Masumi tantōshū*, in Masumida Jinja-shi 1995, p. 97.

41 Murata 1968, pp. 362–367.

- things lost were revived again” (*hyappai kankō* 百廢咸興).⁴² This phrase contains the pair *kō* 興 and *hai* 廢 (“revive” and “lost”) of Yoshinao’s eulogy.
- In 1658, Hayashi Gahō drafted a “Restoration Record of Asakura Shrine in Tosa” documenting events which had occurred the previous year.⁴³ In this text, Gahō uses the entire phrase *keizetsu kōhai* to praise the daimyo’s shrine repairs.
 - The preface to Mito’s *Shintō shūsei* uses the second pair of characters in Yoshinao’s phrase. Here, Tokugawa Mitsukuni is credited with “fame for rejoining what was disconnected” (*keizetsu no mei* 繼絕之名), alluding to his revival of an ideal society that had fallen into oblivion.⁴⁴
 - In the afterword of *Aizu jinja shi*, Hattori Ankyū 服部安休 (1619–1681), who was in charge of the shrine reorganization project in Aizu, described Hoshina Masayuki as the man who “restored the lost Way of the Gods and rejoined the disconnected shrines” (*shintō no sutaretaru o okoshi, jinja no taetaru o tsugu* 興神道之廢、繼神社之絕).⁴⁵

As these examples indicate, the phrase *kōhai keizetsu*, initially associated with Tokugawa Yoshinao, became a kind of motto for Domain Shinto lords and their Confucian tutors in the Kanbun era.

Yoshinao’s Legacy

Tokugawa Yoshinao was already interested in *shikinaisha* in the 1620s. This is evidenced by the fact that in 1626 he asked Bonshun 梵舜 (1553–1632), a member of the Yoshida family and expert on Yoshida Shinto, about the deities of the shrines listed in the *Engishiki*.⁴⁶ As mentioned above, this interest soon resulted in his restoration of Masumida Jinja in 1631. In many other respects, however, Yoshinao did not develop a particularly distinctive religious policy. Contrary to his aggressive criticism of *shinbutsu shūgō* in the *Jingi hōten*, he left mixed religious institutions untouched. Masumida Jinja, for instance, housed a number of Buddhist halls within its precincts and was in fact typical of the traditional combination of Shinto and Buddhism. Until the medieval period, Buddhist rituals performed by shrine monks (*shasō*) played a major role in the festival calendar. However, Yoshinao did not abolish the Buddhist shrine clergy when he restored the shrine in 1631. In 1649, he even issued some regulations obligating the *shasō* of Masumida Jinja to take part in its festivals.⁴⁷

Thus, Yoshinao’s religious policy did not put his anti-Buddhist stance into practice, nor was his renovation program extended to all shrines in his domain. His ideas, however, anticipated the policies of Mito and Aizu during the Kanbun era. Therefore, we can regard the Domain Shinto policies of that time as a continuation of Yoshinao’s philosophy and as an active attempt to turn it into social reality.

42 *Munafuda*, literally roof ridge slips, are short texts documenting the construction of a building that were traditionally written on wooden boards and placed under the roof of the building in question. See Matsudaira Kōekikai 1964, p. 304.

43 *Tōsa no kuni Asakura no miya saikō no ki* 土佐国朝倉宮再興記, in Hino 1997, pp. 82–84.

44 ST 1, p. 4.

45 ZST 27, *Ronsetsu hen* 2, p. 121.

46 According to Tanabe Hiroshi 田辺裕, the idea to compile this *Jingi hōten* can be traced back to 1622, see Tanabe 1968.

47 *Masumi tantōshū*, in Masumida Jinja-shi 1995, pp. 199–200.

Shrine Restorations as a Constitutive Element of Domain Shinto

Daimyo Prior to the Kanbun Era

Tokugawa Yoshinao's interest in the restoration of old shrines and the reestablishment of *shikinaisha* was shared by other feudal lords of his time as well. In 1648, two years after the *Jingi hōten* was drafted, Sakakibara Tadatsugu 榊原忠次 (1605–1665), lord of the Ōshū Shirakawa 奥州白河 domain, restored Hokotsuki Jinja 榊衝神社 in the district of Iwase 岩瀬. Tadatsugu was a most trusted lord from the ranks of former vassals (*fudai* 譜代) of the Tokugawa. His shrine restoration was documented by Hayashi Gahō, who stressed the fact that Hokotsuki Jinja was a *shikinaisha* that had fallen into complete disrepair and was restored on the singlehanded initiative of a daimyo who prayed there for the safety of his domain and family.⁴⁸ Similar to Yoshinao's case, Tadatsugu's restoration also retained elements of the traditional Shinto-Buddhist amalgamation. This can be inferred from a plaque (*munafuda*) dated to the fifth month of the same year (1648), which states that the repairs were dedicated to both the main Shinto deity, Hokotsuki Daimyōjin 榊衝大明神, and its *honji* buddha, the Eleven-Headed Kannon.⁴⁹

Yoshinao's younger brother Tokugawa Yorinobu 徳川頼宣 (1602–1671) also demonstrated a special interest in *shikinaisha* and other old shrines in his domain of Kii Wakayama 紀伊和歌山 when he conducted a survey of such shrines in 1650. Based on this investigation, the domain erected stone markers for shrines of uncertain whereabouts that had fallen into disuse and obscurity.⁵⁰ This example is noteworthy because in this case, Shinto measures were not confined to restoring existing shrines or identifying their deities. Thus, Yorinobu pushed the shrine restoration policies of Yoshinao and Tadatsugu a step further.

Moreover, *tozama daimyō* 外様大名, that is, daimyo who did not belong to the inner circles of the regime, also became interested in *shikinaisha* around this time. In 1657, for instance, Yamauchi Tadayoshi 山内忠義 (1592–1665), the second-generation daimyo of the Tosa Kōchi domain in Shikoku, restored Asakura Jinja 朝倉神社, a local *shikinaisha* mentioned in the *Nihon shoki*. Moreover, Tosa turned to the Yoshida in Kyoto in the hope of gaining more information about the *shikinaisha* deities of his domain.⁵¹ From this example, we can infer that the ancient deities of Tosa, including those of Asakura Jinja, had completely fallen into oblivion, and that it was the domain lord who took on the task of identifying them. This case resembles that of Yoshinao, not only in the special effort to rediscover the names of ancient shrine deities (for which Yoshinao initially also turned to the Yoshida), but also for applying the motto *keizetsu kōhai* familiar from Yoshinao's *Jingi hōten*.

Daimyo from the Kanbun Era Onward

While the above examples of shrine restoration policies may have been inspired by the growing anti-Buddhist ideology of the time, they did not put anti-Buddhism into practice. Domain Shinto before the Kanbun era did not include any destructive measures, but rather aimed at the gradual restoration of an ideal society through a constructive policy of shrine renovation. From the Kanbun era onward, however, Domain Shinto introduced measures

48 "Kinensai harae no batsu" 祈年祭祓禊, in Hino 1997, p. 349.

49 Naganumachō-shi 1997, p. 842.

50 *Kii zoku fudoki* 紀伊続風土記, cited in Wakayama-shi 1965, p. 435; Wakayamashi-shi 1989, p. 219.

51 *Ohiroma zakki* 御広間雑記, entry from Meireki 明暦 3 (1657).7.21 (Yoshida Bunko 吉田文庫, Tenri Central Library).

resulting in the oppression of Buddhism. In addition to Mito, Aizu, and Okayama, there were the above-cited cases of Tokugawa Mitsutomo, successor to Yoshinao in the Nagoya domain, and Tokugawa Mitsusada, son and successor of Yorinobu in Wakayama, who removed Buddhist clergy when they restored the ancient shrines in their domains. Thus, Domain Shinto of the Kanbun era continued the constructive policy of shrine revival but shifted towards realizing the anti-Buddhist ideas that had always been part of its ideology.

While anti-Buddhism waned again after the Kanbun era in the 1680s, the emphasis on *shikinaisha* spread to a number of other domains:

- In 1676, the domain of Hirado 平戸 in Kyushu engaged in a particularly large-scale effort to identify and revive all *shikinaisha* on the island of Iki 壱岐.
- From 1680 to 1682, a few *shikinaisha* shrines in the Ōshū Iwakitaira 奥州磐城平 domain were rebuilt.
- In 1699, Wakayama changed the name of the abovementioned Kuzu Daimyōjin. This was done with the help of the Yoshida, who revealed it as the *shikinaisha* shrine Sasutahiko Jinja 刺田比古神社. As a *shikinaisha*, the shrine was given additional land in 1712 by Tokugawa Yoshimune 徳川吉宗 (1684–1751), who later became shogun.
- In 1705, the Confucian scholar Tani Shigetō 谷重遠 (1663–1718, also Jinzan 秦山) drafted a study on the locations and deities of *shikinaisha* shrines in Tosa (*Tosa no kuni shikisha kō* 土佐国式社考). The study was commissioned by the domain. Subsequently, the domain planned to erect stone markers on the sites of vanished *shikinaisha* shrines following the example of Wakayama one generation earlier.
- In 1714, Dewa Kubota 出羽久保田 domain revived one of its *shikinaisha* and ranked it above all other local shrines.

Thus, Domain Shinto's constitutive concern for reestablishing ancient, long-forgotten shrines continued well into the eighteenth century.⁵²

Shinto-Confucian Theory and Practice

Already in the time of Tokugawa Yoshinao, the politics of Domain Shinto were complemented by the creation and promotion of Confucian rituals. This section attempts to demonstrate that this was done in line with the Shinto-Confucian ideologies forming the basis of Domain Shinto. I will then show that this Shinto-Confucian mix is not to be confused with Yoshida Shinto.

Confucian Ritualism

The introduction of Confucianism to Japan dates to the fifth century. In the seventh and eighth centuries, the court adopted the legal and administrative code of China, the *ritsurō* 律令 system, which included the *sekiten* 积奠, a public ceremony for worshiping Confucius. The rite was introduced at the Academic Bureau (*daigakuryō* 大学寮), which oversaw the education of the courtly administrative elite. However, with the imperial court's decline in the later Heian 平安 period of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the *sekiten* rite also fell into oblivion.

52 For the details of these cases, see Inoue 2007.

By the medieval period it was virtually unknown, practiced by only a few court nobles and at the Ashikaga Academy 足利学校 in the province of Shimotsuke 下野 (today's Tochigi).

When the Tokugawa came to power, however, *sekiten* was revived, albeit not in the context of court ritualism. The key players in this development were Hayashi Razan and his disciple in Confucian matters, the abovementioned Tokugawa Yoshinao. In 1632, the Hayashi family built a Confucian hall—literally a “sage hall” (*seidō* 聖堂)—dedicated to Confucius and other Confucian saints. This was supported by Tokugawa Yoshinao, who had himself established a Confucian hall in Nagoya sometime before 1629.⁵³

Yoshinao also took a keen interest in the rituals of the Confucian hall at the Ashikaga Academy in Shimotsuke, including the *sekiten* rite. When he stopped there on his way to the Tokugawa mausoleum at Nikkō 日光 in 1636, Yoshinao noted that the form of their rituals differed from those described in the *Engishiki* and had them revised.⁵⁴ Together with Yoshinao's esteem of *shikinaisha*, this confirms his idealization of the *ritsuryō* system (which the *Engishiki* was part of). Later, in 1668, the Tokugawa funded the renovation of the Confucian hall at the Ashikaga Academy.⁵⁵ The *sekiten* and related rituals were also adopted by Ikeda Mitsumasa, becoming part of his distinctive religious policy in Okayama.⁵⁶

Despite his tolerant political stance towards Buddhism, but in line with his religious thinking, Yoshinao strongly opposed the idea of having his own funeral performed in a Buddhist way, and wished to have a Confucian ceremony.⁵⁷ When he died in 1650, however, the vassals of Nagoya domain were anxious to avert any negative reaction from a Buddhist-influenced shogunate and had a large number of Buddhist monks involved in the funeral ceremony. Yoshinao was finally buried in a Confucian style, but his grave was placed in a Buddhist temple.

His nephew Tokugawa Mitsukuni, who greatly admired his uncle, was furious at this and blamed his chief vassals for disregarding his uncle's will.⁵⁸ Mitsukuni interred his own father Yorifusa 徳川頼房 (1603–1661) according to Confucian rites in 1661 and established a Confucian-style family mausoleum.⁵⁹ From 1655, Ikeda Mitsumasa also changed the funeral rites of his forefathers from Buddhism to Confucianism. In 1659, he built up a Confucian-style family mausoleum, and in 1665, he established a Confucian graveyard in the Waidani 和意谷 region of his domain. He had the remains of his grandfather and father transferred to this site from their family temple in Kyoto in 1667.⁶⁰ Soon, other daimyo followed suit in instating Confucian funerals. These included the Hitotsuyanagi 一柳 of Iyo Komatsu 伊予小松 and the Nagai 永井 of Tango Miyazu 丹後宮津, who both built Confucian ancestor halls (*shidō* 祠堂) in the mid-1670s.⁶¹

53 Nishimura 1910, pp. 55–62; McMullen 2020, pp. 173–176.

54 Nishimura 1910, pp. 66–70.

55 According to a memorial roof ridge plaque dating to this time (Kawakami 1880, appendix 2–4), Shogun Ietsuna provided the money, while Doi Toshifusa 土井利房 (1631–1683), whose domain included the Ashikaga district at that time, had the repairs done by his retainers.

56 For details, see McMullen 2021.

57 Tsuji 1955, pp. 338–339.

58 Nishimura 1910, pp. 168–172; Tamamuro 1968, pp. 871–873.

59 Azuma 2008b.

60 Azuma 2008a.

61 Hino 1997, pp. 119–121, 124.

The Identification of Shinto with Confucianism

Why would domain lords such as Tokugawa Yoshinao, Tokugawa Mitsukuni, or Ikeda Mitsumasa, who put great efforts into restoring ancient shrines, adopt Confucian funeral rites? The reason is their belief in the unity of Shinto and Confucianism (*shinju itchi*). This conviction was shared not only by those lords who adopted Confucian funerals, but also by many other leaders of Domain Shinto, including Matsudaira Naomasa and Hoshina Masayuki. As we have seen, the texts documenting their policies (the prefaces of *Jingi hōten*, *Shintō shūsei*, and *Aizu jinja-shi*) are imbued with this philosophy. These works were collaborations between daimyo and Confucian scholars in their service. The preface of *Jingi hōten* was drafted by Razan in the name of Yoshinao, while that of *Aizu jinja-shi* was written by Razan's son Gahō, who also documented the restoration of Hokotsuki Shrine by Sakakibara Tadatsugu, and that of Asakura Shrine by Tosa's Yamauchi Tadayoshi. Razan's disciple Kurosawa Sekisai was involved in the separation of Shinto and Buddhism at Izumo's Kizuki Shrine. Most policies that combined shrine revivals with anti-Buddhism in the mid- and late seventeenth century were therefore based on the Shinto-Confucian philosophy of the Hayashi, in other words, on Razan's Ritō Shinchi Shinto.

While scholars such as Maruyama Masao 丸山真男 (1914–1996) considered Razan's neo-Confucianism the leading ideology of the early Tokugawa, in recent decades critics like Herman Ooms have downplayed Razan's historical importance.⁶² In fact, Ooms has rightfully pointed out that the Zhu Xi 朱熹 studies by the Hayashi house did not constitute the official ideology of the *bakufu* during the time of Razan.⁶³ Nevertheless, when we focus on the distinctive religious policies of powerful daimyo in the later seventeenth century, the phenomena we call Domain Shinto, we must acknowledge that the political impact of Razan's Shinto-Confucian thinking was indeed enormous.

The reasons why Domain Shinto was founded on the premise of Shinto-Confucian unity have been discussed at length in my recent article "Shinto as a Quasi-Confucian Ideology."⁶⁴ Let me just repeat here that these reasons were ultimately related to the specific geopolitical situation of Japan in the seventeenth century: on the one hand, Japan was trying to achieve the status of a "civilized" East Asian nation and thus felt the need to adopt Confucian virtues; on the other hand, these Confucian virtues were diametrically opposed to the essence of the Tokugawa warrior culture, namely, "martiality" (*bu* 武). Confucian Shinto was, in my view, an attempt to resolve this conundrum.

Domain Shinto and Yoshida Shinto

Finally, I would like to add a word about the influence of Yoshida Shinto on Domain Shinto. In contrast to Razan's Shinto—which was probably influenced by the ideas of Yoshida Kanetomo 吉田兼俱 (1435–1511)—there was very little direct impact. This may come as a surprise, considering that Tokugawa Yoshinao in Owari and Yamauchi Tadayoshi in Tosa asked the Yoshida for advice regarding the deities of their *shikinaisha* shrines, that Tokugawa Mitsukuni in Mito sent local priests to Kyoto in order to study under the Yoshida, and that Matsudaira Yorishige in Takamatsu had a priest with family relations to the Yoshida

62 See, for instance, Maruyama 1974.

63 Ooms 1985, pp. 72–75.

64 Inoue 2021.

installed at Shirotori Shrine in his domain. Moreover, the *Jingi hōten* contains a reference to the “explanations of the Urabe” and Ikeda Mitsumasa sought the endorsement of the Yoshida when he established his collective shrines in Okayama. However, the Yoshida only wielded authority in specialist fields such as shrine ritualism, priestly succession, and the correct identification of shrine deities. Yoshida Shinto, or rather the priestly tradition of the Urabe house, was not meant as a theory of Shinto. The Yoshida derived their authority from the fact that they were the only lineage of priests who had transmitted “pure Shinto” since the Age of the Gods—a fiction, of course—and that they served as high officials in the Office of Deities at the court. As such, they decided ceremonial issues related to shrines and the priesthood. With regard to the guiding ideas of Domain Shinto and its religious policies, however, they had no direct influence at all.

Conclusion

Domain Shinto comprises specific religious policies that came to the fore most prominently in the domains of Mito, Aizu, and Okayama during the Kanbun era. These policies sought the reestablishment of a divine country that had existed in antiquity and was based on Shinto. This idea appears already in the *Jingi hōten* of 1646 and can be traced as far back as the 1620s. In practice, Domain Shinto meant restoring and reviving ancient shrines, such as *shikinaisha*, removing Buddhist elements from shrines, and abolishing temples and shrines without ancient pedigree. The proponents of Domain Shinto were styled as lords who “restore and rejoin what was lost and disconnected” (*kōhai keizetsu*). The ideal of reestablishing a divine country was based on a Shinto-Confucian worldview that regarded the semi-mythic Zhou dynasty of China as the model of an ideal society. It culminated in the creation of Japanese Confucian ceremonies and funerary rites.

Prior to the Kanbun era, many shrine revivals had already been based on anti-Buddhist ideologies, but these remained confined to individual shrines or studies on shrine history. They had no significant impact on the religious *status quo*. Shrines of the common Shinto-Buddhist pattern were allowed to continue their traditions undisturbed. Nevertheless, ideological and personal relations between local shrine policies before and during the Kanbun years suggest a continuity that the term Domain Shinto helps highlight. Moreover, the phenomena called Domain Shinto here have long been regarded as policies related to Buddhism, following Tsuji Zennosuke and Tamamuro Fumio. As demonstrated above, however, their primary target was Shinto.

Yet even if Domain Shinto can be traced back to the 1620s, the Kanbun era marks a clear programmatic shift, with anti-Buddhist policies, the destruction of syncretic shrines, and the introduction of Confucian funeral rites. Further research is needed regarding the reasons for this shift in light of the religious policies of the central government during the same period. In this article, I have limited my discussion to how concepts in pre- and post-Kanbun Domain Shinto were similar, and yet the means employed were different.

Finally, let us consider how Domain Shinto came to an end. It is well known that Ikeda Mitsumasa’s anti-Buddhist policies in Okayama displeased the *bakufu* and had to be abandoned after his reign. This led to a slackening of anti-Buddhist policies in other domains as well. However, if we do not regard Buddhism as the primary target of Domain Shinto, the end of anti-Buddhist policies does not necessarily imply the end of Domain Shinto. Indeed, initiatives to revive *shikinaisha* continued in many domains well into the eighteenth century.

On the other hand, new ideas regarding shrines emerged by the end of the seventeenth century at the latest. For example, Mano Tokitsuna 真野時繩 (1648–1717), a priest of Tsushima Gozu Tennō-sha 津島牛頭天王社 in Owari, strongly criticized the idea that Japanese shrines should imitate Chinese rituals without respecting the differences (*sai* 差異) between Japan and China. This was, in Mano's view, no different from *honji suijaku* theory.⁶⁵ Thus, half a century after Tokugawa Yoshinao, the daimyo of Owari, requested a Confucian funeral, priests in the same domain rejected the identification of Shinto not only with Buddhism but also with Confucianism, resulting in a search for the uniqueness of Japanese culture. A new trend to free Japan from the “Chinese mind” (*karagokoro* 漢意) emerged in intellectual circles, and the idea of Shinto-Confucian unity began to fade. In order to determine the end of Domain Shinto, it will be necessary to examine whether the emphasis in various domains on *shikinaisha* in the eighteenth century was still based on a Shinto-Confucian ideology. Moreover, it will be necessary to examine how Domain Shinto emerged, including the fact that it was mainly carried out by Tokugawa leaders, against the backdrop of the social conditions of the first half of the seventeenth century.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

ST *Shintō taikai* 神道大系. 120 volumes. Edited by Shintō Taikai Hensankai 神道大系編纂會, Shintō Taikai Hensankai, 1977–1994.

ZST *Zoku shintō taikai* 續神道大系. 50 volumes. Edited by Shintō Taikai Hensankai. Shintō Koten Kenkyūjo, 1995–2007.

Aizu Wakamatsu-shi 1965

Aizu Wakamatsu-shi Shuppaniinkai 会津若松市出版委員会, eds. *Aizu Wakamatsu-shi: Aizu-han no kakuritsu kinsei 2* 会津若松史: 会津藩の確立 近世 2. Aizu Wakamatsu-shi Shuppaniinkai, 1965.

Azuma 2008a

Azuma Jūji 吾妻重二. “Ikeda Mitsumasa to jukyō sōsai girei” 池田光政と儒教喪祭儀礼. *Higashi Ajia bunka kōshō kenkyū* 東アジア文化交渉研究 1 (2008), pp. 79–104.

Azuma 2008b

Azuma Jūji. “Mito Tokugawa-ke to jukyō girei: Sairei o chūshin ni” 水戸徳川家と儒教儀礼: 祭礼を中心に. *Ajia bunka kōryū kenkyū* アジア文化交流研究 3 (2008), pp. 219–245.

Ganban 1916

Ganban Shiryō Kankōkai 岩磐史料刊行会, eds. *Ganban shiryō sōsho* 1 岩磐史料叢書上卷. Ganban Shiryō Kankōkai, 1916.

Hayashi 1999

Hayashi Tōichi 林董一, ed. *Shinshū Nagoyashishi* 3 新修名古屋市史 第3巻. Nagoya-shi, 1999.

Hino 1997

Hino Tatsuo 日野龍夫, ed. *Gahō Rin gakushi bunshū* 鷲峰林学士文集. Perikansha, 1997.

65 Mano Tokitsuna, *Kokon shingaku ruiben* 古今神学類編, in ST 2, p. 358.

Inoue 2007

Inoue Tomokatsu 井上智勝. “17 seiki chūkōki no ryōshu kenryoku to Ichinomiya, shikinaisha: Sono hogo, kenshō seisaku to seitōsei” 一七世紀中後期の領主権力と一宮・式内社: その保護・顕彰政策と正当性. *Nihon shūkyō bunkashi kenkyū* 日本宗教文化史研究 11:2 (2007), pp. 1–18.

Inoue 2009

Inoue Tomokatsu. “Kanbun 9 nen shikinensengū: Jingū ni okeru shinbutsu bunri to bakuhan kenryokusha no shisō” 寛文九年式年遷宮: 神宮における神仏分離と幕藩権力者の思想. In *Ise jingū to kamigami no bijutsu: dai 62 kai shikinensengū kinen tokubetsu ten* 伊勢神宮と神々の美術: 第62回式年遷宮記念特別展, edited by the Tokyo National Museum, Osaka Museum of History, Kasumikaikan, and the Sankei Newspaper. Kasumikaikan 2009, pp. 162–164.

Inoue 2021

Tomokatsu Inoue. “Shinto as a Quasi-Confucian Ideology.” In Köck et al. 2021, pp. 91–102.

Kagawa-ken 1989

Kagawa-ken 香川県, eds. *Kagawa-kenshi tsūshihen 3 kinsei 1* 香川県史 通史編 第三卷 近世 I. Shikoku News, 1989.

Kasei Jikki 1976

Kasei Jikki Kanpon Hensaniinkai 家世実紀刊本編纂委員会, eds. *Aizu-han kasei jikki 2* 会津藩家世実紀 第二卷. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1976.

Kawakami 1880

Kawakami Hiroki 川上廣樹. *Ashikaga gakkō jiseki-kō* 足利学校事蹟考. Kimura Yūzō, 1880.

Köck 2021

Stefan Köck. “Domain Shinto and *shintō-uke* in Okayama-han.” In Köck et al. 2021, pp. 163–175.

Köck et al. 2021

Stefan Köck, Brigitte Pickl-Kolaczka, and Bernhard Scheid, eds. *Religion, Power, and the Rise of Shinto in Early Modern Japan*. Bloomsbury, 2021.

Kyōto Shisekikai 1918

Kyōto Shisekikai 京都史蹟会, eds. *Razan Hayashi-sensei bunshū 2* 羅山林先生文集 卷2. Heian Kōkogakkai, 1918.

Maruyama 1974

Masao Maruyama. *Studies in Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*. Princeton University Press, 1974.

Masumida Jinja-shi 1994

Masumida Jinja-shi Hensaniinkai 真清田神社史編纂委員会, eds. *Masumida jinja-shi* 真清田神社史. Masumida Jinja-shi Hensaniinkai, 1994.

Masumida Jinja-shi 1995

Masumida Jinja-shi Hensaniinkai, eds. *Masumida jinja-shi shiryō-ben* 真清田神社史 資料編. Masumida Jinja-shi Hensaniinkai, 1995.

Matsudaira Kōekikai 1964

Matsudaira Kōekikai 松平公益会, eds. *Takamatsu hanso Matsudaira Yorishige den* 高松藩祖松平頼重伝. Matsudaira Kōekikai, 1964.

- McMullen 2020
James McMullen. *The Worship of Confucius in Japan*. Harvard University Asia Center, 2020.
- McMullen 2021
James McMullen. “Ikeda Mitsumasa and Confucian Ritual.” In Köck et al. 2021, pp. 117–131.
- Murata 1968
Murata Masashi 村田正志, ed. *Izumo no kuni-no-miyatsuko ke monjo* 出雲国造家文書. Seibundō Shuppan, 1968.
- Naganumachō-shi 1997
Naganumachō-shi Hensaniinkai 長沼町史編纂委員会, eds. *Naganumachō-shi 3 shiryōhen* 2 長沼町史 第3巻 資料編 2. Naganumachō, 1997.
- Nishimura 1910
Nishimura Tokitsune 西村時彦. *Owari keikō* 尾張敬公. Nagoya Kaifu Sanbyakunen Kinenkai, 1910.
- Nishioka 2002
Nishioka Kazuhiko 西岡和彦. *Kinsei Izumo Taisha no kisoteki kenkyū* 近世出雲大社の基礎的研究. Taimeidō, 2002.
- Ooms 1985
Herman Ooms. *Tokugawa Ideology: Early Constructs, 1570–1680*. Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Pickl-Kolaczia 2021
Brigitte Pickl-Kolaczia. “‘Kami Is Kami, Buddha Is Buddha’: Religious Policies in Mito Domain in the Later Seventeenth Century.” Köck et al. 2021, pp. 177–189.
- Saiki 1979
Saiki Kazuma 斎木一馬, ed. *Tokugawa shoka keifu* 3 徳川諸家系譜 第3. Zokugunshoruijū Kanseikai, 1979.
- Scheid 2003
Bernhard Scheid. “‘Both Parts’ or ‘Only One’? Challenges to the Honji Suijaku Paradigm in the Edo Period.” In *Buddhas and Kami in Japan: Honji Suijaku as a Combinatory Paradigm*, edited by Mark Teeuwen and Fabio Rambelli. Routledge, 2003, pp. 204–221.
- Taira et al. 1972
Taira Shigemichi 平重道 and Abe Akio 阿部秋生, eds. “Shintō denju” 神道伝授. In *Nihon shisō taikai* 日本思想大系 39. Iwanami Shoten 1972, pp. 12–57.
- Tamamuro 1968
Tamamuro Fumio 圭室文雄. “Kanbun, Genroku no shaji kaikaku” 寛文・元禄の社寺改革. In *Mito-shi shi, chūkan* 1 水戸市史 中巻 (一), edited by Itō Tasaburō 伊東多三郎. Mito Shiyakusho, 1968, pp. 836–876.
- Tamamuro 1971
Tamamuro Fumio. *Edo bakufu no shūkyō tōsei* 江戸幕府の宗教統制. Hyōronsha, 1971.
- Tamamuro 1987
Tamamuro Fumio. *Nihon bukkō shi, kinsei* 日本仏教史 近世. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987.

Tamamuro 2003

Tamamuro Fumio. “Edo-jidai no mura chinju no jittai: Mito-hanryō mura chinju no sūryōteki kentō” 江戸時代の村鎮守の実態: 水戸藩領村鎮守の数量的検討. *Meiji daigaku kyōyō ronshū* 明治大学教養論集 368 (2003), pp. 1–27.

Tanabe 1968

Tanabe Hiroshi 田辺裕. “Tokugawa Yoshinao no Ise sangū: ‘Jingi hōten’ no seiritsu ni kanren shite” 徳川義直の伊勢参宮: 「神祇宝典」の成立に関連して. *Kōgakkan ronsō* 皇學館論叢 1:4 (1968), pp. 39–48.

Taniguchi 1964

Taniguchi Sumio 谷口澄夫. *Okayama hansei-shi no kenkyū* 岡山藩政史の研究. Hanawa Shobō, 1964.

Teeuwen 2021

Mark Teeuwen. “Shinto in the 1660s and 1670s: The Shrine Clauses of 1665 as an Expression of Domain Shinto.” In Köck et al. 2021, pp. 151–162.

Tsuji 1953

Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助. *Nihon bukkyōshi 8 kinsei-hen 2* 日本佛教史 第8卷 近世篇之二. Iwanami Shoten, 1953.

Tsuji 1955

Tsuji Zennosuke. *Nihon bukkyōshi 10 kinsei-hen 4* 日本佛教史 第10卷 近世篇之四. Iwanami Shoten, 1955.

Wakayama-shi 1965

Wakayama-shi 和歌山市, eds. *Wakayama shiyō* 和歌山史要. Wakayama Shiyakusho, 1965.

Wakayamashi-shi 1989

Wakayamashi-shi Hensaniinkai 和歌山市史編纂委員会, eds. *Wakayamashi-shi 2; kinsei*. 和歌山市史 第2卷 近世. Wakayama-shi, 1989.

Zhong 2016

Yijiang Zhong. *The Origin of Modern Shinto in Japan: The Vanquished Gods of Izumo*. Bloomsbury, 2016.