Japanese Journal of Religious Studies 2000 27/3–4

Bodies of Evidence

Imperial Funeral Rites and the Meiji Restoration

Edmund T. GILDAY

Prior to the Meiji period (1868–1912) imperial funerals and memorial rites in Japan had been conducted as Buddhist ceremonies for over a millennium. It is said that the emperor Meiji's father, Kōmei, was buried according to Buddhist protocols; it was not until memorial rites in 1869 marking the third anniversary of Kōmei's death that all vestiges of Buddhist liturgy were ostensibly proscribed as part of a wider attempt to purify the nation of the evil of Buddhism. But these observations tend to obscure what is actually known about the imperial mortuary tradition, especially at critical moments in its modern metamorphosis. This essay questions the historical judgment that Kōmei's mortuary rites mark a clean break with tradition, suggesting instead that the twentieth-century conventions of imperial mortuary practice did not in fact get established until after the Meiji period had come to an end.

Keywords: Kōmei — Meiji — *sōsō girei* — *shinsōsai* — *sanryō* — *taisō(-gi)* — *shinbutsu bunri* — Japanese emperor

THE STUDY OF the modern Japanese emperor system in English language scholarship has made remarkable strides in the past fifteen years, with new and valuable attention paid to the ritual dimensions of the Meiji revolution (see GLUCK 1985; HARDACRE 1989; KETELAAR 1990; FUJITANI 1996). One area that has not received the attention it deserves, however, is the matter of imperial death. In an effort to stimulate further discussion of this important topic, I want to begin with some questions. First of all, what is known about premodern imperial funerals besides the fact that Buddhist monks participated? Were Buddhists then in fact excluded from participation as a result of the imperial restoration? If so, what did the Meiji reformers find to replace the disgraced Buddhist procedures? What traditional forms could they turn to in crafting a new but appropriately Japanese imperial funeral style?

This overview of mortuary issues attending the Meiji revolution begins with a telephoto snapshot of the terrain of imperial death and its practical (ritual) consequences prior to the 1860s. After a brief excursus into Edo-era contentions over general funeral practices that led to the development of a new style of funeral known as *shinsōsai* 神葬祭 we turn to the emperor Meiji's father, Kōmei, and his demise. Finally, the investigation moves to the latter years of the Meiji period, when the first post-revolution imperial funerals had to be staged.

As is well known, the attacks against Buddhism nationwide in the Meiji period had roots in provincial disputes over ritual authority as far back as the seventeenth century, when local and regional Shinto shrines began to petition for the right to conduct funeral services according to "local" or family traditions rather than follow the general rule that all funerals be conducted by (and fees paid to) Buddhist priests (KATŌ 1976, pp. 194–95). These non-Buddhist rites were labeled *shinsō* 神葬 or *shinsōsai*, where the character for *shin* 神 is the same as that for "kami." As a result, these funeral rites were subsequently associated, especially during the Meiji period, with something called "Shinto." Perhaps not surprisingly, a closer look at the early modern funeral ceremonies thus characterized as "native" or Shinto reveals the basic pattern for imperial rites that was later institutionalized at the end of the Meiji period. Preparation of the corpse, the timing and manner of encoffining, the style of funeral procession and burial, protocols for post-internment mortuary practices, and the importance of various ritual paraphernalia in the modern imperial funeral system all seem to be traceable back to the extraordinary "Shinto" funeral patterns that emerged locally in the seventeenth century.

My research into these matters began innocently enough as a footnote to my interest in the modern Japanese accession process. I was immediately intrigued by the similarity of these non-Buddhist funeral procedures to those described in Chu Hsi's famous manual, *Family Rituals* (*Chu Tzu chia-li* 朱子家礼, known in Japan as *Kōbun karei* 公文家礼).[1] On the basis of this evidence alone, I began to understand the extent to which nascent Shintoism as a ritual system was identifiable more by explicit differentiation from Buddhism than by any continuity with a primordial Japanese tradition of practice. To put the matter differently, it quickly became clear to me that what the Meiji architects were drawing on in the case of Edo period Shinto funerals was not a "native" system of ideas and practices in the modern sense of the word, but rather (at least early on) a loosely related set of local funeral practices that had been self-consciously promoted as an alternative to Buddhist

[1] My suspicions were confirmed when I consulted KONDŌ 1989 and 1990.

practices. At the same time, certain significant differences between modern imperial funerals and those earlier Shinto rites alerted me to the need to investigate pre-Meiji imperial funerals more thoroughly, and that of Emperor Kōmei 孝明 (1831–1867) in particular. This essay explores various funeral models available to the Meiji reformers in their efforts to design a "pure" and "native" imperial ritual system. My interest in this regard is not to discover "origins" in the genetic sense, but rather to understand the modern imperial funeral system in terms of the various precedents that the architects of that system might have had to draw upon, and what kinds of choices they eventually made.

Historical Background

IMPERIAL RITES

As Gary EBERSOLE (1989) and others have amply demonstrated, imperial funerary procedures prior to the use of Buddhist ceremonials at the funeral of Emperor Shōmu 聖武 (d. 756) are a matter of some conjecture. There is, for example, some question as to precisely when Buddhist practices became central to imperial funerary procedures, but certainly by the time of Shōmu they had (WADA 1976; WADA 1982, p. 178). There is no doubt, however, that as early as the seventh century aristocratic funerary protocols were already deeply informed by continental precedents, including forms of ritual entertainment during the temporary internment and the subsequent procession to the burial site, as well as changes in mourning conventions. WATABE Mayumi's (1993) comparative analysis of Chinese and Japanese funerary practices between the seventh and ninth century offers systematic evidence of these influences from the Taika reforms (645–650) to the death of Emperor Kōkō 光孝 in 887. An extended three-stage process of institutionalizing a new imperial funeral system, Watabe argues, relied on Han Chinese funeral models even more than did contemporary Chinese practices under the T'ang. Even the well-documented tendency toward simplification began earlier than any documentable Buddhist participation in imperial funerals (WADA 1976; SHINTANI 1986).

Nonetheless, with the introduction of imperial cremation at the funeral of the retired empress Jitō 持統 (d. 703) and soon thereafter of formal Buddhist participation in funerals, an ever more rigorously simplified style came increasingly to be employed. Indeed, beginning with Jitō, the number of emperors who asked in formal testamentary wills (*ishō* 遺詔) for simple funerals (*hakusō* 薄葬) grew steadily. The empress Genmei 元明 (d. 721) was the first to eschew burial in a grand tomb (*sanryō* 山陵), requesting instead that her ashes be buried in the

ground and a tree planted above them. The site was to be marked with a simple gravestone in place of a monumental tomb (*ryōsho* 陵所). Soon, testamentary instructions of this sort became customary, and their proclamation on the day of the funeral was duly ritualized. This tendency toward "conspicuous" simplification finds its extreme example in the case of Junna 淳和 (d. 840), who left instructions not only that his body was to be cremated, but also that his bones were to be pulverized and dispersed from the top of a mountain. Other imperial testamentary wills document the end of the use of special mourning clothes, as well as prohibitions against national mourning and the construction of grand tombs (first proscribed more narrowly in the Taika Funerary Edict [*Taika no hakusō-ryō* 大化の薄葬令] of 646). During the ninth century, formal ritual lamentations and eulogies were also successively omitted, being replaced by the chanting of sutras and the presentation of offerings (*kuyō* 供養) by Buddhist monks attached to the imperial court; government ministers made offerings of incense in place of the earlier food offering (*kyōsen* 供饌) and lamentations (*koai* 挙哀). Various changes in, and finally the elimination of, the so-called temporary interment rites (*mogari no girei* 殯の儀礼)—studied by Ebersole—in favor of other forms of mourning rites are thus but one measure of this transformative process. Needless to say, such simplification efforts were determined not only as a result of imperial piety; both political and, increasingly, economic factors also played a role. From the beginning, of course, the three factors were interlinked, and the fitful decline of imperial fortunes beginning in the latter half of the Heian period paralleled the diminishing grandeur of imperial funerals well into the early modern era.

Beginning with Emperor Goichijō 後一条 (1008–1036), the custom of constructing a meditation hall (*sanmaidō* 三昧堂) at the burial site (*ryōsho*) was established, and various sorts of structures, including stupas, came to mark the final resting places of imperial family members. A related development began with the funeral of the Northern Dynasty emperor Gofukakusa 後深草 (1243–1304), which illustrated the principle of simplicity noted already and which underlined an intensified desire to assert imperial filiality, continuity, and legitimacy in light of the Northern-Southern Courts' succession disputes. From the fourteenth to the early seventeenth century (i.e., down to Emperor Goyōzei 後陽成 [1571–1617]), a total of twelve emperors had their ashes enshrined along with Gofukakusa's in the Fukakusa "Lotus Meditation Hall" 法華三昧堂 (HASHIMOTO 1978).

During the tenth century, there had been some cases of corporeal burial (e.g., Emperor Daigo 醍醐 [885–930] and Emperor Murakami 村上 [926–967]), but cremation continued to be the preferred

method of disposition throughout the premodern period. I hedge in using the term "premodern" because in 1654 funeral rites for the emperor Gokōmyō 後光明 (1633–1654) were carried out at Sennyū-ji.[2] It appeared as if typical ceremonies of cremation and interment took place, but in fact his uncremated remains were buried and a stone stupa erected on top of the grave. Thus began the dissembling convention of faux cremation and secret corporeal burial that would be maintained down through the funeral of Emperor Kōmei's father, Ninkō 仁孝 (1800–1846). Only with Kōmei's own death in 1867 would the artifice be openly acknowledged and measures be taken to restore what Toda Tadayuki 戸田忠至 (1809–1883) referred to as the integrity of imperial death (*Kōmei tennō-ki* 5: 936).[3]

In brief, despite various shifts and innovations over the centuries, we can identify a *pattern* of imperial funeral practice, a pattern characterized by conspicuously simplified procedures on the one hand and routinized Buddhist involvement on the other. Cremation (*dabi* 荼毘) came to be seen as the emblem of this twofold process, and the case of Gokōmyō thus signals a new and potentially unsettling shift in attitudes about imperial demise. This shift coincided with other challenges to conventional funerary practices, so let us now turn our attention to those.

SHINSŌ UNDŌ 神葬運動: THE EMERGENCE OF "NATIVE" OR "LOCAL" FUNERAL RIGHTS MOVEMENTS

While it might seem reasonable to assume that Buddhist involvement in funeral practices penetrated all levels of Japanese society early on, prior to the Genna era (1615–1624) aristocrats and commoners alike were at least in principle free to choose funerary styles. There were, of course, economic considerations that affected some more than others. For example, prior to the Genroku era (1688–1704), virtually no one below the rank of samurai had tombstones, stupas, or other permanent mortuary markers constructed for his or her family's ancestors. Indeed, it appears that Buddhist funerals were relatively unusual

[2] Sources differ on precisely when the convention of using the precincts of Sennyū-ji as the site of imperial interment began, but certainly by the fourteenth century it was standard practice. AKAMATSU Toshihide's authoritative *Sennyū-ji-shi* (1984) says the continuous tradition began with Emperor Shijō 四条 (1231–1242).

[3] The historical circumstances of the Gokōmyō funeral are unclear to me at this stage of my research. How secret the practice of faux-cremation actually was is less important here than the uses to which the restorationists put the information during the 1860s. I suspect that Gokōmyō may himself have requested full burial, for he was an outspoken patron of neo-Confucian studies and a critic of classical (and impractical) imperial learning. If that is the case, the reason for the charade might have been to avoid fueling the fires of local funeral-rights unrest, which is the subject of the next section.

for those below the aristocratic level prior to the Edo period.[4] It was only with the intensification of prohibitions against Christian missions and converts, culminating in temple registration laws and increasingly severe inquisitions against Christians and their sympathizers after the Shimabara rebellion between 1638 and 1639 that Buddhist funerals became the norm. As a result, during most of the Edo period, shrine priests were permitted to perform non-Buddhist funerals only with the explicit permission of authorities at both the bakufu and domain (*han*) levels. The process was complicated and expensive, and required a personal appearance in Kyoto or Edo, as well as in the appropriate castle town. Hearings could be exceedingly rigorous: the first requirement was proof that the applicant was not a Christian; the second requirement was proof that the applicant was qualified to carry out a form of funeral rites already recognized by the authorities. And finally, it had to be established that Buddhist rites were not otherwise possible or appropriate (SUGIYAMA 1992).

Of course, shrine priests at many major cult centers had little interest in challenging these directives, for their families were part of the old aristocratic order and often had as part of their estates more than one (Buddhist) family temple (*bodaiji* 菩提寺). They often sent members of their own families into Buddhist orders, and had since early medieval times retained hereditary privileges that shielded them from both the economic and political pressures brought on by the anti-Christian persecution. They were, then, more than ready to concede the privileged role that Buddhist institutions began to assume by bakufu fiat. Priests at provincial "Grand Shrines" (e.g., Ise Jingū and Matsuo Taisha), on the other hand, ostensibly still maintained the venerable traditions of ancient Japan and thus found it relatively easy to comply with the new requirements.[5]

Funeral practices for priestly families at powerful cult centers around the country were called "Shinto (*kaminagara*) Funerals" in contemporary documents, but this referred specifically to the private family traditions associated with major shrines and then, especially

[4] This was an argument used by Oka Kumaomi 岡熊臣 (1783–1851), a Bakumatsu apologist for non-Buddhist funeral/ancestral rites, as cited in HAGA 1979, p. 343. See also OKADA 1989 and SHINTANI 1986, pp. 240–43. For a detailed and suggestive archaeological report on burial practices in Edo (Tokyo) during the Tokugawa period, see TANIGAWA 1992.

[5] This adaptation had interesting material consequences. At Ise, for example, Buddhist-style (stupa) stone grave monuments were inscribed with "*jingi*" 神祇 and other such expressions (SUGIYAMA 1992, pp. 9–10). It should also be noted that it was in these institutions that various imperial "traditions," including ritual music and dance forms that had been sold to the Grand Shrines during periods of imperial destitution, were maintained, and it was from there that they were "recovered" during the Meiji period. See GARFIAS (1968, pp. 24–25) for an account of the transmission of imperial music traditions after the Heian period.

towards the end of the seventeenth century, to those rites authorized and carried out under the auspices of the Yoshida priesthood (to which we will return in a moment). At the same time, the text of Chu-hsi's *Family Rituals* was being studied and distributed among Confucianists, and there is every indication that Shinto-style practices drew on this source in developing an ancestor-cult that could be generalized as an alternative to the Buddhist ritual hegemony that resulted from the Tokugawa bakufu's anti-Christian policy of temple registration.[6] On the local level, Buddhist priests could (and did) use the anti-Christian policies of the shogunate to enjoin their less than fervent parishioners (*danka*) to sponsor Buddhist rituals, including funerals. Not surprisingly, villagers were often forced to delay funeral rites that involved Buddhist priests due to the financial burden that such rites entailed. Local shrine priests likewise had no close relationship with the Buddhist authorities, particularly when it involved having to pay for ritual services they neither wanted nor required. It was at this level that resentment of the inquisition grew most severe, and it was from this group that many of the most successful challenges to Buddhist ritual hegemony eventually emerged.

There was a brief period during the second half of the seventeenth century when shrine priests regained local ritual authority. Beginning in the 1650s, we see the first waves of ritual resistance to these strictures among Confucianist and Yoshida-inspired Shinto intellectuals such as Hoshina Masayuki 保科正之 (1611–1672), Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀 (1628–1701), and Ikeda Mitsumasa 池田光政 (1609–1682).[7] Bakufu sympathy with this incipient movement is evidenced in the *Shosha negi kannushi hatto* 諸社禰宜神主法度 (Regulations for Shrine Priests) of 1665 (Kanbun 5/7/1), which stipulated that "the priests and various functionaries of the several shrines shall study the Way of the Kami (*jingi-no-michi*) and become knowledgeable about the kami of their respective shrines" (SUGIYAMA 1992, p. 10). As Sugiyama points out, this was later to be cited as the clearest bakufu authorization of the separation (or distinction) of Shinto from Buddhism.[8] But this arguably unambiguous directive was neither ultimate nor conclusive. The previous year (1664), shrines with an annual income of over

[6] As OKADA (1989) notes, however, commoners had no legal status to adopt either Shinto or Confucian funeral practices, despite the fact that increasing numbers of them had become well aware of and even knowledgeable about such putative options.

[7] All three of these men were intimately linked to Tokugawa Iemitsu and served in important advisory capacities during Tokugawa Ietsuna's (1641–1680) rule. See OOMS 1985.

[8] It was also this directive that authorized the exclusive privileges of the Hirakawa and Yoshida houses in relation to so-called Shinto practices both at court and in the provinces (HARDACRE 1989).

10,000 *koku* had been ordered to establish inquisition offices, and the resulting inquisitions nationwide lasted for five years. After that, the inquiries grew even more comprehensive and severe, although until the end of the century more liberal local (*han*) policies in various domains were being promulgated as well. It was during this period that the Yoshida house was granted regional authority, first by Tokugawa Mitsukuni of Mito, to register (Shinto) priests of all ranks as authorized liturgists and inquisitors. The consequences of this shift in the Mito domain alone were stunning: a backlash against Buddhist institutions resulted in the destruction of almost 1100 Buddhist structures, and in some areas that amounted to over 90% of the Buddhist presence. This of course had a striking impact on the funerary practices of commoners. An abbreviated manual on Yoshida-style funerary services was soon compiled and circulated, and this served as a guide for private funeral rites (Okada 1989).

A similar trend during the latter half of the seventeenth century can be traced in other regions as well. In Bizen, under Ikeda Mitsumasa, local heterodox shrines were destroyed and Buddhist monasteries and temples were demolished in the spring of 1666, while the principle of one estate/one shrine was instituted for all estates of 5000 *koku* and above. In the eighth month of the same year, the temple registry system was abolished and in its place an orthodoxy (*shūmon* 宗門) registration system, administered by priests of territorial (*ubusuna* 産土) shrines, was instituted. In all, 601 shrines were designated "(orthodox) local shrines," while the remaining 10,527 were destroyed as "heterodox." It is estimated that, by 1669, 97.5% of the residents in the Ikeda domain had Shinto-style (i.e., locally-authorized, non-Buddhist) funerals based on Yoshida ritual texts. After Mitsumasa's death in 1682, the situation was quickly reversed, however, so that by 1687 the temple registry system had been reinstated, while unauthorized (Confucian and shrine-family) rites were proscribed and "heterodox" shrines destroyed. This pattern of liberalization followed by retrenchment was reproduced in many areas during the Bakumatsu era and ultimately informed early Meiji efforts to completely remove Buddhism from national life (Sugiyama 1991; Ketelaar 1990). Significantly, regulations and privileges at both the regional and national level were throughout this period defined in terms of lineage and shrine income, not in terms of popularity or efficacy. In other words (and not surprisingly), the criteria for legitimacy or authority were specified not in terms of religious belief or of ritual practice, but in terms of traditional hereditary association and economic power. That said, it is clear that by the beginning of the eighteenth century Buddhist hegemony in matters of funerals had been reinstated nationwide.

Nonetheless, the seeds of discontent had been planted, and the movement that was to become known as the "Shinto revival" had begun. These seeds would be nourished by Nativist intellectuals like Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801) and Hirata Atsutane (1776–1843), and their ideas would in turn be used to encourage and explain the changes in imperial funeral practice that were to come. Before proceeding with my argument of how all of this affected the creation of the modern imperial funeral system, however, let me briefly outline the early development of the distinctive Yoshida house protocols in order to illustrate some of the points I have already alluded to.

YOSHIDA FAMILY RITES

Death pollution had been an issue from very early on in both Chinese and Japanese sensibility, though Watabe Mayumi's research suggests that it was not until the Taika era that the Japanese court began to make clear temporal and spatial distinctions between "inauspicious" (funerals) and "auspicious" (e.g., accession rites and religious festivals) ceremonial events. In this regard, WATABE (1993) argues that the Japanese court seemed to be following Han funeral models even more scrupulously than did the new T'ang regime in China.[9] This concern with death pollution was evidenced in increasingly abbreviated *mogari* rites and the adoption of an elaborate system of mourning rules from the eighth century on, all in conjunction with what has been described as the "buddhification" of imperial funeral practice. It was not until the late medieval period, however, that notions of purity and pollution became focused on grave sites, since until then graves had ordinarily been within the precincts of Buddhist institutions or at least, as in the case of commoners, always physically separated from daily life.

The case of Yoshida Kanetomo 吉田兼倶 (1435–1511), founder of the Yoshida branch of the priestly Imbe family, illustrates this new concern (OKADA 1989 and 1997).[10] During the Ōjin rebellion, sensitivity to "death pollution" had generally intensified and attention to grave sites had accordingly grown more acute. In response, Kanetomo, like Pure Land Buddhist priests in similar circumstances much earlier, contended that humans can through proper ritual treatment become "kami" after death. Unlike the Buddhists, however, Kanetomo based his argument on the Chinese distinction between two types of human

[9] See WECHSLER (1985) for a more thorough analysis of early T'ang rites and ceremonies and their provenance. Unfortunately, Wechsler does not devote much attention to imperial funerals, nor to comparisons with contemporary Japanese imperial rites.

[10] See Elizabeth Kenney's much more detailed discussion of Yoshida Shinto in her essay "Shinto Funerals in the Edo Period" in this issue, pp. 239–71.

"spirit"—the "pure" or numinous soul (*kon/tama* 魂) and the corporeal soul (*haku* 魄).[11] The permanent separation of these souls resulted in death, according to Kanetomo. (The former was, in classic Confucian practice, installed in the ancestral temple, while the latter was interred with the corpse. From a strictly performative perspective, the same could even now still be said for Japanese practice.) In any event, we find with Kanetomo a good example of the use of traditional Chinese vocabulary to stake out a "nativist" position on life after death.[12]

In fact, neither Kanetomo nor his son are known to have requested a peculiarly "Shinto"-style funeral, but soon after Kanetomo's death a shrine (*shinryūsha* 神龍社) was established and his remains interred beneath it. He was given the posthumous title "Shinryū Daimyōjin" 神龍大明神, confirming his belief that humans can indeed become kami after death. It was not until Kanetomo's grandson Kanemigi 兼右 (1516–1573) dictated in his testamentary will (*yuigon* 遺言) the protocols to be observed following his own death, however, that there is evidence of a more systematic and thorough Yoshida version of non-Buddhist funeral observances. Declaring himself one of the family's tutelary kami, Kanemigi was buried within the Yoshida Shrine precincts in 1573, and a mortuary shrine was erected for his spirit. The rites were a distinctive blend of Onmyōdō and Taoist procedures, and explicitly forbade the presence of Buddhist officiants at the proceedings (Okada 1989). Later descendants also left wills that excluded Buddhist participation and called for the establishment of mortuary shrines for their "purified" spirits. At least in its earliest forms, then, the Yoshida cult was not "nativist" in its ritual rhetoric, despite the fact that it was explicitly anti-Buddhist in its generation. Some scholars have associated the rise of these private alternatives to Buddhist funeral practices with similar "heroic cults" established around Toyotomi Hideyoshi and Tokugawa Ieyasu at the turn of the seventeenth century. Such a comparison deserves further elaboration, but this is not the place for it. Instead, I will simply note that even within the Yoshida family, Buddhist rites were still carried out for those members who officially joined the Buddhist order, and this pattern continued down to the Meiji period (Okada 1997).

Two things eventually came to distinguish Yoshida-inspired "Shinto" funerals from those based on Chu-Hsi's *Family Rituals*. First was the

[11] See Okada 1997, p. 35. In fact, Buddhist priests of the Ritsu school had made a similar distinction with respect to the dangers of pollution, claiming that Buddhist priests were permitted to conduct "spirit rites" whereas grave sites themselves were in the hands of "stone workers"—but this had had little effect on popular consciousness (Shintani 1986).

[12] Kanetomo's position was one that would later be amended in light of Hirata Atsutane's elaboration of a theory of "soul" that explicitly denied the dualism implicit in the *konpaku* argument employed by Kanetomo. See Asoya 1989.

attitude toward post-mortem existence, which was apparent in the rituals of the post-burial treatment and eventual enshrinement of the *mitamashiro* 霊璽 (spirit-tablet) as a kami (*reijin* 霊神 or *shugo no kami* 守護神), and later articulated in the theological language of Hirata Atsutane. This, as I have said, became linked with restoration ideology in the late Edo period, especially in the formulations of such people as Oka Kumaomi 岡熊臣 (1783–1851), Ōkuni Takamasa 大国隆正 (1793–1871), and Tanimori Yoshiomi 谷森善臣 (1818–1911).[13] The second distinction can be seen in attitudes toward the pollution associated with death. A clear early example of these features can be seen in the funeral of Hoshina Masayuki, which was linguistically marked as Confucian—in the naming of ritual participants and implements, for example[14]—but which followed the ritual practices of the Yoshida house in terms of the stress on purificatory strategies (e.g., using the Nakatomi purification *norito*), mourning etiquette, and the eventual enshrinement of Masayuki's spirit in the family ancestral shrine (KONDŌ 1989 and 1990). It is worth noting here that the strong reflexive emphasis on filiality in both neo-Confucian and neo-Shintoist ritualizations of death was to become a hallmark of early Meiji Restoration imperial ideology (ASOYA 1997; TAKEDA 1992), as will become clear below.

Meiji Period Developments

As INOUE Nobutaka (1988), Helen HARDACRE (1989), James KETELAAR (1990), and others have shown, the efforts of the early Meiji reformers to vilify Buddhism and establish a national Shinto policy were uneven and, with particular reference to ritual activity, frustrated by precisely the same local variety and lack of consensus among shrine priests that had given strength to regional movements before the Restoration. It was unclear precisely which priests and family traditions should be part of the new system, and this gave impetus to the growth of numerous local "Shinto" funeral practices, despite a series of directives, beginning in 1873, designed to establish an orthodox ritual system throughout the nation. By the 1880s, political and economic factors together had conspired to remove the issue of Shinto funerals

[13] See KATŌ 1976; HAGA 1979; ASOYA 1989; and KONDŌ 1990. For stronger readings, see HAROOTUNIAN 1988 and KETELAAR 1990.

[14] This is due perhaps to Yamazaki Anzai's (1619–1682) editorial hand in transcribing Masayuki's last will and testament. On Masayuki's relationship with Anzai, and on Anzai's relationship with Yoshida Shinto and neo-Confucianism, see chapter 6 of Hermann OOM's masterful 1985 study of Tokugawa ideology.

from the national agenda, relegating it once again to a matter for local resolution.[15]

Even in the case of imperial rites, comprehensive concerted attention to funeral practices was remarkably slow to develop, although as we have seen it took little time to distance the young emperor Meiji's father from at least some of his posthumous Buddhist trappings. Takashi FUJITANI (1996) has elegantly demonstrated the complexity of the larger ritualizing project of the Meiji architects, but he too seems to have assumed that Kōmei's funeral itself was not the signal event that I am claiming it to be. Indeed, the bureaucrats themselves did not devote a great deal of attention to imperial death during most of the Meiji period; the fact that the new emperor (Meiji) was just a boy when this process began helps us to understand why there was no pressing need to anticipate his death or to integrate his eventual demise into the larger ritual complex. In fact, however, serious systematic attention was being paid to the symbolic importance of imperial death even before Kōmei's untimely passing at the age of 36.

THE CASE OF EMPEROR KŌMEI

The first half of the decade of the 1860s marked a great turning point in imperial fortunes, and the confidence and perspicacity of the restoration leaders is apparent in their commitment to revitalizing the mortuary remains of an imagined past. This revitalization project began in concrete terms with the formation of the office of Mausoleum Administration approved by the bakufu under the leadership of Toda Tadayuki.[16] Tadayuki's immediate charge was to survey and restore the grand tombs or mausolea (*misasagi* or *sanryō* 山陵) of both mythic emperors like Jinmu and historical emperors of both the ancient and medieval periods, including those like Junna with only an isolated memorial marker, and those whose ashes were memorialized in various ways at Sennyū-ji. First proposed in 1861, the project was designed not only to recognize and celebrate the imperial past, but to instantiate its symbolic and historic value in the context of the anticipated restoration of the emperor system itself. Its primary objective was realized between 1864 and 1866, when tributary inspections (*hōhei junken* 奉幣巡検) by representatives of the mausoleum restoration project

[15] Even today, only a very small proportion of ordinary Japanese receive Shinto funeral rites, though the protocols have been systematized, based on Edo-period precedents, and are taught as part of Shinto priestly training at Kokugakuin and Kōgakkan University seminaries.

[16] For an account of Emperor Kōmei's role in the establishment of this office, see *Taiyō* 太陽 3.4 (1897): 867.

(*sanryō shūho jigyō* 山陵修補事業) were carried out at over 100 different imperial mortuary sites. Whatever sectarian interests this massive effort might have entailed were subordinated to the larger objective of affirming ancestral (filial) legitimacy *without specific reference to Buddhism.*

The untimely death of Kōmei on Keiō 2/12/25 (January 30, 1867), allowed Tadayuki to accelerate his efforts to reassert the dignity and integrity of the imperial heritage through a revived *sanryō* (mausoleum) system. Within a week of Kōmei's death, Tadayuki submitted a written report (*Sanryō hōkō jōshinsho* 山陵奉行上申書)[17] to bakufu and imperial court authorities proposing that the *sanryō* system be formally revived. Two immediate consequences of such a plan were spelled out. First, it would mean the deceased emperor would be buried in a newly constructed mausoleum; and second, such burial would imply abandoning even the pretext of imperial cremation that had been, in Tadayuki's opinion, the lamentable rule since the funeral of Gokōmyō. His argument called for an "honorable burial in which the inner and outer [or manifest and secret] are in perfect accord," in explicit contrast with the fractious duplicity that marked the practice of false cremation and which undoubtedly had had an "injurious effect on the morals of the whole realm."

Eight days after Kōmei's death, Tadayuki led a delegation to Sennyū-ji to select an appropriate site for the new mausoleum, and the following day his overall plan was officially approved by the Court Council (*chōgi* 朝議). On Keiō 3/1/4, the site at Sennyū-ji was also approved, as were architectural design plans for the mausoleum itself. By the eighth, Tadayuki was prepared to present a formal proposal to court officials for the abolition of imperial cremation; after the proposal was presented, it too was approved after some debate. The next day he wrote several official notices outlining in greater detail how he wanted the funeral ceremonies at the mausoleum to be carried out (TAKEDA 1992, pp. 13–16). In these documents we see the first explicit references to participation by Buddhist clergy and, as we will see in a moment, the new ritual protocols undermine the conventional wisdom that Kōmei's was the last Buddhist imperial funeral. At the same time, we should note that on the same afternoon of the ninth, monks from Sennyū-ji arrived at the palace to participate in the encoffining ceremony (*nyūkan no gi* 入棺の儀) that began at 4:00 p.m.

Before we get to the funeral itself, however, let me quickly summarize the logistical preparations that were undertaken. On Keiō 3/1/17, groundbreaking ceremonies (*ryōsho jichinsai* 陵所地鎮祭) were carried

[17] The text of this petition can be found in *Kōmei tennō-ki* 1:935–36 and in *Meiji tennō-ki* 1: 459–60.

out at the Sennyū-ji site by an Onmyō specialist, and actual construction work began immediately thereafter, continuing around-the-clock until 1/23. At that point, the underground chamber for the sarcophagus was finished, and above the burial chamber a temporary pavilion called *osuya* 御須屋 was erected. South of the *osuya*, temporary shelters for mourners were set up. On the same day, the name *Nochi no tsuki no wa no higashi yama no misasagi* 後月輪東山陵 was approved for Emperor Kōmei's mausoleum.[18] Thus, everything was now in place for the grand funeral (*taisō* 大葬) scheduled for 1/27 and 1/28.

At ten o'clock on the morning of the twenty-seventh, the ceremonial reading of Kōmei's last testament (*ishōsō no gi* 遺詔奏の儀) took place in the Shishinden inside the imperial palace grounds. Late in the afternoon, the imperial casket was ceremonially moved to the courtyard and loaded onto an ox-drawn hearse. At 6:00 p.m., the funeral procession departed for Sennyū-ji. Significantly, leading the procession were Toda Tadayuki, Tanimori Yoshinori, and other important functionaries in the Mausoleum Administration. They were followed by high-ranking courtiers and bakufu officials, including Tokugawa Yoshinobu 徳川慶喜 (1837–1913), the new (and last) shogun.

When the procession arrived at Sennyū-ji at around 11:00 p.m., the second major change effected by Tadayuki's reforms became apparent. In previous imperial funerals, the body of the emperor had been removed from the hearse at the Gokyōji Gate 御凶事門 and placed on a portable imperial bier (*hōgan* 宝龕). In front of the bier was a temporary pavilion (*ganzendō* 龕前堂), where, in the presence of the congregated mourners, monks chanted sutras for the emperor's welfare before proceeding with the bier (*hōgan igyo* 宝龕移御) to the cremation site at the top of the mountain. Rites thereafter were conducted solely in the company of monks. For the Kōmei ceremonies, however, this traditional protocol was reversed. When the procession reached the Gokyōji Gate, there was no imperial bier to receive the casket, and the site formerly set aside for the final rites before cremation was now identified as a parking area. From here, after a pause during which mourners parked their vehicles and reorganized the procession on foot, the hearse carrying the imperial remains proceeded directly to the mausoleum. The most dramatic element of all, however, was the

[18] This was a very prescient if unintentional choice for the name, for it refers back to the designation (*tsuki no wa no misasagi*) for the tomb of the child Emperor Shijō, reputed to have been the first in the long line of emperors to be buried at Sennyū-ji. Kōmei, of course, was the last. The more immediate reference is to the tomb (*nochi no tsuki no wa no misasagi*) of Kōmei's grandfather Kōkaku 光格 (1771–1840). Kōmei's mausoleum was built to the northeast of Kōkaku's, perhaps explaining the *higashi no yama* ("eastern mound") specification.

exclusion of Buddhist monks. Until Kōmei's funeral only monks had been permitted to accompany the imperial corpse beyond the Gokyōji Gate to the mountaintop rites (*santō sahō* 山頭作法), but this time there was a sign posted that forbade the presence of monks beyond the same gate, meaning of course that they were excluded from the burial services altogether.

At approximately 2:00 a.m. on Keiō 3/1/28, the funeral procession arrived at the foot of a slope leading up to the mausoleum. Here, the casket was transferred to a renamed imperial bier (*gyoren* 御輦), and the procession moved up the hill to the *osuya*. After necessary logistical preparations were completed, the casket was lowered into the sarcophagus, which was then closed with a stone lid. Finally, at a small temporary shelter set up in front of the torii gate that marked the entrance to the mausoleum, mourners made offerings in a new rite called the *ryōsho no gi* 陵所の儀, which mirrored the graveside rites of a typical Yoshida-style funeral.[19] With this the official funeral was complete and the assembly returned to the staging area at the Gokyōji Gate and eventually dispersed. At this point, monks were permitted to enter the sacred mausoleum compound and to carry out rites on the west side of the *osuya*; these rites included lighting candles, burning incense, and chanting sutras.[20]

What we have seen here is certainly not what we might have expected, given the common perception that Kōmei's was the last imperial funeral conducted as a Buddhist ceremony.[21] Granted, I have not presented many details of the mortuary rites that were carried out between Keiō 2/12/25 (the day of Kōmei's death) and Keiō 3/1/27–28, when he was buried. Our first impression, based on the participation of Buddhist monks at the encoffining ceremony on 1/9, might be that many of these private imperial rites and ceremonies were conducted in a traditional Buddhist style. But even assuming that all of these private family rites were in fact led by Buddhist clergy, we are still faced

[19] First-hand accounts cited by TAKEDA (1992, p. 19) reveal that awnings were attached to the torii gate to make a temporary shelter for the offering tables.

[20] Whether any of the official funeral guests, including members of the imperial family, remained for these supplementary rites is unclear in the records I have examined.

[21] FUJITANI (1996, p. 152), relying on YAMAORI (1981, p. 148), mistakenly reports that Buddhist priests conducted the interment ceremonies at the mausoleum. Yamaori provides no evidence for his assertion. I have relied on TAKEDA (1992), who cites several sources, including the *Kōmei tennō gokyōji* 公明天皇御山事 manuscript in the Kunaichō archives. I have not examined this document myself, but I find Takeda's account credible, particularly given that the conventional dividing line between "Buddhist" and "Shinto" imperial rites centering on the Kōmei corpse ignores the nuances I am highlighting here, especially the distinction between the funeral/burial itself and those official and unofficial rites which led up to or followed the formal funeral (*taisō-gi* 大葬儀).

with the evidence of a rigorously self-conscious and strategically successful production of a civil and at least arguably "Shinto" tinged public (i.e., officially sponsored) funeral, which was notably unwelcoming of Buddhist participation. At the same time, we might still wonder about the apparent lack of attention to the problem of purity with regard to handling the imperial remains. It may be that, by allowing Buddhists to be in charge of the encoffining ceremonies, the restoration authorities felt confident that a shield (the sealed double casket) had been established between the corpse and non-family mourners. But they had another, more compelling, argument based on Hirata Nativist thought as expressed by Tanimori Yoshinori, Tadayuki's primary assistant in the *sanryō* recovery project. Ketelaar (quoting YASUMARU 1979, p. 65) summarizes it as follows: "Since the emperor was a divine presence (*akitsu mikami* [現津御神]) both in this world *and* in the next (*gense demo yūkai demo* [現世でも幽界でも]), there was finally no possibility of [an emperor's body] being 'impure'" (KETELAAR 1990, p. 45).

Now, Toda Tadayuki based many of his arguments for changes in funeral staging on the principle of recovering and promoting an archaic imperial model of filiality.[22] Emperor Kōmei himself was convinced by Toda's emphasis on the importance of the public display of filiality expressed through the recovery and revitalization of imperial ancestral graves and the creation of a new imperial mortuary system.[23] This was to be a system of practice in which the "callous duplicity" that had marked Emperor Gokōmyō's final disposition (and that of his heirs, including Kōmei's own father) would be replaced by an openness and integrity that would be a model for the nation. The ultimate objective, of course, was to produce a situation where the imperial body was analogous to the national polity, where filiality was modeled by and for the sake of the imperial tradition, and where the (non-cremated) integrity of the emperor's natural body could stand as the emblem of a "revived" body politic of the nation.

The irony, if one can call it that, is that Tadayuki set in motion a different kind of ritual artifice in which the state's interests took precedence over the private inclinations of the imperial family itself. The real issue was not whether Buddhists participated in imperial funeral rites, but where and how they did it. For politically savvy bureaucrats like Tadayuki, there may indeed have been an animosity toward Bud-

[22] Tadayuki was indebted to Gamō Kumpei's 蒲生君平 (1768–1813) 1808 treatise *Sanryōshi* 山陵志 (SASAGAWA 1988, p. 50).

[23] See the journalistic account of Kōmei's enthusiasm for revival of the *sanryō* tradition written by Kawasaki Saburō 川崎三郎 in *Taiyō* 3.4 (1897): 867.

dhism that informed his perspective, but he did not frame his agenda in those terms. He was satisfied with publicly foregrounding the renewed integrity of the imperial past and present, and in the process allowed private imperial family connections with Buddhism to remain largely undisturbed.

By way of further illustration, for Kōmei's third anniversary mortuary rites, "Worship from afar" (*sanryō yōhai* 山陵遥拝) was conducted by Jingikan officials at the palace, while imperial messengers dispatched for the occasion carried out Shinto ceremonies at the tomb itself at Sennyū-ji. After the official services were over, however, imperial princes and others remained at Sennyū-ji for a private ceremony that included the chanting of the *Lotus Sutra*. This strategy of distinguishing public from private—and thus, at least nominally, Shinto from Buddhist—in this way was therefore not simply a tactical compromise at the time of Kōmei's funeral. Indeed, it became part and parcel of the overall plan insofar as imperial funerals were concerned.[24] Rather than highlighting divisive sectarian interests in the matter of imperial death, ritual theorists focused during the early Meiji period on creating an imperial cult around the immanent presence of both mythic and historical imperial ancestors by the revitalization of the newly recovered tombs of former emperors on the one hand and the establishment of new palace sanctuaries on the other.[25] Along with Ise Jingū, these ancestral sites created an overlapping system of sacred geography and were integrated into the larger national political cult; presumably there is no need for me to elaborate on the details of these processes, for they have been well-documented both in English and in Japanese. Let us therefore jump to the very end of the nineteenth century, when the matter of imperial mortality finally reemerged as a matter of public (and political) concern.

THE CASE OF THE EMPRESS DOWAGER EISHŌ

At the time of Empress Dowager Eishō's 英照 death on January 11, 1897, the emperor (Meiji) himself called for the services to stand "as a standard for the future," and as such it was to be both dignified and simple. The state would pay for the ceremonies, but both legally and in accordance with the deceased's wishes, the entire affair would be

[24] In the postwar years, we see this same dissembling strategy rehearsed first at the funeral for the Empress Dowager Teimei 貞明 in 1951 and again at the Shōwa funeral in 1989; the latter was in response to concerns about infringements of the constitutional separation of religion and the state. See NAKAJIMA (1987) for postwar imperial funeral practices.

[25] On the imperial tombs, see especially TAKEDA (1992). On the Palace Sanctuaries, the standard reference for authors writing in English is YASUMARU (1979), but one needs to be cautious about relying on his descriptions of rites and ceremonies.

carried out not as a ceremony of state but as a private ceremony of the imperial family.

As would be expected, preparation of the corpse and preliminary mourning rites were begun immediately, but we see in these rites a definite shift from those for Emperor Kōmei some thirty years earlier. Journalistic reports indicate that on the morning of January 19, the Encoffining Ceremony 御入棺式 took place in the Central Hall of the Aoyama Detached Palace. After Shinto-style offerings were made in front of the primary coffin 御船 bearing Eishō's body, this coffin was transferred into a second, more substantial, casket 御棺. That afternoon at 1:00 p.m., preparations for the Spirit Transfer Rite 御霊移祭 began. A temporary shrine 御殿 was set up around the casket. The tablet in which Eishō's spirit would reside 御霊璽 was then placed in a small box 辛櫃, and this was set aside on a spirit seat 御霊座 until the transfer ceremony proper. Sacred *misakaki* 御榊 branches were placed to the left and right of the shrine, and silk cloth was draped around it. At 4:00 p.m., four Shinto priests entered and took their places. As traditional courtly music began, the chief ritualist 斎主 retrieved the spirit tablet box and placed it on a small altar in front of the casket. Then, as he opened the casket lid, he intoned the Spirit-Transfer prayer 御霊移の詞. After the ritualists presented offerings (*shinsen* 神撰 and *heimotsu* 幣物), obsequies (*gohai* 御拝) and offerings (*tamagushi* 玉串) were presented by the representatives of the emperor and empress, imperial princes, court officials, imperial chamberlains, and ladies-in-waiting. Finally, the entire congregation offered a deep bow 拝礼, and the service was completed at just after 6:00 p.m. (*Taiyō* 1897, 928–29).

Daily rites continued at the temporary shrine until February 2, when the imperial casket was transferred by train to the Ōmiya Detached Palace in Kyoto. This of course constituted the formal separation of the body and "soul" (*mitama*) of the empress, and suitable rites accompanied the physical separation. That is, the "pure" spirit installed in the mortuary tablet (*goreiji; mitamashiro* 御霊璽) remained at the Aoyama Palace in the temporary shrine, while the corporeal spirit was moved along with the corpse for transfer to Kyoto and eventual burial alongside Emperor Kōmei in a mausoleum at Sennyū-ji.[26]

In all of this, we see evidence that those in charge of orchestrating imperial funerals had indeed by this time drawn on Edo-period Shinto funeral conventions, which were themselves borrowed from Confu-

[26] The spirit tablet would be installed in the Imperial Ancestral Shrine (*kōreiden*) in the Palace Sanctuary after a year of mourning. The practice of enshrining the imperial ancestral spirit was not new, of course. Since the Heian period the spirit tablets (位牌) of imperial family members had been installed in the Kurodo 黒戸 Shrine within the imperial palace in Kyoto.

cian funerary protocols, even for the "private" services of the imperial family. The fact that we have contemporary popular records of these rites, however, indicates that the lines between public and private were becoming increasingly ambiguous.[27] We know also that from the very day of the empress's death, an unofficial Buddhist memorial tablet (*kari no sonpai* 仮の尊牌) had been enshrined at the Reimeiden 霊明殿 at Sennyū-ji, and that daily services were carried out there by the resident monks. On February 9, 1897 (the day after the formal burial rites were completed), a special ceremony (*gohōyō* 御法要) called the *Rishu Sanmai* 理趣三昧 was conducted at the Reimeiden, with ladies-in-waiting from the Aoyama Palace in Tokyo, as well as former court servants who had become Buddhist nuns in Kyoto, participating. Similar ceremonies were carried out at Myōhō-in 妙法院 and Nanzen-ji 南禅寺 as well (*Taiyō* 1897, p. 929).

Here, then, we see another feature of the modernized imperial funeral system: just as Kōmei's death had maintained and expanded an unstable distinction between the public and private dimensions of imperial death, so also Empress Dowager Eishō's demise provided the occasion to produce a suitably ambiguous example "for the future" of a simple yet dignified funeral designed to be "reminiscent" of the rites carried out for members of the imperial family for centuries, albeit with the more obvious Buddhist involvements decidedly private and in the background. And yet it also echoed the funerals of the Tokugawa shoguns with its highly visible security along the funeral procession route, its extensive publicity, and—most especially—with its detailed directives about properly respectful decorum. Most remarkably, ordinary Japanese were permitted to pay their respects and to view the funeral site at Sennyū-ji (*Taiyō* 1897, 929–31).

There were more modern innovations as well. Official detailed medical reports on Eishō's declining condition were reported in newspapers across the country—in conscious imitation of the publicity and concern surrounding both Emperor Kōmei's and, much earlier, Emperor Tenmu's mortal illness as reported in the *Nihon shoki.* But there was another model that informed these dimensions of Eishō's case. We know, for example, that the Japanese imperial government had for decades been systematically collecting reports on European royal ceremonies and protocols, and found these to be important resources in their own nation-building ritualizations (FUJITANI 1996). SASAGAWA (1988) reports that between 1887 and 1889, a survey of European royal ceremonial practices had been carried out for the

[27] See the special issues of *Fūzoku gaho* (1897) and *Taiyō* (1897) for details of the public dimensions of Eishō's funeral, including photographs, drawings, and eyewitness accounts.

Meiji government by a Prussian royal chamberlain named Ottmar von Mohl. Among these records, there are documents that discuss European royal protocols for funerals and mourning—with newspaper clippings from the *Frankfurt Zeitung* documenting the fatal illness and demise of Wilhelm I in 1888.[28] While I have not been able to confirm the existence of these particular documents, it is certainly clear that among the precedents the Meiji ritualists had to draw on in formulating funeral protocols were those of the European courts. That such documentary evidence exists is not in itself news, of course, but its apparent relationship to the relatively late development of modern imperial funeral protocols deserves further investigation.

Conclusion

At this stage of my research, which includes reviews both of the prewar and postwar imperial funerary regulations and of the several imperial funerals carried out in the twentieth century, it is clear that three types of very "non-native" funeral models played a large part in the development of modern imperial mortuary rites. First, of course, are the models of the Chinese Han Dynasty, which included protocols that informed seventh- and eighth-century imperial funerals and which became the benchmark for modern Shinto liturgists. Second, there are those that were developed in the early modern period as alternative (i.e., non-Buddhist) models. These were characterized formally by their reliance on Confucian vocabulary and protocols and yet, informed by native sensibilities concerning pollution and the afterlife, became antecedents for the "domestic" or private ritual dimension of modern imperial funerals. These also provided specific models for how to conduct ceremonial burial services that did not assume cremation, and that linked corporeal burial to filial piety in no uncertain terms. And third, there are the models with a public or modern "state" dimension that drew heavily on European royal examples, at first somewhat unabashedly but then with greater circumspection.

By the time any kind of systematic (albeit still provisional) protocols for imperial mortuary rites were developed shortly before the

[28] See SASAGAWA (1988, pp. 70–76, esp. 71–72) for primary sources. I must note that the Kunaichō Shoryōbu, which I visited in the summer of 2000, could not locate the documents Sasagawa cites. I did, however, find numerous other manuscripts both by and about von Mohl. It turns out that he was in Japan from 1887 to 1889 as an official consultant to the imperial household agency, and thus could at best have provided only second-hand accounts of the two Wilhelms' deaths and funeral ceremonies. FUJITANI (1996) makes good use of numerous reports by Japanese observers of European royal practices, summarizing some of the most salient on pp. 148–49 and 155–84.

death of the emperor Meiji in 1912, almost a half century had passed since his father Kōmei's funeral.[29] Much had occurred in the intervening years, so it is only mildly surprising that it took so long to set in place a coherent, circumspect, and apparently seamless strategy for ritualizing a modern emperor's demise.

In conclusion, it is clear that the funeral system that emerged from the waning hours of the long Meiji period was the product of many historical factors, but it would be a mistake to identify the issues involved in this transition as simply points of conflict between "Buddhism" and "Shinto." The Meiji architects researched and experimented with many different models and ended up with a kind of ritual bricolage, cloaking all of the so-called "foreign" *and* "native" elements in the ambiguous space between secrecy and display that even today is the hallmark of the emperor system.

REFERENCES

SOURCES CITED BY TITLE

Fūzoku Gahō 風俗画報

1897 Gotaisō zue 御大喪図絵. Special issue of *Fūzoku gahō* 135–36 (February and March, 1897).

Kōmei tennō-ki 孝明天皇紀

1969 *Kōmei tennō-ki dai-go* 孝明天皇紀第五. Tokyo: Heian Jingū.

Meiji tennō-ki 明治天皇紀

1968 *Meiji tennō-ki dai-ichi* 明治天皇紀第一. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Taiyō 太陽 3.4: February 20, 1897.

SOURCES CITED BY AUTHOR'S NAME

AKAMATSU Toshihide 赤松俊秀

1984 *Sennyū-ji-shi* 泉涌寺史. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

ASOYA Masahiko 阿蘇谷正彦

1989 *Shintō no seishikan* 神道の生死観. Tokyo: Perikansha.

1997 Kokugakusha no shigokan 国学者の死後観. In *Shinsōsai daijiten*

[29] The Edict on Imperial Household Mourning (*kōshitsu fukumo no rei* 皇室服喪令) was promulgated in 1909. In 1911, a draft for an imperial funerary edict (*sōgi no rei no sōan* 喪儀令草案) was presented by an official committee commissioned to investigate various dimensions of the imperial system (*kōshitsu seido chōsakyoku* 皇室制度調査局), but it was not enacted into law (with minor amendments) until 1926, shortly before the death of Emperor Taishō, and then as part of a more sweeping set of decrees. The Meiji emperor's funeral was carried out according to the prescriptions in the 1911 document. See FUJITANI (1996, pp. 145–54) for a description and analysis of Emperor Meiji's funeral.

神葬祭大事典. Katō Takahisa 加藤隆久, ed., pp. 50–53. Tokyo: Ebisu Kōshō.

EBERSOLE, Gary L.
1989 *Ritual Poetry and the Politics of Death in Early Japan.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

FUJITANI, Takeshi
1996 *Splendid Monarchy.* Berkeley: University of California.

GARFIAS, Robert
1968 The sacred mikagura of the Japanese Imperial Court. *Selected Reports* 1.2. Los Angeles: The Institute of Ethnomusicology of the University of California at Los Angeles.

GLUCK, Carol
1985 *Japan's Modern Myths.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

HAGA Noboru 芳賀 登
1979 Shi to shinsō 死と神葬. In *Kōza Nihon no minzoku shūkyō* 講座日本の民俗宗教 1. Gorai Shigeru 五来 重, et al., comp., pp. 341–55. Tokyo: Kōbundō.

HARDACRE, Helen
1989 *Shintō and the State, 1868–1988.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

HAROOTUNIAN, H. D.
1988 *Things Seen and Unseen: Discourse and Ideology in Tokugawa Nativism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

HASHIMOTO Yoshihiko 橋本義彦
1978 Kōshitsu sōgi no hensen 皇室葬儀の変遷 and Ryōbo 陵墓. In Kodama Kōta, comp., *Tennō: Nihon-shi shohyakka* 天皇—日本史小百科 8: 74–77. Tokyo: Kondō Shuppansha.

INOUE Nobutaka
1988 The Shinto world of the 1880s. *History of Religions* 27: 326–53.

KATŌ Takahisa 加藤隆久
1976 Shinsōsai 神喪祭. In *Shintō yogoshū saishi-hen* 2 神道要語集祭祀篇2. Kokugakuin Daigaku Nihonbunka Kenkyūsho, ed., pp. 193–202. Tokyo: Shintō Bunkakai.

KATŌ Takahisa, ed.
1997 *Shinsōsai daijiten* 神葬祭大事典. Tokyo: Ebisu Kōshō Shuppansha.

KAWASAKI Saburō 川崎三郎
1897 Kōmei tennō 孝明天皇. *Taiyō* 太陽 3(4): 859–71.

KENNEY, Elizabeth
1996–1997 Shintō mortuary rites in contemporary Japan. *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 9: 397–439.

KETELAAR, James Edward
1990 *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

KONDŌ Keigo 近藤啓吾
1989 Shushi karei gaisetsu 朱子家礼概説. *Shintō shūkyō* 13/5: 2–22.
1990 *Jusō to shinsō* 儒葬と神葬. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.

NAKAJIMA Michio 中島三千男
1987 Sengo kōzoku sōgi kō 戦後皇族葬儀考. *Nihonshi kenkyū* 300: 104–33.

OKADA Shōji 岡田荘司
1989 Shintō sōsai no seiritsu: Sono engen ni tsuite 神道葬祭の成立—その淵源について. *Jinja shinpō* April 24.
1997 Kinsei Shintō no jomaku 近世神道の序幕. In KATŌ 1997, pp. 323–43.

OOMS, Herman
1985 *Tokugawa Ideology.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

SASAGAWA Norikatsu 笹川紀勝
1988 *Tennō no sōgi* 天皇の葬儀. Tokyo: Shinkyō Shuppansha.

SHINTANI Takanori 新谷尚紀
1986 *Sei to shi no minzoku-shi* 生と死の民俗史. Tokyo: Mokujisha.

SUGIYAMA Shigetsugu 椙山林継
1991 Sugiura Kuniakira no sōgi 杉浦国頭の葬儀. *Nihonbunka Kenkyūsho kiyō* 67: 1–38.
1992 (Yōyaku) Edo jidai no shinsōsai (要約)江戸時代の神葬祭. *Kokugakuin Daigaku Nihonbunka Kenkyūsho hō* 169: 9–11.

TAKEDA Hideaki 武田秀章
1992 *Kōmei tennō taisō-gi to sanryō zōei no ikkōsatsu (jō)* 孝明天皇大葬儀と山陵造営の一考察 (上). *Shintō shūkyō* 149:1–25.

TANIGAWA Akio 谷川章雄
1992 Excavating Edo's cemeteries: Graves as indicators of status and class. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 19/2–3: 271–97.

WADA Atsumu 和田 萃
1976 Bukkyō to sōsō girei no henka 仏教と喪葬儀礼の変化. *Rekishi kōron* 2(6): 102–13.
1982 Asuka-Nara jidai no sōsō girei 飛鳥奈良時代の喪葬儀礼. In *Higashi Ajia ni okeru girei to kokka* 東アジアにおける儀礼と国家, Inoue Mitsusada et al., eds., pp. 143–78. Tokyo: Gakuseisha.

WATABE Mayumi 渡部真弓
1993 Nitchū sōsō girei no hikaku kenkyū 日中喪葬儀礼の比較研究. *Nihon Bunka Kenkyūsho kiyō* 71 (March): 27–61.

WECHSLER, Howard
1985 *Offerings of Jade and Silk.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

YAMAORI Tetsuo 山折哲雄
1981 Tennō no sōsō girei to sokui girei 天皇の葬送儀礼と即位儀礼. *Rekishi kōron* 62: 148–52.

YASUMARU Yoshio 安丸良夫
1979 *Kamigami no Meiji ishin* 神々の明治維新. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.