Religious Studies in Japan VOLUME 3: 67–82

REVIEW ARTICLE

Jeff SCHROEDER

Historical Blind Spots

The Overlooked Figure of Chikazumi Jōkan

Iwata Fumiaki 岩田文昭, *Kindai Bukkyō to seinen: Chikazumi Jōkan to sono jidai* 近代仏教と青年—近角常観とその時代 (Modern Buddhism and youth: Chikazumi Jōkan and his age). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2014.

Ōmi Toshihiro 碧海寿広, *Kindai Bukkyō no naka no Shinshū: Chikazumi Jōkan to kyūdōsha tachi* 近代仏教の中の真宗—近角常観と求道者たち (Shin in the midst of modern Buddhism: Chikazumi Jōkan and seekers of the way). Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2014.

REGARDING the genesis of *Kindai Bukkyō to seinen*, Iwata Fumiaki explains that at a 1999 conference on religion and psychology, scholars raised the question of the origins of the Ajase Complex theory. First advanced by psychoanalyst Kosawa Heisaku 古澤平作 (1897–1968) in a 1931 essay, the Ajase Complex theory posited an inherent antagonism and guilt within mother-child relationships. Just as Freud explained his Oedipal Complex theory in relation to the myth of Oedipus, Kosawa explained his theory in relation to the story of the ancient Indian prince Ajase (Sk. Ajātaśatru) described in Buddhist scriptures. Yet it was not clear to scholars why Kosawa became interested in the Ajase tale or how he arrived at his unique interpretation. After much searching, one day Iwata was rereading a popular book by Chikazumi Jōkan 近角常観 (1870–1941) and realized that main sections of Kosawa's essay were copied directly from Jōkan's book. Rather than elation, Iwata was struck with a sense of shame that such a simple fact had escaped the attention of scholars. One discovery led to another, and soon Iwata had obtained grant money to fund a team of researchers—

Jeff SCHROEDER is an instructor in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Oregon.

including Ōmi Toshihiro—to study a mass of letters and other documents still housed at Jōkan's Buddhist meeting hall.

Iwata and Ōmi's books on Chikazumi Jōkan draw attention to blind spots in scholarship on Japanese intellectual history and Buddhist history. Following an extensive biography, Iwata examines Jōkan's influence on psychoanalysist Kosawa Heisaku, writers Kamura Isota 嘉村礒多 (1897–1933) and Miyazawa Kenji 宮澤賢治 (1896–1933), and philosopher Miki Kiyoshi 三木 清 (1897–1945). He argues that the critical influence of Jōkan's Buddhist teachings on these figures has been overlooked due to disciplinary specialization, emphasis on texts over biographical details, and an inability to recognize the "traces" of religion that persist in nonreligious fields. Ōmi examines Jōkan's role in the modernization of Japanese Buddhism, specifically in regard to the themes of religious experience, Christian proselytization techniques, personality, gender, and the state. He argues that Jōkan's central significance has been overlooked due to the triumph of a narrative of (Ōtani denomination) Shin history centered around Kiyozawa Manshi 清澤満之 (1863–1903), along with a prejudice against traditionalism. Readers of these two works, in addition to learning the story of a fascinating Buddhist priest, will gain insight into the complexity of modern Japanese Buddhism and its connections to modern Japanese philosophy, literature, psychotherapy, and cultural theory.

Below, I first give an overview of Jōkan's career, largely following Part I (chapters 1–8) of Iwata's work. I then summarize and briefly respond to the arguments presented in Part II (chapters 9–12) of Iwata's work regarding Jōkan's influence on the fields of psychoanalysis, literature, and philosophy, and then discuss the arguments presented in Ōmi's work. In the final section, I reflect upon the intersections between modern Buddhism and psychology revealed by these works and the potential for a renewed study of Buddhists' "religious experiences."

Chikazumi Jōkan's Career

A cursory look at Jōkan's career shows how prolific and pivotal a figure he was: a leading figure in the 1899–1900 Buddhist movement against the Religions Bill (Shūkyō Hōan), one of two Japanese presenters at the First International Congress for the History of Religions in Paris in 1900, founder of the Kyūdō 求道 faith movement, pioneer in the Buddhist use of Christian-style meeting halls and student dormitories, popularizer of the *Tannishō*, leader of the 1929 movement to restore priestly status to the former Ōtani chief abbot, and teacher of a long list of famous philosophers (for example, Miki Kiyoshi and Tanikawa Tetsuzō), writers (for example, Itō Sachio and Kamura Isota), scholars, right-wing thinkers (for example, Mitsui Kōshi), and businessmen (for example, Kirishima Shōichi). In the eyes of some, Jōkan was even a "living Buddha" associated with miracu-

lous healings. In summarizing Jōkan's message and its widespread appeal, Iwata points to Jōkan's effective modern reconstruction of premodern Shin traditions, as well as his joining of inner faith with social connection.

Born in 1870 in a devoutly Shin town on the shores of Lake Biwa, Jōkan was the eldest son of temple priest Chikazumi Jōzui. In addition to instilling in Jōkan a sense of loyalty to the sect and its chief abbots, Jōzui was responsible for introducing Jōkan to the *Tannishō*. Although the *Tannishō* is generally understood to have been a "secret" text that was "rediscovered" and popularized in the modern period, Jōkan reportedly observed his father and members of their congregation intently reading and discussing this text late into the night (25). For Jōkan, the *Tannishō* was not a newly discovered "modern" text but an integral part of the Shin tradition.

Jōkan excelled as a student, eventually entering the philosophy department at Tokyo Imperial University. As a student, he was active in the Greater Japan Buddhist Youth Association (Dai Nippon Bukkyō Seinenkai, established 1892) and in the Kiyozawa-led Shirakawa Reform Movement (1896–1897). Following the failure of the Shirakawa movement, Jōkan became deeply depressed due to "personal relationship issues." Iwata speculates that he may have had conflicts with reform movement members as the movement unraveled. This depression brought on thoughts of suicide, as well as physical ailments and a two-week-long hospitalization. Returning home from the hospital, he suddenly felt his heart opening up, and simultaneously realized that the "true friend" he had been seeking was none other than Amida Buddha (39). By 1898, Jōkan and his psychology professor Motora Yūjirō 元良勇次郎 (1858–1912) had founded a "Religious Experience Discussion Group" (Shūkyōteki Keiken Danwakai) for Buddhists and Christians to discuss their experiences (33).

After graduating in 1898, Jōkan became actively involved in the Greater Japan Buddhist Alliance's (Dai Nippon Bukkyōto Dōmeikai) movement to secure Buddhism a favorable legal status vis-à-vis Christianity. Begun as a reaction to the replacement of Buddhist chaplains by Christians at Sugamo prison in 1898, this movement organized resistance to the first national Religions Bill. Jōkan protested on the grounds that such a law would bring undue interference into the administrative affairs of Buddhist organizations and would incorrectly accord the same treatment to a well-established majority religion as it would to a newcomer minority religion. In regard to Jōkan's activism, Iwata highlights Jōkan's appreciation of Buddhism's need for both individuals with strong inner faith and institutions with strong legal standing (53–56).

Jōkan's activism won him the ire of the government and the praise of the Ōtani organization. The government had him expelled from graduate school while Ōtani authorities gifted him a piece of property west of Tokyo Imperial University and invited him on a two-year trip abroad to inspect the status of

religion in foreign societies. Visiting Vancouver, Chicago, New York, Detroit, Philadelphia, London, Paris, and Berlin, Jōkan was struck by the prevalence of Christian social outreach programs to youth, prisoners, and the poor. Returning to Japan in March 1902, he oversaw the construction of a new dormitory for Buddhist youth that he named the Kyūdō Gakusha 求道学舎. Jōkan lived there together with his pupils, giving public sermons every Sunday. These sermons quickly became overcrowded, and Jōkan developed plans for a larger meeting hall named the Kyūdō Kaikan 求道会館. This two-story red brick building (finally completed in 1915 after fundraising problems) was constructed in the style of a modern Protestant church, yet it incorporated traditional Buddhist motifs.[1] Jōkan's meeting hall and dormitory became the center of a bustling faith community comprised especially of students from the nearby universities and high schools (including many women). Philosopher Tanabe Hajime later recalled: "In those days, almost every week on the high school bulletin board, there were announcements for lectures by top religious leaders like the Christians Uchimura Kanzō and Ebina Danjō or Buddhist Chikazumi Jōkan, so their names became extremely familiar to all of us" (v). Further indicating Jōkan's fame and influence, Ōmi introduces a 1906 newspaper article declaring "the three magnificent sights of the Buddhist world" to be "Chikazumi's personality, Sakaino [Kōyō]'s learning, and Katō [Totsudō]'s eloquence" (118).

In Iwata's analysis, Jōkan's use of the term "kyūdō" (lit. "seeking the way") epitomizes his effective modern reconstruction of traditional Shin teachings. This traditional Buddhist term appears in Shin scriptures only infrequently due to the association of "seeking" with "self-power" (*jiriki* 自力). Jōkan used this and the related term "spiritual cultivation" (*seishin shūyō* 精神修養) to attract young urban intellectuals, but ultimately, he delivered the message that "seeking the way" and "spiritual cultivation" are achieved by the Buddha's powers (59–64). Jōkan invited his followers to "seek the way" by actively participating in "faith conversations" and in the writing of "faith confessions," many of which were published in the *Kyūdō* journal. This practice of having laypeople discuss and read about each other's faith experiences was a new development in the Buddhist world, seemingly inspired by similar Christian practices (for example, records of Mukyōkai members' "experiences" in Uchimura Kanzō's *Seisho no kenkyū* journal; see Ōmi 95–96).

As a preacher, Jōkan delivered a relatively simple message: that people on their own are powerless to act ethically, achieve their goals, or find salvation, and that Amida Buddha—presented not as a philosophical ideal or pantheistic force, but as an anthropomorphic being—compassionately saves people just as they are. It seems it was precisely the anti-intellectualism of Jōkan's message—

1. For images and analysis of the Kyūdō Kaikan building, see WASHINGTON (2013).

combined with his enthusiasm, charisma, and effective use of stories—that resonated with young religious seekers, who often found solace in Jōkan's teachings after failing to grasp Buddhist teachings in other academic or devotional settings.

Another important aspect of Jōkan's teachings, according to Iwata, was his views of family, modeled on his own family life. On the one hand, Jōkan's highly-publicized courtship and marriage to his wife, Kiso, exemplified modern ideals of love and personal choice. On the other hand, Jōkan's love for Kiso (as well as his filial devotion to his parents) was connected to his Buddhist faith. According to one account, Jōkan determined to marry Kiso after being shown a copy of the *Kannonkyō* that she owned. Convinced of Kiso's religious faith, Jōkan pursued the consent of her parents by expounding his faith to them. Kiso's parents instead arranged a marriage for her with a wealthy judge, but Kiso broke that off and married Jōkan (88–92). In his writing and preaching, Jōkan frequently discussed family relations, using Shinran and Shōtoku Taishi as models of a faith-based family.

In the late 1920s, Jōkan became involved in sectarian politics. In attempting to address the Ōtani organization's debts, Chief Abbot Ōtani Kōen 大谷光演 (1875–1943), popularly known as Kubutsu 句仏, made a series of failed investments. In 1923, with the Ōtani family (and thus the entire Ōtani organization) in financial jeapordy, the minister of education intervened and saw to Kubutsu's resignation. In the aftermath of this scandal, the new chief abbot—Kubutsu's son—declined to take on Kubutsu's personal debts, and in 1926, Kubutsu filed for personal bankruptcy. In 1929, the new chief abbot and the head of sect affairs (Kubutsu's younger brother) then took the extraordinary step of rescinding Kubutsu's status as priest. Jōkan distributed pamphlets, lectured, published the new journal *Shinkai kengen* 信界建現, and petitioned the Ministry of Education, all in an effort to have Kubutsu's priestly status restored. Ultimately, it was restored in 1935. Jōkan's appeal to family values and the Imperial Rescript on Education in defense of the former chief abbot won him considerable support at the time, but it led postwar sect leaders and scholars to judge him as being out of step with the history of Buddhist modernization.

Chikazumi Jōkan's Influence on Psychoanalysis, Literature, and Philosophy

To my mind, chapter 9 of Iwata's book, "Religion and Psychoanalysis: Kosawa Heisaku's Ajase Complex," contains the most compelling of Iwata's arguments for Jōkan's broad historical significance. As Iwata demonstrates, Kosawa and Jōkan had a close and sustained relationship, and much of Kosawa's psychiatric theory and practice likely derive from Jōkan's influence. In addition to identifying Kosawa's extended quotation from Jōkan's *Zangeroku* 懺悔録 (Notes on

repentence, 1905), Iwata shows that Kosawa's interpretation of the Ajase tale—including his curious focus on Ajase's conflict with his mother rather than Ajase's murder of his father—likely derives from Jōkan's influence. Jōkan frequently likened his own story of familial conflict, realization of his evil nature, and final attainment of faith to that of Ajase, and he drew particular attention to the anger of Ajase's mother toward her son (140–41). Iwata also points out that Kosawa's notion of a mother "melting" (*torokashi* とろかし, 融かし) her son's resentment through loving self-sacrifice, along with his clinical technique of adopting an attitude of maternal love to "melt" a patient's feelings of resentment, likely derive from Jōkan's frequent use of tropes of "melting" and parental love to describe Amida and the process of salvation (143–45).

More significantly, Iwata shows that Kosawa's Ajase Complex theory was originally a theory about "perfected religious psychology" (*kansei saretaru shūkyōteki shinri*), but it was gradually emptied of its religious content as his students deployed it first in the development of psychoanalysis as a scientific discipline, and then in the construction of theories of Japanese uniqueness (*Nihonjinron*). As Iwata shows, Kosawa's groundbreaking essay, "Two Kinds of Guilt Feelings: The Ajase Complex," had originally been published under a different title, "Religion Viewed from the Perspective of the Study of Psychoanalysis," with an introduction expressing opposition to the anti-religion movement's claim that religion is the "opium of the people" (135–36). Kosawa's theory concerned the value of a Buddhist experience of encountering a divine, truly selfless love, becoming conscious of one's evilness, and repenting. Kosawa's student Okonogi Keigo 小此木啓吾 (1930–2003) elided the religious aspects of Kosawa's theory, reworking it into a theory about the growth of individual autonomy through recognition of the *illusion* of the ideal mother figure. Okonogi proceeded to write numerous popular essays and books on how Japanese psychology is uniquely based on this longing for an ideal mother figure.[2] In Iwata's interpretation, this is a displaced longing for a transcendent power. Okonogi's "ideal mother figure" is the remnant of Jōkan's Amida Buddha, and *Nihonjinron* literature's depiction of Japanese children indulgently dependent on their mothers is a remnant of Jōkan's teaching about dependence on Amida Buddha.[3]

Chapter 10 considers Jōkan's influence on novelist Kamura Isota, representative of the "I-novel" (*shishōsetsu* 私小説) genre. Through an examination of two letters written to Jōkan by Isota, Iwata reveals the personal backstory behind two of Isota's novels, *Gōku* 業苦 (Karmic suffering) and *Gake no shita* 崖の下

2. Another of Kosawa's students, Doi Takeo 土居健郎 (1920–2009), relates that he arrived at his famous theory of *amae* (indulgent dependence) as the key to understanding Japanese culture through his relationship of tension and disagreement with Kosawa (Iwata 157).

3. For a recent discussion in English of Kosawa and his Buddhist views, see HARDING (2014).

(Beneath the cliff), in which the character "Master G" (G 師) is based on Jōkan. Isota's letters describe a yearning to have a religious experience of faith like the one Jōkan described in *Zangeroku*. They also discuss Isota's inner anguish over an affair he was then having with a married woman. Although Jōkan viewed human nature as inherently evil, he did not view this as a license to willfully carry out evil. Rather, realization of one's evil nature was, for Jōkan, an essential step on the path to salvation through Amida's compassion, which then provides the basis for an ethical life. Jōkan advised Isota and his partner to separate and introspect on their actions, but Isota instead chose to carry on with what he recognized as an "evil" life and write about it in his novels. In Iwata's view, the act of writing was for Isota a quasi-religious activity that took the place of a religious encounter, enabling him to endure his "karmic suffering."

Chapter 11 examines Jōkan's influence on writer Miyazawa Kenji and his family. Kenji's upbringing in northern Iwate Prefecture was permeated with the modernist Shin faith of his father, who organized a regular summer lecture event involving preachers like Jōkan and Kiyozawa follower Akegarasu Haya 暁烏敏 (1877–1954). Kenji's father and uncle became longterm Jōkan followers. When Kenji's beloved younger sister Toshi トシ (1898–1922) became embroiled in a scandal over an affair with her high school music teacher, she was sent to study at Japan Women's University in Tokyo and directed to Jōkan for spiritual guidance. Toshi wrote two letters to Jōkan (reproduced by Iwata in an appendix) that lay bare her inner pain as well as her failure to find faith through Jōkan's teachings. According to Iwata's analysis, while other youth found in Jōkan's teachings a new, fresh interpretation of Shin, Toshi and Kenji found only the spiritual world of their parents. Iwata follows Kenji's spiritual path from *kokkurisan* (table-turning) séances, to *seiza* (quiet sitting) meditation practice, to Tendai-inflected study of the *Lotus Sutra*, and to a brief but unproductive encounter with Jōkan. Although Kenji finally found refuge in the Nichirenist Kokuchūkai group, Iwata detects traces of Jōkan's influence in Kenji's terminology and in his call to discover the Absolute in this world in the act (rather than the destination) of "seeking the way" (*kyūdō*, 215–21).

Chapter 12 turns to Jōkan's influence on Miki Kiyoshi, one of a handful of important philosophers who frequented Jōkan's Kyūdō Kaikan. Jōkan's philosophical background and the philosophical views submerged within his preaching seem to have enabled him to connect with young, philosophically-inclined intellectuals. Iwata's tracing of a line of influence between Jōkan and Miki is part of a larger argument about Miki, namely that an interest in religion, especially Shin, runs throughout Miki's work. This is contrary to the general view that Miki's final project—an unfinished study of Shinran—was a surprising turn toward religion by a philosopher otherwise focused on society and ethics. Iwata first traces Miki's upbringing in a Shin family, his interest as a high school

student in the *Tannishō*, and his appreciation for Jōkan's sermons and writings, especially his *Tannishō kōgi*. As a Communist supporter, Miki became a vocal critic of religion's oppressive social function, but he always maintained a belief that religion was a fundamental aspect of human nature enabling creativity and social reform.

Iwata then extensively traces Miki's philosophical career—from his student days under Nishida Kitarō, to his sojourn in Germany and France, to his engagement with Nietzsche, and finally to his writings on Shinran. Iwata draws particular attention to parallels between Miki's 1926 work on Pascal and his unfinished work on Shinran. In both works, Miki provisionally accepts certain religious content (original sin and Jesus's resurrection in the former case, the discovery of Amida's Primary Vow in the latter), and then treats them as "symbols" to be applied in the philosophical analysis of the human condition. Miki viewed philosophy as incomplete so long as it contained itself to "internal analysis" and failed to take account of the transcendent as revealed through historical religion. Yet Miki's approach was not theological, Iwata emphasizes. Even in these works of religious philosophy, Miki kept to philosophical methods and maintained a focus on the human condition.

The major finding of Iwata's chapter is that Miki's unfinished work on Shinran grew out of his reading of Takeuchi Yoshinori's 武内義範 (1913–2002) *Kyōgyōshinshō no tetsugaku* (1941)—a fact proven by Miki's letter to a book publisher requesting Takeuchi's book, along with the extreme similarity in their contents. Takeuchi, even more so than Miki, was an admiring student of Jōkan's. By recognizing this web of influence, Iwata is able to shed light on confusing aspects of Miki's work. As Iwata explains, both Takeuchi and Miki followed Jōkan's lead in reading the *Kyōgyōshinshō* through Hegel (specifically through *Phenomenology of Spirit* and *Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*—in contrast to Kiyozawa Manshi, who analyzed Shin teachings in relation to Hegel's *Science of Logic*), and both inherited Jōkan's concern with the manifestation of Shin faith in history. Takeuchi's work advanced the unique interpretation that Shinran's "three vow conversion" (*sangan tennyū* 三願転入), as described in the last chapter of the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, expresses a logic that permeates the whole of the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, and that the basis for this logic lies in the Buddhist view of historical decline according to three stages (*shōzōmatsu* 正像末). Following Takeuchi, Miki argued that Shinran's faith was not a mere discovery of evil within himself; it was the discovery of historical decline and of a counterhistory of individuals awakening to an understanding of evil as evil. Miki proceeded to seek a way to make Shinran's notion of "no precepts" the basis for a new social formation appropriate to this degenerate age.

Having demonstrated Jōkan's influence in the fields of psychoanalysis, literature, and philosophy, Iwata returns in his conclusion to the question of why

Jōkan's historical significance has been overlooked until now. First, he argues that in each of these fields, there has been a tendency toward the abstract analysis of ideas, as found in texts, to the neglect of these figures' personal lives and social networks. Second, and more controversially, Iwata argues that these fields (philosophy and psychology more so than literature) are characterized by a certain avoidance, even disparagement, of religion due to a loss of religious sensibility: "In contemporary Japanese society, the place of encountering the 'Absolute' of the sort presented by Jōkan is not so near at hand. Due to this, most people have difficulty recognizing the 'traces' of the 'Absolute' developed by these individuals in their various fields following their encounters with Jōkan" (276).

As noted above, I found Iwata's argument regarding Kosawa and psychoanalysis the most convincing. In the other cases, there are reasons to be skeptical that Jōkan had a truly significant impact. Isota rejected Jōkan's advice and distanced himself from religion; Kenji was impacted by Jōkan only indirectly through his family; and the possible impact of Jōkan on Miki's philosophy only really surfaces in Miki's final, unfinished work, the importance of which remains unclear. There is no doubt that Jōkan and his teachings were present in these individuals' worlds, but—except in the case of Kosawa—it is not clear that Jōkan's influence was decisive. Even so, Iwata's broader point remains that a historically important figure has long been overlooked by scholars due to disciplinary specialization and insufficient attention to intellectuals' personal lives and social networks.

Jōkan's Influence on Modern Buddhism

Ōmi's work begins with an introduction concisely analyzing the state of the field of modern Japanese Buddhist studies. Ōmi pays particular attention to the significance of Ōtani Eiichi's recent work (2012) in complicating, but not ultimately transcending, the dominant "reformist paradigm" set in place by Yoshida Kyūichi, Kashiwahara Yūsen, and Ikeda Eishun, and also to the reasons—legitimate and otherwise—for the Shin-centered perspective that characterizes much of the scholarship. In response, Ōmi expresses his intention to reveal the persistence of "tradition" within Buddhist "modernization" and to enrich scholars' understanding of "Shin modernization" by incorporating Jōkan and his movement into the picture.

Chapter 1 looks at how a particular picture of "modern Shin" centered around Kiyozawa Manshi and his followers came to be formed. Although this lengthy review of discourse about Kiyozawa and Seishinshugi thought feels a little out of place, Ōmi does effectively refer to Kiyozawa and his followers throughout the book as a counterpoint for understanding Jōkan. Ōmi first documents the various social and doctrinal critiques that were made of Kiyozawa's Seishinshugi movement at its outset. He then traces three strands of sectarian discourse

about Kiyozawa—as beloved teacher, initiator of modern doctrinal studies, and reformer of the Ōtani institution—that eventually merged and became dominant in the 1970s. Finally, Ōmi reviews the variety of postwar nonsectarian scholarship on Kiyozawa, concluding that a long repetitive pattern of social critique has recently given way to a new search (by Okada Masahiko, Moriya Tomoe, Shigeta Shinji, and others) for positive social significance in Kiyozawa. Ultimately, Ōmi seeks to draw attention to how this discourse has crowded out attention to other streams of "Shin modernization" and how its extreme focus on "modernization" has entailed a failure to perceive how "tradition" undergirds modern Shin.

Chapter 2 uses Jōkan's early career to illustrate the transition in mid-Meiji Buddhism from "Buddhism as philosophy" to "Buddhism as experience." For Jōkan, this transition was above all a strategic choice. After his dramatic experience of attaining faith, Jōkan continued to pursue philosophy, believing that philosophical argument was necessary to promote Buddhism on a national and global stage. Years later, Jōkan described his earlier religious experiences in *Seikan roku* (Notes on quiet contemplation, 1899), arguing that true, unbreakable faith can only be established through a direct encounter with the Buddha. The extremely positive reception of this work showed Jōkan that others were hungry for an anti-rationalist, experience-based approach to Buddhism. By 1902, when he opened the Kyūdō Kaikan, Jōkan's anti-rationalist position had intensified, as seen in essays like "The Poisonous Effect of Philosophical Research on Buddhist Faith" (66). In his popular 1905 *Zangeroku*, Jōkan conveyed the message that a universal pattern ran through the far-flung religious experiences of Prince Ajase, Queen Idaike (Skt. Vaidehī), Shinran, and Jōkan and his contemporaries. According to Ōmi's interpretation, Jōkan had shifted from a Hegelian belief in a universal *logos* running through history to a belief in a universal experience running through history. Based on this view, Jōkan developed a new practice of confessing one's religious experience, comparing it to others described in scripture or reported by others, and continually discovering in (or imposing upon) those experiences a unifying pattern, reinforcing the belief in the authenticity of one's own experience.

Following chapter 2, Ōmi presents the first of a series of five short interludes in which are paraphrased the personal accounts of Kyūdō Kaikan members coming to attain faith. In the first account, a young man comes to realize that his grudge against his deceased father is baseless. In the second, a middle-aged man realizes that his ongoing failure to understand Buddhist teachings is proof of his ignorance. In the third, a longtime student of Buddhism assigned to prison chaplaincy realizes he has nothing sincere to teach. In each case, a sudden discovery of one's ignorance or evilness (which indicates one's need of salvation) triggers an acceptance of Shin teachings and a feeling of being saved.

Chapter 3 examines Jōkan's complicated engagement with Christianity. Consistently antagonistic toward Christianity, Jōkan nonetheless saw much in Chris-

tianity worthy of emulation. Whereas Shimaji Mokurai 島地黙雷 (1838–1911) had previously introduced foreign ideas about the proper legal standing of religion (freedom of religious faith, separation of religion and state), Jōkan's travels in the United States and Europe led him to introduce Christian models of proselytization. Ōmi characterizes Jōkan's preaching activities as combining innovative practices modeled on Christianity (for example, youth dormitories, a large meeting hall for sermons, lay participation in faith discussions, a journal column for congregant testimonials, and a discourse of personal "cultivation" [*shūyō* 修養]) with a traditional *myōkōnin*-style Shin faith that denies the efficacy of learning or personal cultivation. Whereas previous scholars have defined Shin modernism in terms of introspection and the related reinterpretation of Shin doctrines, Ōmi argues that Jōkan's Shin modernism was primarily a matter of new forms of proselytization that could skillfully guide modern youths back to traditional Shin faith. In Jōkan's case, this involved adapting Buddhism to a social space dominated by Christian concepts and practices; in later periods, other ideologies and institutions (for example, State Shinto) became dominant, demanding adaptive responses by Buddhist modernizers.

Chapter 4 presents a fascinating study of the evolution of the discourse of "personality" (*jinkaku* 人格) in modern Japan. The term was originally introduced in the Meiji 20s (1887–1896) as a translation of the English word "personality" in connection with philosophical discussions of morality. Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1856–1944) spoke of personality in terms of self-improvement: "elevating one's personality" by reflecting on one's improprieties and strengthening one's "power of self-mastery" (121–22). Nakajima Rikizō 中島力造 (1858–1918), by contrast, defined "personality" in social terms as the humanity present in each individual deserving of others' respect. These philosophers' attempts to articulate a basis for patriotism and social ethics separate from religion produced a chain of responses from the religious world. Preeminent religious studies scholar Anesaki Masaharu 姉崎正治 (1873–1949) defined religious awareness as the integration of one's knowledge, emotion, and will into a unified personality, enabling an encounter with the divine. In *An Inquiry into the Good* (1911), Nishida Kitarō defined personality in extremely similar terms. Ōmi proceeds to show how "personality" was further developed as a concept about the existence of the transcendent (or access to the transcendent) within the individual by Tsunashima Ryōsen, Murakami Senshō, Sakaino Kōyō, Katō Totsudō, and finally, Chikazumi Jōkan. Although this common discourse appears to indicate an abstract notion of religion shared across sectarian boundaries, Ōmi argues that Jōkan skillfully used this common concept to relay traditional Shin views. Specifically, Jōkan defended Amida Buddha's "objective existence" (*kyakkanteki no jitsuzai*) against other modernist thinkers' abstract, pantheistic interpretations by arguing that humans, as "personalities" receptive to form and sound,

can only be saved by a transcendent power that likewise possesses "personality." In conclusion, Ōmi describes how the discourse of "personality" reached new heights in the Taishō period (1912–1926), with intellectuals and politicians increasingly turning away from hollow state morality programs to religion for assistance in cultivating the people's "personality." In this way, the exclusion of religion from the realm of public morality was overcome by religious thinkers' strategic co-opting of the discourse of "personality." Meanwhile, Jōkan's popularity boomed, as he continued to make use of this popular concept for his own traditional Shin agenda.

Chapter 5 focuses on the writings of two of Jōkan's female students to explore the place of women in the history of modern Japanese Buddhism. Ōmi first considers the case of Sugase Tadako 菅瀬忠子 (1886–1909), the wife of an influential Honganji denomination priest. Tadako was an ardent follower of Jōkan for a few years prior to her death. Her diary, discovered and published after her death, relates how she endured the difficulties of her role as wife, daughter, and temple worker, accepting the view that her troubles were due to her sinfulness as a woman. At the same time, she found through Jōkan's teachings a sense of belonging to a "faith family" transcendent of her mundane family. Miyazawa Kenji's sister Toshi is the next example discussed by Ōmi. According to Ōmi, although Toshi failed to find faith through Jōkan's teachings, Jōkan and the Kyūdō Kaikan nonetheless played a role in facilitating Toshi's personal religious seeking, which ultimately led her to develop greater autonomy and to break from her family and their traditions. Ōmi places Toshi and Tadako into a group with poet Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう (1886–1971) as elite women who developed new senses of selfhood and independence through Buddhist practice.

Chapter 6 considers Jōkan's views of the state in the context of his movement to restore the priestly status of the former chief abbot. In the postwar period, the system of locating total administrative and doctrinal authority in the chief abbot was dismantled, so from today's perspective, Jōkan's efforts to maintain that system seem misguided. Yet Jōkan succeeded in winning much support for his cause. According to Ōmi's analysis, a key reason for this was his evocation of national morality. Jōkan presented the chief abbot system as a bastion of Japan's traditional "family system" (*ie seido*), in which personal identity, legal standing, and morality are tied to family. Just as the nation constituted a family headed by the emperor, the Shin community constituted a family headed by the chief abbot. The former chief abbot's punishment at the hands of his son and younger brother was an affront to the family values at the core of the Japanese nation. As Ōmi argues, the case of Jōkan's dual support for the chief abbot system and the imperial system adds a new wrinkle to scholars' understanding of modern Shin ethics. Kiyozawa Manshi and his followers' generally conservative social ethic has been explained with reference to their focus on introspection. Focused on

inner subjectivity, this group of Shin modernists tended either to ignore social and political problems or to view them as outer reflections of inner mental states. By contrast, Jōkan and his followers' conservative social ethic was a natural product of certain features of traditional Shin faith, particularly the need for absolute trust in one's teachers (epitomized by Shinran's trust in Hōnen).

In the conclusion, Ōmi further discusses the differences between Kiyozawa and Jōkan. In Ōmi's synopsis, Kiyozawa was an intellectual who expended great efforts (that is, self power) to arrive at Other Power faith, while Jōkan was a person of Other Power faith who expended great efforts to connect with intellectuals and usher them to Other Power faith. In contrast to Kiyozawa, Jōkan was a Buddhist reformer thoroughly grounded in traditional Shin faith. Responding to a model proposed by scholar Sueki Fumihiko, Ōmi argues that "modern Buddhism" and "folk Buddhism" were in a more interactive, dynamic relationship than has formerly been recognized. In Jōkan's case, the "modernization" of Buddhism was not a matter of denying or transcending tradition; it was a matter of remaking tradition to better accord with the times.

Ōmi has made a strong case that Chikazumi Jōkan played a central role in modern Buddhist history—especially in the transition to "Buddhism as experience," the introduction of Christian proselytization techniques, and the development of a discourse of religious "personality." In the case of Shin sectarian scholarship, the wealth of attention paid to Kiyozawa and the Seishinshugi movement compared to the general neglect of Jōkan and his Kyūdō faith movement undoubtedly reflects an institutional allegiance to Kiyozawa and his line rather than a true measure of their respective historical significance.

Although Ōmi's introduction and conclusion take up the broader field of modern Japanese Buddhism, the book's chapters have a strong Shin focus, with particular attention to Kiyozawa and his followers as the main point of comparison. Some readers will wish Ōmi had better situated Jōkan in relation to Buddhist reformers of other sects. Another minor shortcoming of Ōmi's book (and Iwata's), in my opinion, is the lack of specificity surrounding the term "Shin tradition." Ōmi's introduction includes several pages discussing the term "tradition," noting scholarship on "invented traditions" and the tendency of scholars to approach the term "tradition" skeptically. In response, Ōmi presents Buddhist funerary practices as an example of a tradition that has persisted since at least the early modern period. Yet when it comes to "Shin tradition," the examples he gives are few and far between. In chapter 3, he argues that Jōkan's innovative proselytization techniques signaled "discontinuity of practice" but "continuity of faith" with that of prior eras, but the claim that the faith of Jōkan's followers and that of early modern *myōkōnin* was continuous is not substantiated by almost any discussion of *myōkōnin* (97–105). Likewise, in chapter 4, Ōmi argues that Jōkan skillfully used the modern discourse of "personality" to convey a traditional Shin view of salvation, but there is little discussion of what that

"traditional" view consists of (136–41). This vagueness, in my opinion, renders Ōmi's argument about tradition undergirding Buddhist modernization somewhat imprecise.

Reflections on Modern Buddhism, Psychology, and "Religious Experience"

The assertion that the origin and goal of all Buddhist teachings lie in a certain "experience" is at once a central feature of the age-old Buddhist tradition and a modern innovation. Śākyamuni's experience of awakening under the bodhi tree set the Buddhist tradition in motion, and the goal of attaining a similar awakening—in this life or the next—has been one core motivation for many Buddhist practitioners ever since. The modern innovation lies in the strong emphasis on an *ineffable*, *unmediated* experience to the exclusion or de-emphasis of texts, rituals, images, practices, institutions, and so forth. It also lies in the very deployment of the term "experience" (Jp. *keiken* 経験; *jikken* 実験; *taiken* 体験) that is used to suggest that Buddhism has an "empirical" (*keiken-teki*, *jikken-teki*) basis and connection with the "experiences" attainable through other religious paths.

Psychologist William James's 1901–1902 Gifford Lectures on "The Varieties of Religious Experience" were of paramount importance in the spread of a discourse of "religious experience" in the US and Europe. As Sharf has shown, James's writings also influenced D. T. Suzuki and Nishida Kitarō in their thinking on "religious experience" and "pure experience" (SHARF 1993, 22–23). Yet years earlier in 1898, Chikazumi Jōkan and his psychology professor had organized an interreligious "Religious Experience Discussion Group." By 1901, Kiyozawa Manshi—who had studied and lectured on Western psychology—and his followers were also writing about "religious experience" as the core element of the Buddhist tradition.[4] And decades earlier in 1869, Buddhist scholar-priest Hara Tanzan had introduced his method of "Buddhist experience/experiment studies" (*Bukkyō jikken gaku*; FURUTA 1980, 150).

In Iwata and Ōmi's accounts, we see glimpses of how this new discourse of "religious experience" altered the Buddhist landscape. Within the Kyūdō Kaikan community, Jōkan made discussion of personal religious experiences the basis for his sermons and his congregants' practice. A new discourse of "personality," first developed by philosophers in relation to morality, was transformed by Buddhist writers into one about a psychological state in which communion with the transcendent is achieved. And the development of the field of psychoanalysis was inspired by a Jōkan follower's aspiration to enable his patients to achieve a certain religious state of mind.

4. For example, see SASAKI Gesshō's *Jikken no shūkyō* (Religion of experience, 1926; originally published 1903), comprised of essays published previously in the journal *Seishinkai*.

For a long time now, the study of religious experience has been out of fashion. Wayne Proudfoot revealed theories of religious experience to be strategies to protect religion against rationalistic "reductive explanations" (1985). In regard to Buddhism, Sharf has argued that meditative experiences were historically never the primary goal of practice nor the basis for doctrinal understanding (1998, 99). Yet with the advent of modernity, religious experience has increasingly become these. For scholars of religion in the modern period, it seems perfectly appropriate for "religious experience" to serve as an object of study, even as a basis for theory.[5] What role have religious experiences played in the lives of modern Buddhists? What sorts of experiences are they? How do they come about? How has the appeal to religious experience led to the reinterpretation of Buddhist doctrine? How have Buddhist institutions and practices been adapted to accommodate such experiences? The development of experience-based approaches to modern Buddhist studies—employing the disciplines of history, anthropology, psychology, and/or philosophy—would have to be mindful of critiques of the concept and rhetoric of "religious experience." But if scholars fail to investigate the significance of religious experiences in the lives of modern Buddhists, a major historical blind spot will remain.

5. For a recent attempt to resuscitate the category of religious experience, see Orsi (2011, 90): "To insist that this experience is not *sui generis* (and I agree that it is not) is not to have said very much about it. To explain it as a function of cultural formation (which it is) does not adequately take into account how the people having the experience of the holy described it or how it acted upon them. Contemporary religious studies wants to stop with the sociological formation of the holy, but this is really only the beginning of understanding this human experience that earlier generations of religious theorists named 'holy.'"

REFERENCES

Furuta Shōkin 古田紹欽

1980 Hara Tanzan to jikken Bukkyōgaku 原坦山と実験仏教学. *Nihon Daigaku Seishin Bunka Kenkyujō Kyōiku Seido Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 11: 145–67.

Harding, Christopher

2014 Japanese psychoanalysis and Buddhism: The making of a relationship. *History of Psychiatry* 252: 154–70.

Orsi, Robert A.

2011 The problem of the holy. In *The Cambridge Companion to Religious Studies*, ed. Robert A. Orsi, 84–106. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一

2012 *Kindai Bukkyō to iu shiza: Sensō, Ajia, shakai-shugi* 近代仏教という視座—戦争・アジア・社会主義. Tokyo: Perikansha.

PROUDFOOT, Wayne
1985 *Religious Experience*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

SASAKI Gesshō 佐々木月樵
1926 *Jikken no shūkyō* 実験之宗教. Kyoto: Inoue Shoten. Originally published 1903.

SHARF, Robert
1993 The Zen of Japanese nationalism. *History of Religions* 33: 1–43.
1998 Experience. In *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor, 94–116. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

WASHINGTON, Garrett
2013 Fighting brick with brick: Chikazumi Jōkan and Buddhism's response to Christian space in imperial Japan. *Cross-Currents: East Asian History and Culture Review* 6: 95–120.