

Franziska Steffen (Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany)

CIR Seminar Tokyo 2017, June 24-5

## Conceptualizing religion in the Meiji period

### Analyzing critical pamphlets against the “heretical” *jakyō* Tenrikyō

#### Introduction

Kaneko Dōsen was the first to publish a critical pamphlet against the new religion Tenrikyō in 1890. The revised booklet is titled “The trial of truth: Eradicate the bewitching teaching” (*Shinri no saiban: yōkyō bokumetsu*, 1893). As the title suggest, Kaneko makes his case by mimicking a trial, the prosecution being the “Just Society of the Empire of Japan” and the prosecuted being the “Tenri Church of the Empire of Japan”. The charge is as follows:

The Tenri Church officially [...] belongs to Shinto [...] under the freedom of belief, in reality however it is neither Buddhism nor Confucianism, nor is it true Shinto in character. It has gone the deviant way of being a harmful heretical teaching (*jakyō*). (Kaneko 1893:5)

Kaneko, an intellectual with a deep connection to the Jōdō Seizan school of Buddhism<sup>1</sup>, sees the Tenrikyō not only as differing from the traditional religions, but also as a harmful deviation. Kaneko’s charges against the Tenrikyō are echoed in various writings and newspaper articles, which decry the devastating moral state of religion in Japan, pointing fingers at the numerous new religious groups that have formed before or after the Meiji restoration. Some of these had managed to institutionalize themselves as part of Denominational Shinto between 1876 and 1908, the last one being the Tenrikyō.

The new religion Tenrikyō boasts an interesting membership resume. It was in 1838 when, according to official doctrine, future foundress Nakayama Miki<sup>2</sup> was possessed by ten deities, most of which were Shinto. They are now collectively called Tenri-Ō. After struggling with the destiny revealed to her, she eventually started to spread the teaching to save mankind with faith healing. In 1867, the small group was licensed by Yoshida Shinto, but switched affiliation following the turmoil of early Meiji religious policy to the Buddhist Jifuku-ji temple. After having lost this affiliation various troubles arose from lack of official recognition, so Miki and her followers joined the Shinto Honkyoku sect as part of Denominational Shinto in 1885. A few years later, about twenty intellectuals like Kaneko Dōsen and the newspaper *Chūō shinbun* in particular took to publishing devastating statements against what they perceived to be *inshi jakyō*, an “immoral” and “heretical teaching”, and demanded the group’s

<sup>1</sup> Details on the authors who published the anti-Tenrikyō texts are taken from Hatakama (2016).

<sup>2</sup> Japanese names are given with the surname before the given name.

prohibition. Yet, the opposite happened in 1908, when the Shinto Tenrikyō officially established itself as the 13<sup>th</sup> and last Shinto denomination. Clearly, political decision making and the ideas of intellectuals did not necessarily match concerning the recognition of Tenrikyō as a religion.

But what exactly did the critics decry as “heretical teaching” (*jakyō*)? The *Chūō shinbun* claims:

Miki [...] bewitched the people with her magic, although anybody with sound reason must see that her practices are Christian ones, or fox possession. (*Chūō shinbun*, 15.5.1896)

These anti-Tenrikyō books and pamphlets have remained a footnote in Tenrikyō research, dismissed mostly as typical evidence of Buddhists decrying the pathetic superstitious state of Japan’s popular religions. Research until now has focused on the problem of “superstition”, translated as *meishin*, and stressed that the Tenrikyō was understood to be heresy (*jakyō*) because of its faith healing practices, which were perceived as pre-modern and fraudulent. Indeed, there is no question that this topic, captured in the language of superstition or *meishin* is an important theme in the anti-Tenrikyō writings. However, I have noted that much of the criticism of the Tenrikyō has been framed in the language of heresy or *jakyō*, hitherto reserved mostly for Christianity, as can be gleaned from the newspaper quote.

Therefore, I find the anti-Tenrikyō writings to be valuable sources in order to answer the question of why the Tenrikyō was attacked as heresy anew. Limited as this inquiry is, I hope to add insight to understanding how Japanese religious thought was reconfigured in late Meiji-society, by analyzing how the Meiji-time Tenrikyō critics understood religion at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. and how they put their argumentation forward. I propose that in a line of thought separate to that of ‘superstition’, the accusation of heresy against the Tenrikyō was aimed at delegitimizing the group in an attempt to separate it from Shinto. This was done through likening it to traditional, established tropes of heresy.

## Revisiting the state of art on Tenrikyō criticism

The anti-Tenrikyō texts have been confirmed for 1890 onwards<sup>3</sup> and constitute the beginning of Tenrikyō research. The database of the National Diet Library Digital Collections has made most of the books and pamphlets known to exist accessible<sup>4</sup>. There are about 20 authors and the newspaper *Chūō shinbun* in particular, who have published heavily polemic criticism of the Tenrikyō between 1890 and 1902, before the Tenrikyō gained recognition in 1908. The authors mostly have a religious background and view themselves as supporting the education of the masses.

The texts themselves have not generated an overwhelming research interest until now. One reason is surely their heavily polemic nature. Another reason is that they have been seen as yet another

<sup>3</sup> Not counting several newspaper articles starting in 1881, see Takano (1963), Kaneko (1967), and Oguri (1969).

<sup>4</sup> For a comprehensive list see Hatakama (2016:80).

example of modern intellectuals expressing their discontent over the troublesome remains of the “unenlightened” past. See, i.e., this lament by critic Katō Totsudō:

Saying things like that you will definitely be completely healed, if you do not take medicine in times of sickness, but give offerings to the gods, is absolutely superstition, which you could not arrive at when judging morally. (Katō 1902:6)

Their main bone of contention, in Oguri Junko’s (1969:211-221) eyes, was the criticized lacking moral and scientific nature of the *jakyō* Tenrikyō, which she takes at face value: immoral mixing of the sexes while dancing, extortion of money from believers, and deception of the ignorant populace with superstitious healing practices. Inoue Nobutaka (1995:67) qualifies that “enlightened” writers were at work, who criticized the backwardness of the magical faith healing of the Tenrikyō by discrediting the group through unfounded charges of immoral behavior. Their research focus has rested on the keyword *meishin*, the neologism for “superstition”.

There are two problematic ethno- in this case eurocentric assumptions underlying this research. First, taking their cues from such charges, scholars have understood them as proof for the theory that notions of cultural progress towards modernization and disenchantment had taken firm roots in the minds of Meiji-time intellectuals. In this way, the early new religions were locked in the narration of a modern Japan and placed in the pre-modern and superstitious “enchanted garden” of the modern “disenchanted” world<sup>5</sup>. Thus, practices like faith healing were supposedly seen as a superstitious remnant of pre-modern culture, which had to be overcome through “civilization and enlightenment”, *bunmei kaika*. In this reading, the state sanctioned slogan included the idea that it was the obligation of the modern Meiji state to put an end to superstition.

Second, post-Orientalist scientists of religion criticize this take on Asian religions as a decidedly ethnocentric one, where European Orientalism is seen to have shaped Asian religions in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This means the idea that in order to be recognized as modern religions, Asian religions were reshaped based on the Western concept of religion, represented by Christianity. Christianity, however, is a revealed religion, the implications of which have been consequential. A revealed religion is one that teaches an absolute truth revealed by a deities. It is often exclusivist, since it holds all other teachings to be false. Japanese religions were, in contrast, based on a combinatory, thus inclusive, logic. This is summarized in the *honji suijaku* paradigm, or the paradigm of “original forms of deities and their local traces”, which means that Shinto kami, Buddhist buddhas and other beings like various spirits co-existed in the same universe. While different religious traditions and schools chose which to worship above all else, the existence of other deities was not doubted, but believed to be different localized

---

<sup>5</sup> While this idea is ascribed to Max Weber, it is a misunderstanding. For details refer to Feldtkeller, Andreas (2014). *Umstrittene Religionswissenschaft. Für eine Neuvermessung ihrer Beziehung zur Säkularisierungstheorie*. Forum Theologische Literaturzeitung, Vol. 31. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

manifestations, even if there was debate on who was the “original”, and who the “local trace”<sup>6</sup>. Post-Orientalist research therefore often lead to distorted interpretations of the Japanese religious traditions as well as the new religions, which had a strong syncretic character.

The problem relevant to this discussion is that these ethnocentric theories lead to the conclusion that the syncretistic Tenrikyō, which was said to have held onto superstitious pre-modern faith healing practices, could never have been seen as a legitimate modern religion in Meiji-time. This has precluded satisfactory explanations of how it organized itself into a religion in the first place. Therefore, this determinist view has to be put aside to better understand the process of how the new religions were incorporated into the religious landscape of Meiji Japan.

The ethnocentric view of the religious transfer process has been discussed for a long time, and numerous contributions have been made by scholars like Shimazono Susumu, Katsurajima Nobutaka and Isomae Jun'ichi, to name a few. Limiting myself to the latest publications, the ethnocentric approach was amended by scholars like Jason Ānanda Josephson (2012), Hoshino Seiji (2012) and Trent Maxey (2014) in two points. They point out that, first, the transfer of Western ideas to Japan did not happen in empty space; new concepts must have been translated based on traditional concepts of religion – or, of what religion was not. Second, this reconfiguration did not happen in a political vacuum either; agency and political motivation had been key aspects in shaping Meiji time discourse. This approach allows me to leave determinist modernization theories aside, and instead focus on the motivation of the Tenrikyō critics and their argumentation, which was made not only in the new language of superstition, but especially in the traditional language of heresy.

### Methodological considerations about “superstition” and “heresy”

The keyword for research has been the Meiji-time neologism for ‘superstition’, *meishin* (literally meaning “misguided belief”). Other terms like *jakyō*, (heretical teaching) or *yōkyō* (demonic teaching), which appear often in the pamphlets but have become obsolete in modern Japanese language, are simply conflated with it. It is important to consider that the European concept of ‘superstition’ means the irrational belief in non-existent entities and/or their workings, for which there was no equivalent in Japan. Hence, the neologism *meishin* was coined and gained currency at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Terms like *jakyō* are regarded as closer to the meaning of ‘heresy’, which expresses a deviance, the

---

<sup>6</sup> See Teeuwen, Mark / Rambelli, Fabio (2003). *Buddhas and kami in Japan: honji suijaku as a combinatory paradigm*. London; New York: Routledge.

existence of which cannot be denied. This means that although ‘heresy’ and ‘superstition’ have the same function of exclusion as a concept, their connotations are not the same.

### What is „superstition“?

Research on magic and superstition has been shaped and dominated by James G. Frazer and Émile Durkheim. The discussion of superstition itself reaches back to pre-Christian times, but our common understanding of the term is derived from ideas championed by these two scholars. They have introduced ‘superstition’ as a mostly anthropological category, which is defined in contrast to science and religion, and has a markedly negative flavor. The essential connotations of ‘superstition’ are ‘irrationality’, meaning that superstitious practice is ultimately ineffective, because it rests on assumptions of a wrong causality, and ‘immorality’, because it does not follow accepted religious standards of conduct. Frazer published his main work *The Golden Bough* in 1890, but his argument was informed by earlier ideas of evolutionists. One figurehead was Edward B. Taylor, who developed his idea of pre-modern *survivals*, which he thought to continue to exist even in modern cultures, from the Spencerian cultural evolution model (Otto 2011:54-5). That means he thought that even in advanced cultures elements of the primitive were bound to survive a bit longer among the uneducated populace. This led to the perception also in Japan that it was the duty of the modern educational apparatus to find and dispose of those superstitious *survivals*, in order to prove oneself to be a modern nation. An example would be the writings of Nakamura Kikyō and Morita Shōma, whose deconstruction of Tenrikyō foundress Nakayama Miki’s possession experience as mental illness proved to be highly “disenchanting” and in the 1920, two decades after the anti-Tenrikyō pamphlets discussed here.

There are two relevant points: First, this approach is heavily informed by both the aforementioned theory of cultural evolution, captured by modernization theory, and an ethnocentric concept of religion. This definition of superstition as an absolute category, whereby elements can be classified as superstitious by their very nature, has long been dismissed, and very masterfully so by Bernd-Christian Otto (2011), in favor of a Foucauldian discursive approach. Second, exactly those modernist sentiments en vogue in the 19<sup>th</sup> c. did have an enormous influence on Meiji-time intellectuals, when the neologism *meishin* was about to establish itself.

If we think of superstition as a discursive category, the question of how it was negotiated has to be addressed anew. I draw on a study by German historian Nils Freytag (2003:17-19), who in his work on 19<sup>th</sup> c. Prussia utilized the concept of ‘superstition’ as matrix, arguing that the reproach of superstition gives evidence of cultural conflicts where attitudes and actions regarding the cultural, religious and medical were negotiated between different social forces. It was by means of those conflicts that the new limits of accepted religious and scientific assumptions were being made visible and boundaries were being shaped. Otto (2011) elaborates even more poignantly: ‘Magic’ does not

constitute an element of the category superstition, as it in itself constitutes an empty signifier. A 'magical' practice can always be a religious practice as well, there is no actual difference. Whether a magical practice is religious or superstitious is only a matter of ascription, which in turn reveals the motivation of the person making the argument. Concerning Japan, Josephson (2012:4-6) concentrates explicitly on the political discourse. He argues that the attempt to establish the "rational real" as political secular renders every obstacle a superstition. Rendering something a superstition, which was defined as irrational, meant to deprive it of legitimacy. Some aspects, however, are in turn accepted as religious and thereby saved from the need to purge them. Josephson concludes that while those aspects stay scientifically irrational, they are accepted in organizational form as a 'religion' so long as they do not infringe on political authority.

To my mind, this approach opens the way to understanding one crucial point for the pamphlet writers that has been critically misunderstood until now: The Tenrikyō and its practices such as faith healing did not automatically fall into the category of superstition, even if critics understood them to be ineffectual. As long as the state did not rescind the legitimization of the group, they were legally part of the religious, alongside Shinto and Buddhist ritual practice.

### What is "heresy"?

Understanding superstition as a label for something, which is to be excluded and delegitimized, allows us not only to historicize the concept, but to broaden it in order to encompass indigenous Japanese notions of heresy or heteropraxy. Albeit these concepts stem from different contexts and therefore carry different connotations, the main characteristic remains the same. The instrumentalization of both aims to exclude a belief or practice based on its likeness to accepted religious ones. In the following I rely on the findings of Josephson (2012:35-8), who has undertaken the task to trace the usage of *ja* (false) in Japanese history from the first appearances in the Confucian and Buddhist classics. The American scholar summarizes that unlike the European concept of superstition, 'heresy' in Japan is based on a false belief that is incorrect about the origins of its power. 'Heresy' is not the worship of non-existent or ineffectual deities, but the worship of demons that look like buddhas or gods and turn one away from the true dharma.

Josephson (2012:174) identifies two discourses: The Buddhist discourse warned monks to beware of the temptation of demonic imitation of Buddhism, which stem from forbidden, 'dark' power sources. The threat of these lay in the fact that they pretended to spread Buddhist teachings, while in fact preaching wrong interpretations of the true dharma. Such deviations were said to be often recognizable by the 'licentious' or 'immoral' *inshi*, meaning immoral and sexual practices they espoused. In the Confucian discourse heresy works to discipline charismatic leaders and popular practices that disregard the authority of the state or produce alternate political centers. Here, too, the

problem is a forbidden power source, which deviant authorities draw upon, allowing them to disregard state sanctioned practice. This discourse is aimed at the activities of various charismatic prophets or healers active among the populace, of unclear or very loose affiliation to the officially recognized schools of Buddhism or Shinto shrines.

Both discourses inform the language of heresy in Japan, which was fundamentally intertwined with the demonic, illicit and licentious, demarcating a political boundary that should not be crossed and often is made visible by sexual perversion. However, unlike the European concept of superstition, 'heresy' is not the worship of non-existent or ineffectual deities. 'Heresy' in Japan is a false, because the origins of power are demonic.

The most prominent case of exclusion in Japan is Christianity. Since its arrival of Japanese shores in 1549, it has been called a heresy in various ordinances and anti-Christian tracts from the Tokugawa period. This was not done to discredit the Christian God as non-existent and therefore harmless, like Europeans did with "pagan" religions. To the contrary, it meant to call it powerfully demonic and obscene and as such, fundamentally dangerous. The Christian case has been researched by Ōhashi Yukihiro (2014) and Kiri Paramore. Paramore (2009:5) has ascertained that the reason for this hardliner stance against Christianity was not a perceived clash of cultures, even if it was framed that way, but concrete conflicts occurring in domestic Japanese politics. Still, the politically subversive Christian God, who is to be followed even before the emperor or shogun, could not be accepted. This alternate power center that transcended political law, lent itself to fill the idea of heresy as something dangerous, and Christian prayers to this omnipotent God soon had the image of being powerful magic. By the time most Christian activity was suppressed through the efforts of the Tokugawa shoguns in the 17<sup>th</sup> c., the image of heresy stuck after the Shimabara rebellion of 1637-8. The reproach of being Christian or a Christian *jakyō* or *jashū* (evil sect) has been established and institutionalized in the *shūmon aratame* system, where everybody had to routinely prove that one was not affiliated with Christianity until the end of the Tokugawa period.

Interestingly, Paramore (2009:162) has worked out that the anti-Christian discourse by then had long become a discursive tool for delineating intellectual and political orthodoxy and heterodoxy and for attacking clearly non-Christian political enemies and ideas. Ōhashi (2014:155) stresses that it was routinely used to suppress disturbances among the populace, called hidden *kirishitan* incidents, when alleged remnants of Christian believers were uncovered, even if the connection to actual Christianity was thin or not given at all. The label *kirishitan* is used for the self-proclaimed followers of Christ or for those, who have been accused of being ones. Following Paramore, I will refer to this discourse as the *kirishitan* trope. Until now, only Inoue (1995:59-70) and Ōhashi (2014:155) have noted that this is the very discourse utilized to criticize the Tenrikyō in the Meiji period as well.

## Research aim

Research on the anti-Tenrikyō texts has until now focused on the keyword ‘superstition’ (*meishin*) and claimed that practices viewed as pre-modern, like faith healing, were the reason for modernist critics to deny the Tenrikyō the credentials of a proper religion. Of course, notions concerning medicine and faith healing did play a big part in the discussion surrounding new religions like Tenrikyō, but I will not discuss them here anew. Here, I hope to shed a new light on the questions of why the Tenrikyō was attacked as heretical, how this was done, and what this can tell us about Meiji-time intellectuals’ understanding of religion. Following my methodological considerations, I re-examine the anti-Tenrikyō pamphlets and place the focus on the motivation of the critics and the language used in their argumentation. This reveals two other important themes besides faith healing, namely the background of the Tenrikyō criticism, a perceived incapability of the Tenrikyō with Shinto, and the method of criticism, the *kirishitan* trope.

Instead of arguing the deterministic idea that the pamphlet writers adhered to some Western concept of modernity and “disenchanted” religion, I assert that they deliberated their understanding of religion in order to suit their own agenda, which in turn reflects their socio-political understanding of religion in general. I follow the idea of Sano Tomonori (2007) and Kim Taehoon (2009), both of whom have proposed that the target of the critics was not only the Tenrikyō itself, but its connection to Shinto. Both researchers have deduced that the elitist Tenrikyō critics felt a patriotic duty to detect and deflect harmful ideas to the national ideology. This means, that their agenda was based on their perception that the Tenrikyō as part of Denominational Shinto was incompatible with Shinto itself, as they understood it. The critics give several answers to the question of why they see the Tenrikyō as incompatible with Shinto, but unfortunately a thorough analysis of their reasoning is beyond the scope of this paper. Here, I limit my discussion to a hitherto mostly overlooked theme that reappears throughout all of the pamphlets, which may serve as a clue to future research: Keywords like ‘heresy’ (*jakyō*) are linked to a negative attitude towards Christianity, shared by all pamphlet writers.

To foreclose my conclusion, I argue that the pamphlet writers used the traditional connotations of the discourse on heresy and utilized the *kirishitan* trope in order to delegitimize the Tenrikyō as heresy and thus exclude it as a dangerous similarity to Shinto.

## The immoral heresy Tenrikyō

It is important to take into consideration the motivation of the Tenrikyō critics, if we want to understand why they saw the Tenrikyō as heretical. A complete discussion of the writers and their respective backgrounds, as well as their ideas on Shinto in general has to be left for another



opportunity, however. In the following I will briefly expound of the political background concerning religion in the 1880s and 90s, in order to summarize the ideological background of the writers.

### The Shinto ideology

The character of this national Shinto ideology, which I assume the critics were trying to protect, is currently being discussed anew. It is part of an ongoing debate about what exactly the Meiji politicians sought to achieve when they tried to separate Shinto from Buddhism in 1868 and defined the Emperor as the descendant of the Shinto goddess Amaterasu and therefore a living god. Dismissing the idea that Shinto was supposedly made to be a state religion, Maxey (2014) qualifies that with the promulgation of the constitution in 1889, the national ideology rested both on the sacralization of the emperor and his ancestral lineage as well as the secularization of Shinto as a state cult. Maxey (2014:94) explains that this happened because the state had to disassociate itself from the realm of private belief in the interest of effective governance, but also had to retain a claim over those private beliefs if the "unenlightened" were to be molded into civilized, national subjects. The result achieved by the Meiji-officials was both the sacralization and secularization of the Imperial Constitution, embedding it in a Shinto-based emperor system derived from myth on the one hand, and putting Shinto beyond the realm of religion on the other. In other words, Shinto was declared to be non-religious, so that everybody could worship the Emperor in state rites, irrespective of personal belief.

However, this ideological construct was hard to understand for most and posed problems ever since it was conceived. One question it left open was how to understand Denominational Shinto, especially those religious groups which were loosely attached to the officially recognized sects. What is absolutely certain from the anti-Tenrikyō pamphlets is that the Tenrikyō critics were skeptical about this division of Shinto and highly doubted the value of Denominational Shinto. As expressed most expressively by Haneda Ayaharu (1893:34-6), they feared that the existence of the Shinto sects would blur idea of non-religious Shinto and turn all of Shinto into a religion, which then would make it impossible for it to be a national ideology compatible with competing personal beliefs. This, Haneda is sure, would result in the national unity falling apart and prelude the end of the Japanese nation.

### Painting the life of foundress Nakayama Miki – a fraudulent *kirishitan* shaman

The antipathy towards the Tenrikyō stemmed in part from the idea that Denominational Shinto threatened the non-religious character of the national Shinto ideology, and therefore the peace of the nation. A central concern for the critics was therefore to prove that the Tenrikyō, even though it was officially part of Shinto Honkyoku since 1885, had little in common with true Shinto. One way to

achieve this was to declare the group an outright heresy. In the following, I will present how foundress Miki was linked to the heretical and the *kirishitan* trope.

Official Tenrikyō sources tell that the beginning of the Tenrikyō was when (mostly) Shintō deities possessed the peasant woman Nakayama Miki. This happened when she helped a monk with a healing prayer ceremony for her sick son. After the deities, now collectively called Tenri-Ō, revealed the true teaching to Miki, she took to spreading the faith and gained a following due to her faith healing. This story mirrors the founding lore of many other religions, as it contains a recognizable claim to a divine revelation and makes Miki a true religious foundress.

The Tenrikyō critics, however, do their best to discredit Miki's possession experience for this exact reason. The newspaper *Chūō shinbun* ran a 150 installments long series titled "The immoral and heretical Tenri Church" (*Inshi jakyō Tenri kyōkai*) from April 25, 1896<sup>7</sup>. In this series, the newspaper tells us a very different story of how Miki came to her faith. In the article from May 12, 1896, Miki is said to be the daughter of a certain Toyoda Shichibei and a woman named Mizuki, who are identified as covert *kirishitan* believers, disciples of a Mizuno Gunkichi. The authorities are said to have caught both men and crucified them, leaving Miki and her mother destitute until Nakayama Shohei picked them up and Miki married his son Zenbei. However, the article from May 23 adds that there are rumors that Miki also might be the daughter not of Mizuki, but of Toyoda Mitsugi, and Mizuno Gunki. Then follows the known story of how Miki married into the Nakayama family and how the Shugendō monk Ichibei provided healing prayers for her son. The article claims that this was the beginning of a fruitful working arrangement between Ichibei and Miki, who henceforth learned the shamanistic arts and assisted Ichibei. She is said to have started propagating a syncretic faith and shamanistic healing, to which she added the secret arts of her allegedly *kirishitan* parents.

In short, the articles claim that Miki did not experience revelation, but simply learned the shamanistic arts from the *shugenja* Ichibei, like a traditional *miko* shaman, tampering with the forbidden *kirishitan* arts while at it. In this story, two charges are made: Firstly, that Miki's heritage is Christian, and secondly, that Miki was nothing but a (fraudulent) shaman.

#### Miki as a *kirishitan*

The newspapers' claims about Miki's heritage clearly are fiction. No proof exists for this version and the Maekawa surname of Miki's parents<sup>8</sup> was already known by the earliest critics like Haneda (1893:5). There is more behind this story than simple sensationalism, however. The newspaper seeks to discredit Miki by linking her to a famous case of 1829, when none other than Toyoda Mitsugi (the alleged

<sup>7</sup> The identities of the author or authors of the articles are unknown.

<sup>8</sup> Miki (\*April 8, 1798) is the daughter of Maekawa Hanshichi Masanobu and Kinu from Yamato Province, Yamabe, village of Sanmaiden.

mother) was crucified as a *kirishitan*. Her mentor was Mizuno Gunki (the alleged father), who is thought to have taught her pieces of Christian teachings (Seki 2002:200-1).

Ōhashi Yukihiro (2014:155) underlines that the crucifixion of Mitsugi was a milestone in the development of the *kirishitan* trope, as the case had attracted much attention. This incident was retold in various stories, and also inspired writers in Meiji-time. This makes it probable that the newspaper readers knew about this story.

In reality, even the connection of the historical Mitsugi to Christianity is thin. Although Mitsugi and a small group of women surrounding her had identified themselves as *kirishitan* in trial, in reality they knew mere pieces of it. Mitsugi and her mostly female followers had been low-level folk practitioners, who had amplified their professional knowledge with an aura of the forbidden teaching passed on by Mizuno, which they believed made their arts more effective (Seki 2002:206-7). A quarrel over money issues made them the target of an investigation, where more than their healing practices their claim of being *kirishitan* posed a predicament. The authorities decided to take care of the problem by charging them with being members of the forbidden faith and crucifying most people involved. In this way, the accusation of being Christian started to serve as a means to punish wayward practitioners. The link between Miki and Mitsugi is clearly fabrication, but the imaginary used is powerful. The newspaper used this well-known means of accusation and linked Miki to the banned *kirishitan* 'magic', thus the heretical, via the *kirishitan* trope.

### Miki as a shaman

It would be a stretch to say that the pamphlet writers adhered to the rules of scientific writing. They did, however, see their endeavor as true research and to my knowledge none took up this far-fetched newspaper story. However, most linked Miki to questionable folk healing practitioners, just like the historical Toyoda Mitsugi. Mitsugi and her group had been traditional *miko* shamans<sup>9</sup>, who acted as spirit mediums in order to heal. They let themselves be possessed by a deity, usually the Fox God *inari*, and asked for remedies of an affliction. They often belonged to the Buddhist 'folk religion' Shugendō, but others were also affiliated with Onmyōdō, which was under the influence of Yoshida Shintō. As was usual in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the boundaries between professions was not clear cut, so Mitsugi also performed Onmyōdō-style divination, having attained an Onmyōdō license (Hayashi 2011:6-8). Let me clarify these various terms shortly. The reputation of women like Mitsugi was often questioned, however, and their social status was low (Seki 2002).

---

<sup>9</sup> There are several names for shamans, but I will settle for the term *miko* in this paper. Of course, their activities also varied. For details see Blacker, Carmen (1986). *The Catalpa Bow. A study of Shamanistic Practices in Japan*. London: RoutledgeCurzon; Groemer, Gerald (2007). Narratives and Rituals in Asian Folk Religion and Culture. *Asian Folklore Studies*, Vol. 66, no. 1/2, pp. 27-53, or Meeks (2011).

Itō Masahiko, another Tenrikyō critic who was a *konpira* believer and political activist working in Kyōto, spins the tale further by linking Miki to folk healing practitioners like *shugenja*, *miko* and the *onmyōji*. According to Itō (1901:18-19), Miki and Ichibei came up with the idea that Miki should claim she was possessed by Shinto deities. Of course, they had an affair and Miki, who had gained fame among Tenrikyō believers for her powers concerning safe childbirth, is derided for actually having performed abortions for income. However, trouble with authorities ensued over the lack of a healing license. In Itō's version, a certain Kimura Masanori proved to be Miki's savior then, an overseer for the Tsuchimikado family of Onmyōdō under Yoshida Shinto, charged with keeping track of licensing for low-level priests and *onmyōji*. He advised Miki to gain a license from the Yoshida house to be a low-level Shinto priest (*machi kannushi*) and then to petition at the Inari shrine so she would be entitled to do Fox god summoning rituals (*kami oroshi*). This way, Miki was certified as the "Goddess of childbirth", *sanba daimyōjin* (Itō 190:24). Itō (1901:25-27) makes sure, however, to clarify that Miki nevertheless was not to be relied on. She is said to have performed her shamanistic rituals and to have told everybody to forego medicine and medical advice, causing the death of numerous pregnant women.

While Itō does not refer to Christianity in his narrative, he does tie Miki to harmful and deviant heresy, which only imitated the powers of Shintō. Easily understandable for the intended readership, the image of heresy is established through the move to switch Miki's true credentials of being the "Goddess of childbirth" to the highly immoral one of being famous for performing abortions. This turns the "Goddess" into a heretical shaman. On top of that this shaman is engaged in an extra-marital relationships with Ichibei, referring to the immoral and licentious dimension of heresy.

Another Tenrikyō critic, Matsuki Tokihiko (1894:55), a preacher of the Jingūkyō Shinto sect, is even more outspoken when he says: "Miki in her original occupation has been a kind of miko", the healing activities of which had already been banned in the reign of Emperor Go-Ichijō (1008-1036). Matsuki most probably refers to the "Supplementary Laws of the Three Ages" (*Ruiju Sandai kyaku*, 1002-1089), which records an edict of 781 prohibiting licentious spirit divination of folk practitioners.

Recently, my ignorant subjects have been patronizing spirit diviners (*fugeki*) with whom they have been engaging in reckless licentious worship (*inshi*). [...] Behaving like this is not only in defiance of our noble decrees, in truth, it is also unremittingly reckless and dangerous. Henceforth, this is strictly forbidden. (translation by Josephson 2012:175)

The oldest prohibition of this kind is found in the "Code for monks and nuns" (*Sōniryō*) dating from 717 (Meeks 2011:213). Josephson (2012:175) finds that healing practitioners of the folk were banned in various instances and claims that these bans clearly reflect the terminology of the 'licentious' (*inshi*) and the 'demonic', 'deviant' (*ja*). This was carried through the times by Confucian influenced Tokugawa scholars. The common point of these is the fear that the public is easily misguided by charismatic prophets into committing immoralities and crimes, or into rebellion against the authorities. Such is also the narrative given by Itō Masahiko.

Most importantly, divination and healing magic are not only historic ‘heresy’, since these bans have been renewed the Meiji government, as the readers of the pamphlets well knew. Onmyōdō and Shugendō were banned in 1870 and 1872 resp., albeit for political reasons. To modernists like Kaneko (1893), Matsuki (1894) and the others it must have looked like a blow against pre-modern ritualists, and they duly point out the official *kitō kin’atsu* bans of *miko* shamans, fox possession exorcisms, divination and the like from 1873 and 1874. They claim that the Tenrikyō is guilty of ignoring these laws, even concerning the events surrounding Miki’s propagation before the Meiji restoration.

To my mind it is not too far-fetched to assume that Miki’s description as a fraudulent low-level *miko* shaman with an Onmyōdō license forces the link to the image of the *kirishitan* Toyoda Mitsugi, who also had an Onmyōdō license and who had performed fox possession exorcisms. Miki resembles her in this regard as well, as the Tenrikyō is constantly accused to disregard the policies against spirit possession rituals. To the critics it did not seem to matter that *miko* healing rituals have been wide spread throughout Japan notwithstanding the bans against them. Or that the *kitō kin’atsu* laws only came into effect in the 1870s, and even were mitigated in 1882, when healing rituals were allowed again, under the conditions that patients must have sought out a doctor before consulting a medium. This is also why Itō especially mentions that Miki told her patients not to consult doctors or take medicine.

Using the *kirishitan* trope, the critics succeed in establishing two things: Firstly, the Tenrikyō foundress is either seen as directly utilizing a forbidden (*kirishitan*) power source, or she is linked to the forbidden by conjuring parallels to figures traditionally meant by the *jakyō* discourse, like itinerant shamans and their dubious arts. By projecting the *kirishitan* trope as manifested in the story of Mitsugi onto Miki, the Tenrikyō foundress is linked to shamanistic activities of the much frowned upon *onmyōji*, *shugenja* and *miko*, and is derided for having broken ancient and modern law. Secondly, this proves that Miki does not draw on the correct Shinto sources for her powers, separating the Tenrikyō practice from what is supposed to be correct Shinto practice, even if that is scarcely discussed in the pamphlets. The tactic used here has been unraveled by Otto (2011), who reminds us, that the line drawn between the “heretical magic” of Tenrikyō and the (unnamed) “correct religious practice” of Shinto is purely artificial, even if it still serves the goal to demarcate the boundaries of accepted practice and belief.

## Conclusion

The authors of the anti-Tenrikyō pamphlets written in the 1890s were well-educated men of the Meiji-time with various religious backgrounds, dedicated to the educative mission laid out by the slogan

“Civilization and enlightenment” (*bunmei kaika*). But their take on the modernization of the country was not only doing away with superstition like faith healing, as has been discussed already by previous research. A big part of their idea of a modern state was to have a strong national ideology, which would unify the Japanese people. How these authors truly understood the religious policies of the Meiji state and what exactly their idea of Shinto was, is a topic to for future research projects. It is clear from their writings, however, that it was their biggest grievance that religious groups like the Tenrikyō were taken in by Denominational Shinto.

The goal of the writers was to disassociate the Tenrikyō from Shinto as fundamentally different, namely heretical, by denying religious elements which were dangerously similar. Foundress Nakayama Miki is denied the status as a true Shintō priest, despite her having obtained a license from Yoshida Shintō. The charges against the authenticity of Miki’s possession experience and her teachings were made in the traditional language of heresy. Heresy as a concept serves to demarcate a boundary between beliefs and practices which are, to the objective observer, in truth the same. According to the critic’s view on the matter at hand, however, Miki’s arts were not Shinto – but deviant, demonic and immoral. Miki was linked to the *jakyō* discourse by referencing most elements, which had shaped the concept of heresy (*jakyō*) throughout Japanese history. The power source of Miki’s art is either nonexistent, as she is described as a fraud, or said to be shamanism or Onmyōdō style divination, both of which have been banned repeatedly (inconsequentially) historically and in the Meiji period. This description of Miki also forces the connection to the *kirishitan* trope of the forbidden and dangerous Christian power, known to the public through stories like that of Toyoda Mitsugi. This way, the semblance of the Tenrikyō to Shinto is explained at the same time as it is denied. The consequences of having a heresy like the Tenrikyō in Japan are dire, according to Kaneko Dōsen, who summarizes them as he casts the following verdict in his trial:

The defendant Tenri Church spouts blind beliefs (*mōshin*), deceives the hearts of people, disrupts the social order and damages the proper public way. Because of this it is a demonic teaching (*yōkyō*) and we advocate its immediate eradication. (Kaneko 1893:1)

Yet, there is a significant difference to the *kirishitan* trope and discourse on heresy that existed until the early Meiji time. Josephson (2012) argues for the intriguing idea that the *kitō kin’atsu* bans of the 1870s were formulated with the idea still in mind that such arts are actually potent and dangerous. Be that as it may, the shift toward the Western notion of superstition is obvious by the 1890s. We can still trace the image of heresy through the references to shamanic arts, but all authors are quick to point out that Miki’s arts never worked. In fact, the Tenrikyō is accused of having a massive death toll due to its wicked propagation of scientifically ineffectual healing. Here we can see a reconfiguration of the traditional heresy vocabulary, albeit still shrouded in images of the licentious, forbidden and dangerous, which turns out to be just simple ‘superstition’ and need not be feared. Tsukinowa Bōten (1895) and Andō Masazumi (1896), both leaning to Buddhism and occupied with education, already

ascribe Miki's possession experience to her mental constitution, denying any legitimacy to her claim. This line of thought would become dominant in the Taishō period.

Closing this article I would like to point out that I have laid out only the critic's view of the Tenrikyō. What remains to be explored is the self-referential discourse of the Tenrikyō, which strove to be recognized as a religion amidst the onslaught of criticism raging against it. I also hope that the preliminary thoughts laid out here will be useful when considering how the Tenrikyō critics or well-educated men of moderate impact or importance, understood the religious landscape of Meiji-time Japan, and especially the new religious movements spattered in it.

## References

### Primary literature

- Andō Masazumi (1896). *Tenrikyō Daidanan: Kōhei hyōron*. Kyōtō: Hōzōkan.
- Chūō shinbun Microform (1969). Tōkyō: Nihon maikuro shashin.
- Haneda, Ayaharu (1893). *Tenrin-Ō benmō [Talk against Tenrin-Ō]*. Kyōto: Hōzōkan.
- Itō, Masahiko (1901). *Yōja Tenrikyō himitsu taizen [The full secret account of the bewitching heresy Tenrikyō]*. Tōkyō: Itō, Masahiko.
- Kaneko, Dōsen (1893). *Shinri no saiban: yōkyō bokumetsu [The trial of truth: Eradicate the bewitching teaching]*. Kōbe: Jimuryōsha.
- Katō, Totsudō (1902). *Tenrikyō no gaidoku [The harm of Tenrikyō]*. Tōkyō: Morie Shoten.
- Matsuki, Tokihiko (1894). *Shinkyō. Ichimei Tenrikyō taiji [Mirror of the heart. The extermination of Tenrikyō]*. Kyoto: Hozokan.
- Tsukinowa, Bōten (1895). *Bukkyō saikin no teki. Ichimei Tenrikyō no gaidoku [The recent enemy of Buddhism. The harm of Tenrikyō]*. Kōbe: Nittōkan.

### Secondary literature

- Freytag, Nils (2003). *Aberglauben im 19. Jahrhundert. Preußen und seine Rheinprovinz zwischen Tradition und Moderne (1815-1918)*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Hatakama, Kazuhiro (2016). Meiji 20 nendai no shakai ni okeru Tenrikyō no oshie no tokushusei to fuhensei hihansho ni okeru 'kashimono, karimono' no oshie o tegakari ni [Peculiarity and Universality of the Tenrikyō Teachings in the Social Settings of the Meiji 20s: Drawing on the Teaching of "a Thing Lent, a Thing Borrowed" in Critical Publications.] *Tenridaigaku oyasato kenkyūjo nenpō*, no.22, pp.75-94.
- Hayashi, Makoto (2011). Tenshukyō to Onna onmyōji [Catholicism and Female Onmyoji]. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters of Aichi Gakuin University*, no.41, pp.220-212.
- Hoshino, Seiji (2012). *Kindai Nihon no shūkyō gainen: Shūkyōsha no kotoba to kindai [The Concept of Religion in Modern Japan]*. Tokyo: Yūshisha Press.
- Inoue, Nobutaka (1995). *Shinshūkyō no kaidoku [Decoding the new religions]*. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō.
- Josephson, Jason Ānanda (2012). *The Invention of Religion in Japan*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Kaneko, Keisuke (1967). Meijiiki no shinbun ni arawareta Tenrikyō kankei kiji nitsuite [Studies of Newspaper Columns concerning Tenrikyō in the Meiji-Period]. *Tenri University journal*, no.56, pp.57-73.
- Kim, Taehoon (2009). Meiji 20 nendai ni okeru Tenrikyō hihan bunsho no kentō - semegiau shinkō to 'Shinto hi shūkyō ron' no yukue [Study of critical publications about Tenrikyō in the 1890s - Negotiating belief and the way of the idea that Shinto is not a religion-]. *The annual of Japanese Intellectual History*, no. 26, pp.15-33.

- Krämer, Hans Martin (2015). *Shimaji Mokurai and the Reconception of Religion and the Secular in Modern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Maxey, Trent (2014). *The "Greatest Problem": Religion and State Formation in Meiji Japan*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Meeks, Lori (2011). The disappearing Medium: Reassessing the Place of Miko in the religious landscape of pre-modern Japan. *History of Religions*. Vol.50, no. 3, pp. 208-26.
- Oguri Junko (1969). *Nihon no kindai shakai to Tenrikyo [Modern society and Tenrikyō]*. Tōkyō: Hōronsha.
- Ōhashi, Yukihiro (2014). *Senpuku kirishitan. Edo jidai no kinkyō seisaku to minshū [Hidden Christians. The Edo period bans on religion and the populace]*. Tōkyō: Kōdansha.
- Otto, Bernd-Christian (2011). *Magie: Rezeptions- Und Diskursgeschichtliche Analysen Von Der Antike Bis Zur Neuzeit*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Paramore, Kiri (2009). *Ideology and Christianity in Japan*. London: Routledge.
- Sano, Tomonori (2007). Osorubeki 'gumin' tachi - ichi kyū seiki matsu nippon niokeru tenrikyō hihan no bunseki [The terrible fools: an analysis: critiques of Tenrikyō in late 19th-century Japan]. *Bulletin of the Graduate Division of Letters, Arts and Sciences of Waseda University*, no. 52, pp.165-177.
- Seki, Tamiko (2002). "Jashūmon ichi-ken" ni miru danjo no shosō [Different aspects of men and woman as seen in the „case of heresy]. In: Kuroda, Hiroko / Nagano, Hiroko (ed.). *Esunishiti jendā kara miru Nihon no rekishi [Japanese history seen through ethnicity and gender]*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- Takano, Tomoji (1963). Meiji jidai no jānarizumu ni arawareta Tenrikyō hihan no kenkyū [Study of critical publications in Meiji-Period journalism concerning Tenrikyō]. *Tenri University journal*, no. 15(2), pp. 127-139.

シュテッフェン フランツィスカ

マルティン・ルター大学ハレ・ヴィッテンベルク (Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg)

## 明治時代における宗教論

### 「邪教」天理教批判文書の検討を通じて

(省略)

## 序論

『心理ノ裁判』は兼子道仙による最初の天理教批判文書の見出しである。3年後再出版されたこの文書の副題は『妖教撲滅』である。この「裁判」における原告は「大日本国社会公平」で、被告は天理教会である。訴えは以下の通りである。



[天理教会ハ]曰ク神道直轄ナリ、…曰ク信教ノ自由ナリト、種々ニ潤色シ、陰ニハ佛教ニ非ラズ、儒教ニ非ラズ、又神道ノ真面目ニ非ザル…真理ノ正路ヲ踏ミ違ヘ、邪教ノ横路…ニ入り…吾ガ日本帝国臣民…害スルモノナリ (兼子 1893: 4-5)

明らかに、1890年代の天理教は評判が悪く、伝統宗教異なる、社会を害するものとして批判されていた。ここで、天理教を客観的に紹介する。天理教は幕末の新宗教で、教祖中山みきという女性が神がかりを体験したことが始まりである。こうして天理王と呼ばれる神に啓示を受け取ったみきは、信仰療法を用い、布教しはじめた。そして、吉田神道の認可を得たが、明治時代には、神道本局の傘下に入り、教派神道の一部になった。しかし、わずか数年後、天理教を「邪教」とみなす知識人は先に引用したような、激しい批判文書を発表した。それにもかかわらず、天理教は1908年、神道天理教という宗教団体として認可された。明らかに、天理教の宗教公認に関し、知識人が同感ではなかったと言えるだろう。

では、「邪教」とは英語で“heresy”という意味であるが、それは何を指すだろうか。『中央新聞』から引用する。

妖婆おみきは…邪教を弘め…加持祈祷を行ひ…心ある者は…彼れが切支丹の餘類か…狐使ひの類ひならんと想像したり (『中央新聞』1896年5月15日)

従来の宗教研究は、「迷信」(superstition)に集中し、天理教の信仰療法を問題にしてきた。それは批判文書の重要な論点でもありながら、今引用した表現から分かるように、批判者の理論はキリスト教に対する「邪教」観の枠づけによって行われていた。

本稿では、1890年代に出版された天理教批判文書と其中的「邪教」批判とその意味・機能を検討しようと思う。それによって、明治時代の知識人が「宗教」概念をどのように理解していたか、という問題を明らかにしようと思う。

## 天理教批判研究の再検討

まず、史料について述べるが、1890年と1902年くらいの間、約20人の知識人と『中央新聞』が中心になり、非常に論説的な天理教批判文書を出版した<sup>10</sup>。この作家たちは様々な宗教的背景を持っていたが、それより重要なのは、彼らが自分たちを「文明開化」を推進する啓蒙人として見ていた点である。

批判文書についての先行研究の問題は何かというと、この著作が「迷信」批判の典型的な例としてしか見られていないことである。つまり、近代知識人が迷信的「野蛮」時代の残り物に対して不満を表したものとして見られていた。例を見よう。例えば、批判者であった加藤咄堂による天理教に対する嘆きが次の通りである。

<sup>10</sup> 1881年から新聞記事はある。高野(1963)、金子(1967)、小栗(1969)参照。

一切の病気に医薬を要せず、々神に供したるお供え物を服<sup>ふく</sup>すれば必ず平癒する  
 という如きは、これ全く道理の判断によりては考えることの出来ぬ迷信がある。(加  
 藤 1902: 6)

新宗教研究者である小栗純子(1969)や井上信孝(1995)のような学者は、このような非合理的な信仰療法に対する批判に集中し、その研究の焦点は「迷信」というキーワードにあった。

その理由は、彼らの研究は次の二つ、問題のある西洋文化至上主義的な説に基づくことである。一つ目は、「脱呪術化」を唱える近代化説である。それは、信仰療法は排除しなければならない前近代の迷信的な残存物であるという認識があったことを意味する。二つ目は、ポスト・オリエンタリズムの宗教概念である。それによると、日本の宗教伝統は近代に生き残るために、西洋の宗教概念、つまりキリスト教をモデルにした概念に基づいて形成されたという説である。ポイントは、キリストが「啓示宗教」であることで、神様が人々に唯一の真実を啓示したという前提で他の信仰は信じることのできない排他的な宗教である。それに対して、伝統的な日本の信仰は神儒仏の包括的なコスモロジーの中で存在し、そこから生まれた新宗教も集合的性格を持っている。従って、ポスト・オリエンタリズム研究による日本の宗教の解釈は偏っており、問題点が多いと思われる。

私が指摘したいのは、近代化説と西洋の宗教概念に基づく研究は、天理教に対する研究問題も起こしたことである。すなわち、天理教があらゆる理由で明治時代の知識人に近代宗教として認識されたわけがないという前提が従来の研究にあり、天理教批判文書はその証拠として位置付けられている。その結果、天理教がどのようにして公認宗教として制度化したかという問題には今のところ満足のいく理論がないと思う。

宗教思想の再構成を研究し、エスノセントリズムの訂正に努力した先駆者が多く、最新の研究として Jason Josephson (2012)、星野清二 (2012)、Trent Maxey (2014)がある。それによると、明治期に西洋概念が一方的に導入され、消極的に受け入れられた定着過程ではなかったということである。というのは、まず、新しい西洋の概念が日本の土着宗教認識・伝統宗教思想に基づいて把握されたという指摘は重要である。そして、宗教概念の再構成はそれぞれの議論の参加者によって、それらの政治的動機の上で行われたということも無視してはいけないという指摘がある。従って、私は本稿でも天理教批判者の批判の動機や目的、そして宗教認識の背景を研究の出発点とする。そして、それらの議論は、新しい「迷信」論に限らず、従来の「邪教」論を使って行われたことに焦点を置く。

## 「迷信」と「邪教」をめぐる研究方法論

従来の研究で西洋概念である「迷信」がキーワードになり、伝統的な概念である「邪教」が同じ意味のものとして無視された。その二つの概念は、確かに機能は同じであるが、分析の鍵一は、「迷信」と「邪教」の含意・コノテーションに注目することである。

### 「迷信」概念

まずは「迷信」概念についてだが、18世紀後半に非合理的とされた思想が科学上、宗教上正しくないと判断され、迷信として片付けられた。そして、近代化の脱呪術かとともに迷信は、「前近代的」な残存物として消えるだろうと考えられた。

しかし、迷信が消える兆しが未だになく、学者は言説的アプローチに移りた。それによって、あることが迷信だという批難は、文化的摩擦の証拠で、宗教や科学的仮説の認識領域の交渉・ネゴシエーションの手段である。そして、歴史学者 Otto (2011) は最も重要な点を強調しているが。宗教と迷信が区別できるような「実態のある」水準がない。言い換えれば、信仰療法などは「宗教」なのか、非合理的「迷信」なのかという判断は、ただ批判者の動機によるものである。すなわち、その判断からは信仰療法の実態について何も言えないのに対し、分かるようになるのは批判者の批判の動機である。さらに、日本に関してアメリカの学者 Josephson (2012:4-6) は政治的議論に集中する。彼の指摘では、近代的合理性に基づく明治国家に反するものはすべて「迷信」とされ、正当化を否定された。しかし、そのものは非合理的であっても「宗教」として制度化することが可能であった。つまり、政治権力に反対しなかった場合、非合理的なものでも宗教として残存できた。

それは天理教批判文書の分析の上で重要な指摘である。天理教の信仰療法が近代的知識人にとって迷信であったという理由だけでは、天理教は「迷信」にならなかった。天理教は国家権力の公認により制度化した限り、「宗教」領域に属したというのは事実であった。

### 「邪教」概念

「邪教」の「邪」という概念は「迷信」と同じように、あるものを排除できるよう正当性を否定する目的で利用できる議論の手段である。しかし、「邪」と「迷信」の差は、文化的歴史的含意・コノテーションである。Josephson (2012:174)によると、「邪」というのは、1. 禁止された危ない起源から力を得ることを意味した。つまり、悪道に陥ることで正しい道をイミテーションする悪のことである。2. その理由で、「邪」という批判は権力者によって、反体制的な傾向を持つとみなされた民間信仰、宗教家を弾圧できるように使われた。従って、

「邪」というのは西洋の「迷信」のように「実は存在しない」神々や「無効」な魔法などではなく、むしろ禁止された起源から力を与える「危険」なものであった。

「邪教」の典型的な例は基督教に違いない。キリストは徳川時代に禁止され「邪宗」と呼ばれた。それは、キリスト教の神様の存在を否定したわけではなく、むしろその神様の力・危険性を強調した。ゴッドは絶対的存在で、日本の伝統的宗教コスモロジーに包括できない将軍より上の存在であるというキリスト教徒の態度が禁止の原因であった。しかし、その邪教観はキリスト教に限って使われていたわけではない。Kiri Paramore (2009:5)と大橋幸弘 (2014)の研究によると、「邪」はその後あるものを切支丹の脅威に例えることでおとしめる機能を持つようになった。つまり、あるものをキリスト教に例える・関連付けることは、そのものを危険である「邪」にみなすことを意味した。本稿で Paramore に従い邪教観を与えるこの批判手段を「切支丹比喻」(Kirishitan trope)と呼ぶことにする。最初の引用にもう一度戻ると、天理教も「切支丹比喻」で批判されていたと言える。

## 本発表の目的

繰り返しになるが、本稿では天理教批判文書を再検討する。従来の研究は、「迷信的」信仰療法が、天理教が近代宗教として認知されなかった原因であったと主張してきた。それを認めながらこのテーマを本稿では取り扱わない。本稿では、天理教批判者の「邪教」批判とその意味・機能を検討しようと思う。それによって、明治時代の知識人が「宗教」概念をどのように理解していたかという問題の考察ができるように貢献しようと思う。なんらかの

「近代化」が目的であるという必然論的なアプローチを使わず、天理教批判者の動機や理論を見ることによって、次の二つ重要なテーマも共通点として明らかになる。

まず一つは、佐野智規 (2007)と金泰勳 (2009)はすでに指摘したことであるが、批判の的は天理教自体だけではなく、天理教が神道に属したという問題であった。天理教批判者は国体に危険と思われるものを見分けたりその処分に努力したりする愛国主義的な義務を感じ、それも批判の動機だったということである。

さて、国体と神道について簡単に触れるが、Maxey (2014)が先行研究で説明するように憲法が 1889 年に発布されるとともに、日本のイデオロギーが二つの柱の上に立つようになった。一つ目は、国体の神聖化である。つまり、日本の天皇は天照大神の子孫である説のことである。二つ目は、逆に同時に憲法は法律に基づき、政治が世俗化されたということである。その理由で、国民に天皇崇拝が義務付けられたが、神道は宗教ではないと定められたので、それは個人信仰と矛盾しないとされた。従って、天理教批判者の問題は「宗教である天

理教」が「宗教でない神道」に属したという矛盾を認識したことにあつたと考え、それを前提に論じようと思う。

なぜ天理教と神道は矛盾すると認識されたかという理由に関して批判者は様々な答えを出すが、これらの全部を論じる余裕がなく、今後の課題にする。しかし、ヒントになるのが二つ目の共通点である。それは「邪教」概念の使用からうかがえる「邪教」キリスト教に対する批判的な態度である。

結論を先に述べるが、下記論じている点は、批判者が天理教を神道から切り離す目的で、「切支丹比喻」、つまりキリスト教の「邪教」観を枠づけによって、天理教の正統的を否定したことである。

### 「邪教」である天理教

神道非宗教論は上記説明したように確定されたものの、実際にこの論がどの程度理解されたか、定着されたかは明らかではない。そして、最初から問題点が多かったと思われる。例えば、無宗教であった神社神道とともに宗教的であった教派神道が定められたが、この区別はあまりにも人為的に感じた人は多かったと推測できる。天理教批判者も教派神道について批難の言葉しかない。それを一番強く強調したのは、羽田文明(1893: 34-6)である。彼は神社神道と教派神道の区別に納得できず、教派神道の存在が神道非宗教論そのものに矛盾すると信じた。そして、神道は宗教だったら国民は神道を信仰しなくてもいい状況になり、従って先祖、天皇、国家を否定する自由を持つようになり、日本帝国の破壊に繋がると羽田は恐れている。

従い、天理教が神道本局の一部であったにもかかわらず、実は本物の神道と何の関係もなかったことを証明することは批判者の目的であった。そして、それが実現できる方法は天理教を「邪教」とすることである。以下では、天理教の教祖みきが「切支丹比喻」を通じて邪教観を与えられたことを紹介する。

みきの神がかりの体験は、天理教が啓示宗教である、みきは正当の教祖であることを意味する。そのきっかけになったのは、みきの息子のために行われた加持祈祷という信仰療法であった。みきはミディアムになった時に、「天理王」と総称される神々はみきに使命を与えたと言われている。しかし、天理教の批判者は、みきの神がかりに疑問を投げかけるように全力を尽くした。

例えば、『中央新聞』は(1986年5月12日、14日、23日)みきの話を違うように物語っている。新聞によると、みきはある水野軍記と豊田貢の娘で、親二人は隠れ切支丹として磔になったと書かれている。そして、みきは息子が病気であった時に修験者市兵衛に依頼し、

そのきっかけでみきは市兵衛から巫女というシャマンの技術を勉強したと書かれている。後にみきは、市兵衛から学んだ信仰療法を親から学んだ切支丹魔法・呪術と混ぜて行ったと説明されている。『中央新聞』はこうしてみきに対して二つの疑問を表している。一つは、みきは切支丹であつた訴えで、もう一つは、みきは平凡の巫女しかなかったという訴えである。

## 1. みきは切支丹であること

『中央新聞』の話はどう見るべきだろうか。まず、みきの親の話は根拠のない嘘に違いない。新聞の目的は明らかに、みきを 1829 年に起こった豊田貢の切支丹事件と関連付けることであつた。その事件で (みきの母とされていた) 豊田貢が実に磔になった (関 2002: 200-1)。大橋幸弘 (2014: 155) は、豊田貢の事件が邪教観に重要である「切支丹比喻」の発展のマイルストーンだと強調している。この事件は、あらゆる物語で伝えられ、明治時代の作家にも影響を与えた有名な事件である。

現実には、歴史的人物豊田貢のキリスト教とのつながりは薄いである。貢は自分が切支丹であると証言したが、実際にはその欠片しか知らなかったようである。貢の小さなグループは、信仰療法を行う民間宗教家であり、禁止された切支丹の呪術を使うと自分の術がより効果的になると信じた (Seki 2002: 206-7)。貢が検察を受けた時に信仰療法より彼女が切支丹信仰をやめたくないことは問題であつた。それも、彼女が磔になった原因である。それにもかかわらず、切支丹である訴えが宗教家を「邪」とする処刑できるようにする手段で、「切支丹比喻」になった。みきと貢の関連は根拠がないものの、極めて強い影響を及ぼした。『中央新聞』がそのよく知られていた「切支丹比喻」を使い、禁止された切支丹魔法、つまり邪教観をみきに当てはめようとした。

## 2. みきはシャマンであつたこと

貢の話を取り上げたのは、『中央新聞』だけであつた。しかし、天理教批判者はみんな、みきを貢のような巫女、修験者、陰陽師として軽蔑した。貢は狐下げ、加持祈祷などのような民間信仰療法を使う、低レベルの巫女や陰陽道の占い師であつた。巫女を簡単に説明すると、巫女は病気の原因や治療の方法を神々にうかがうミディアムであつた。巫女はよく、仏教である修験道や吉田神道と関係のあつた陰陽道に属したが、評判がやはり曖昧である民間宗教家であつた。

では、天理教批判者である揖東正彦 (1901: 18-27) のみきの話を紹介しよう。揖東によれば、みきは自分が神がかりを体験したと嘘を付き信仰療法を行つたが、免許がないことは問



題になった。そして、ある陰陽師の手伝いで、みきは陰陽道の吉田神道の免許を取得できた。それにもかかわらず、揖東はみきの術のせいで数多くの犠牲者や死者がでたことで、それでもみきが詐欺だったと強調する。

揖東はキリスト教に言及していないが、みきは神道ではなく、神道をまねする詐欺であるとして、「邪」に例えている。もう一人の天理教批判者、松木時彦 (1894: 55) はさらに、巫女の活動はすでに 11 世紀から禁止されていたと指摘する。民間宗教家の活動を禁止する最初の禁令は 8 世紀の僧尼令の出でくるが、その禁令を研究した Josephson (2012: 175) の意見では、カリスマのある宗教家が人々を惑わし政治権力に反対することを推進する恐れがあるという理由で発布された。しかし、最も重要なのは、信仰療法などの呪術は歴史的な「邪」だけでなく、明治政府によって同じく禁止されたということである。陰陽道と修験道は両方とも 1870 年代前半に禁止され、天理教批判者も同時に出された「祈祷禁圧」という巫女を禁止する法律があることを述べる。「邪」というのは、政治権力が認めない力を使う、それで政治権力に反対する呪術者を意味し、みきも禁止されている信仰療法を行った理由で「邪」であったと批判者が言ったのである。

結論として言えるのは、天理教批判者の目的は神道に属する天理教を「邪」である神道のイミテーションとして位置付けることであった。みきが吉田神道の免許を取得したにもかかわらず、みきの神道との関係が否定された。作家が「邪」のレトリックを通じて、1. 教祖みきの神がかり体験を詐欺として否定し、また、2. みきの信仰療法が禁止された巫女の技術だとしている。それは、結局、処罰された陰陽師と巫女であった豊田貢と「切支丹比喻」をも思い起こさせたと言えるだろう。

## まとめ

私は本稿で天理教批判文書の「邪教」批判からは、批判者の「宗教」概念の理解について何が分かるかという点を論じてきた。天理教批判者は、天理教が教派神道の一部であったにもかかわらず、神道ではなかったと認識されたことである。この理解は、伝統的な「邪教」概念にも基き、「邪教」の枠づけによっても行われていた。従って、批判者は、天理教の正当性が疑問視されるように努力し、みきの信仰療法は「切支丹比喻」を通じて、巫女や陰陽師に関連付けられ、禁止された呪術として邪教観を与えられた。これによって、天理教批判者は、天理教が神道の危険であるイミテーションであったことを定着させたことで、天理教はなぜ神道に似ているかという説明を提供したと同時に、天理教はなぜ神道ではない説明も提供したことになる。そして、天理教批判者は、批判文書を通じて、政府が天理教公認を取

り消すように全力を尽くした。冒頭に引用した兼子の『心理の裁判』で原告「大日本国社会公平」が求刑する場面を本稿の結びとして見よう：

被告天理教会ハ、妄信ヲ吐キ、人心ヲ惑乱シ、社会ノ秩序ヲ妄リ、正理公道ヲ害スル、妖教ナルニ付、速ヤカニ撲滅シ、全ク彼等人間社会ニ、其根據ヲ絶ツベキ  
(兼子 1893: 1)

では、「邪教」概念の「迷信」概念による再構成に関し、一点だけ取り上げる。上記説明した通り、天理教に対する邪教批判は伝統的に何を意味したかということ、それは教祖みきが禁止された信仰療法を行い、権力者に反するものとされたということである。しかし、天理教批判者である揖東が説明したのは、みきの術は実際に効果がなく治療を受けた患者の多くが死んだということである。つまり、「邪」の危険性はその「禁止された力による効果」ではなくなり、それより「愚民は力に信じてても実際に効果がない」という含意が明治後期にあったことは推測できると考える。すなわち、「邪教」観から「迷信」観へという過程が見えると言えるだろう。