

Thomas A. TWEED

American Occultism and Japanese Buddhism

Albert J. Edmunds, D. T. Suzuki, and Translocative History

Transnational exchanges shaped religious life in Meiji (1868–1912) and Taishō (1912–1926) Japan and Gilded Age (1865–1900) and Progressive Era (1900–1917) America. This essay analyzes one case of cultural exchange in this period. It focuses on Albert J. Edmunds, a British-American Buddhist sympathizer, and it considers the ways that Western occult traditions, especially Swedenborgianism, moved back and forth across the Pacific and shaped the work of D. T. Suzuki. The article offers three conclusions. First, for his influence on Suzuki and others in Japan—he sparked Suzuki’s personal interest in Swedenborgianism, for example—Edmunds deserves to be recognized in scholarly narratives. Second, it is important to note the influence of Western occult traditions on Suzuki’s work, especially between 1903 and 1924. Third, the essay considers the implications of this case study for writing translocative histories, and it suggests that historians reconsider the periodization and spatialization of their narratives as they also reaffirm the importance of scholarly collaboration.

KEYWORDS: D. T. Suzuki – Albert J. Edmunds – occultism – Swedenborgianism – United States – Meiji and Taishō Japan – transnationalism

Thomas A. Tweed is Zachary Smith Distinguished Professor of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

FROM KAMAKURA on 3 June 1895, Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō (a.k.a. D. T. Suzuki) wrote a letter to Paul Carus on behalf of Shaku Sōen, who wanted to thank the German-American philosopher for sending a copy of the periodical he edited, *Open Court*, and to promise that “a statue of Buddha cut by a modern Japanese artist” would arrive shortly at Carus’s home in Illinois.¹ In this way, and many others, transnational exchanges shaped religious life in Meiji (1868–1912) and Taishō (1912–1926) Japan and Gilded Age (1865–1900) and Progressive Era (1900–1917) America—or, perhaps, to highlight transculturation and complicate the usual cartographies and chronologies we should talk about exchanges between Meiji America and Gilded Age Japan.² However we label and periodize the last three decades of the nineteenth century and the first three of the twentieth, it is important to note that not only statues and magazines but practices and people crossed the Pacific in complex cultural flows. Some of these contacts have been well studied. For example, scholars have analyzed the Japanese delegation’s “strategic occidentalism” at the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, traced Unitarian influences in Japan, chronicled the history of Japanese Buddhist migrants in Hawai‘i and along the West Coast of the us, and studied how Western philosophy and Japanese art crossed national boundaries. Many who participated in these exchanges have received some attention in the scholarship, including Ernest Fenollosa and Inoue Enryō, Sakurai Keitoku and William Sturgis Bigelow, John Henry Barrows and Shaku Sōen, Okakura

1. Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō to Paul Carus, 3 June 1895, OC. The letter is reprinted in Suzuki’s collected works (SDZ, vol. 36, p. 57). As I note later in this essay, translocative history requires collaboration, and I have been lucky to have wonderful collaborators. I presented an earlier version of this essay at the xixth World Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions in Tokyo in 2005, and I am grateful to the participants in our session on “Local Buddhisms and Transnational Contacts, 1868–1945,” for their comments and suggestions before, during, and after that conference: Ishii Kōsei, Richard M. Jaffe, Donald S. Lopez, Moriya Tomoe, and Wayne Yokoyama. I also learned from exchanges in Japan with Kirita Kiyohide and Elsa I. Legittimo Arias. I have had helpful exchanges with Yoshinaga Shin’ichi, who also attended the session in Tokyo and read a draft of this article. Other scholars also commented on the draft, including Isomae Jun’ichi, Ann Taves, and Judith Snodgrass. I am especially grateful to Jaffe, with whom I also co-taught a course at Duke and the University of North Carolina on “Transnational Buddhisms,” and Yokoyama, who helped me secure (and translate) archival materials in Matsugaoka Bunko in Kamakura.

2. I take the term “transculturation” from the Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz, who coined it in the 1940s as an alternative to more static and unidirectional labels for cultural contact, including “acculturation.” My thinking about “transculturation” also has been informed by Mary Louise PRATT’s use of the term (1992).

Kakuzō and Lafcadio Hearn, Imamura Yemyō and Edward Morse, Henry Steel Olcott and Ashitsu Jitsuzen, and Hirai Kinza and Paul Carus.³

Others played a role, however; and there were other sorts of exchanges during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Building on my earlier research in *The American Encounter with Buddhism, 1844–1912*, in this essay I focus on Albert J. Edmunds (1857–1941), a British-American Buddhist sympathizer who attended spiritualist séances and celebrated “psychic phenomena,” and I consider the ways that Western occult traditions, especially Swedenborgianism, were part of the complicated transnational exchanges between Japan and America, especially in the work of D. T. Suzuki between 1903 and 1924.⁴

As I argued in that earlier book, many of the most important late-Victorian American Buddhist adherents and advocates—including Henry Steel Olcott, Herman Carl Vetterling, and Marie de Souza Canavarro—favored a hybrid Buddhism that blended occult traditions (including Swedenborgianism and Theosophy) with strands of Asian Buddhism (including Sri Lankan Theravada and Japanese Mahayana). Although he is less widely known, Edmunds was one node in the circulation of occult beliefs back and forth across the Pacific. He had some contacts with Japanese in the United States and Japan.⁵ For example, he wrote articles for the *Light of Dharma* (1901–1907), the English-language periodical sponsored by the Jōdo Shinshū in San Francisco and corresponded with Nishijima Kakuryō (1873–1942), a Japanese Buddhist missionary who thanked Edmunds for his contributions to their magazine and consulted him about which Pali grammar to buy.⁶ Edmunds also corresponded with Anesaki Masaharu, who along with Kishimoto Nobuta, was one of the founders of religious studies in Japan, and he even collaborated on a book with Anesaki—*Buddhist and Christian Gospels Now First Compared from the Originals*. In one polite, if hyperbolic, assertion Anesaki even told Edmunds that “if I could do something

3. Among the many relevant works in English are those by THELLE (1987), ROSENSTONE (1988), KETELAAR (1990), TWEED (2000), SHARF (1993), SEAGER (1995), VERHOEVEN (1998), BUDDHIST CHURCHES OF AMERICA (1998), MORIYA (2000), and SNODGRASS (2003). To mention just one well-known example of cultural exchange, in 1889 the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston acquired the William Sturgis Bigelow collection and the Ernest Fenollosa–Charles Goddard Weld collection, and with that it could lay claim to the greatest collection of Japanese art—especially Japanese Buddhist art—outside Japan. In a similar way, both Bigelow and Fenollosa in different ways supported the arts in Japan. Bigelow supported the preservation of ancient Buddhist monuments, for example at Shōrinji (Nara Prefecture), and helped the painter Kano Hōgai (1828–1888); Fenollosa did a great deal too, including his famous speech at the Museum of Education in Tokyo in 1882, when he argued for the value of Japanese art (FONTEIN 1992). On the Japanese collection, including the works collected by Bigelow and Fenollosa, see MORSE and TSUIJI (1998).

4. For references to Edmunds in that earlier work see TWEED 2000, pp. 51, 54–55, 62, 76, 82, 84, 85, 89, 91, 102, 109–110, 124, 128, 146, 149, 160, 229. On Suzuki, see pp. 31, 32, 51, 53, 55, 158–59, 161, 186n 14.

5. For example, in an undated entry in Edmunds’s diary in January 1902, he noted that “on another [Sunday in January] I entertained Noguchi and 3 other Japanese in my room.” Albert J. Edmunds, *Diary #10*, vol. 18, AEP. Edmunds does not identify his Japanese visitors.

6. Nishijima Kakuryō to Albert J. Edmunds, 10 May 1902, AEP.

in this sphere of scientific work [that is, the academic study of religion and the study of Pali Buddhism] I should owe the most part of it to your encouragement.”⁷ From this exchange with Anesaki, Edmunds gained an irregular but life-long correspondent and literary companion.⁸ In turn, even if we are suspicious about Anesaki’s hyperbolic assertion about Edmunds’ influence, that “obscure American” (as Edmunds described himself in a published account of his collaboration with Anesaki) might have played a very minor and indirect role in the formation of religious studies in Japan, though more research on that is needed before we arrive at firmer conclusions (EDMUNDS 1913a).

Edmunds also had face-to-face encounters and literary exchanges with D. T. Suzuki, and that is my focus here. I draw on English language archival sources in the United States and Japan—at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, the Open Court Papers at Southern Illinois University, and Matsugaoka Bunko in Kamakura—as I trace their exchanges about occult traditions, especially Swedenborgianism, a topic that Suzuki went on to discuss in public lectures and published volumes.⁹ Between 1910 and 1915, Suzuki translated four of the scientist and mystic Emanuel Swedenborg’s (1688–1772) works into Japanese, and he offered his own interpretations of the Swedish writer’s religious views in a book length study in 1913 (Swedenborg) and in an article eleven years later (“Swedenborg’s View of Heaven and ‘Other Power’”).¹⁰ By tracing these exchanges between Suzuki and Edmunds I not only hope to complicate the scholarly interpretations of both men—and rethink the accounts of Buddhism on both sides of the Pacific during this period—but also offer some

7. Anesaki Masaharu to Albert J. Edmunds, 12 February 1905, AEP. In turn, Edmunds was grateful for Anesaki’s collaboration too. A year earlier, Edmunds had expressed his thanks to Suzuki for introducing him to Anesaki: Albert J. Edmunds to Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō, 19 August 1904, MB. Scholarship about the history of religious studies in Japan has noted Anesaki’s prominent role. On that see TSUCHIYA (2000) and ISOMAE (2002, pp. 21–46). Anesaki is the only Asian scholar mentioned in any of the Western histories of the field: See JORDAN (1905). On Kishimoto’s role, see SUZUKI Norihisa (1970). Other Japanese scholars, including TAKAKUSU Junjirō (1906), also praised Edmunds’s book and “the able editorship of Professor Anesaki.” Takakusu even suggested that “Japan will be grateful to our author [Edmunds] for the boon of this excellent work, which will, I hope, eventually help to bring about a solution of the religious problem of Japan.”

8. After a period with no apparent contact, Anesaki and Edmunds exchanged notes and texts again in the 1920s. In one letter Edmunds reports that after an encounter with two Japanese visitors in Philadelphia in 1920 he was “so full of Japan” that he felt compelled to write to Anesaki again, and four years later the Japanese scholar sent him a card. Edmunds responded with a five-page letter and, under separate cover, he sent two of his works on Buddhism and Christianity. Albert J. Edmunds to Anesaki Masaharu, 30 September 1920, UTA. Albert J. Edmunds to Anesaki Masaharu, 19 November 1924, UTA. I am grateful to Isomae Jun’ichi for telling me about these letters and to Inada Masuyo for copying them.

9. I rely on these archival sources since Suzuki’s letters to Edmunds are not included in his collected works (SDZ), and the archives include other valuable material.

10. Both of his interpretations, the book and the article, have been translated and reprinted in SUZUKI 1996.

tentative proposals about researching and writing transnational or, to use my term, translocative histories.

Swedenborg and American Occult Traditions

Swedenborg's religious views appeared in a number of books that were published—anonymously at first—after his spiritual “crisis” from 1743 to 1745. After years of working as a natural scientist and an assessor on the Swedish Board of Mines, that middle-aged son of a prominent Lutheran clergyman turned his attention to the spiritual realm or, more precisely, he turned his attention to the correspondences and pathways between heaven and earth. In his famous doctrine of “correspondences” Swedenborg claimed that “whatever is seen anywhere in the universe is representative of the Lord's Kingdom and... there is not anything in the atmosphere of the starry universe, or in the earth and its three kingdoms, which is not in its own manner representative” (LARSEN 1984, p. 26). He also reported in the “Dream Diary” he kept during this period when he had visions (BERGQUIST 2001). About ten o'clock on a night that would transform him, Swedenborg went to bed. Then, he reported, “there came over me a shuddering, so strong from the head downwards and over the whole body, with a noise of thunder, and this happened several times. I found that something holy was upon me” (LARSEN 1984, p. 10). Later that night he had a vision of Jesus, and after that he would be given the gifts of discerning the “spiritual sense” of Christian scriptures and traveling through “spirit worlds.”

Some of his contemporaries dismissed Swedenborg and his theological works. The German philosopher Immanuel Kant called Swedenborg's *Arcana Coelestia* “eight Quarto volumes full of nonsense,” and John Wesley, the British founder of Methodism, called him “one of the most ingenious, lively, entertaining madmen that ever set pen to paper” (LARSEN 1984, pp. 13–14).¹¹ In 1787, however, the first New Church society in the world was founded in London, and institutions later formed in America, including in Edmunds's Philadelphia, so that by the time the General Convention met in that city in 1817 there were seventeen Swedenborgian churches in the United States. Card carrying members were few, but the Swedish mystic had disproportionate cultural influence during the nineteenth century. As the American religious historian Sydney Ahlstrom put it, Swedenborg's “influence was seen everywhere.” “Of all the unconventional currents streaming through the many levels of American religion during the antebellum half-century,” Ahlstrom suggested, “none proved attractive to more diverse types of dissenters from established denominations than those which stemmed from Emanuel Swedenborg” (AHLSTROM 2004, p. 483). In varied ways, Swedenborgianism influenced Transcendentalism, mesmerism, spiritualism, Theosophy, and New Thought. It sparked utopian experiments,

11. For more detail about Kant's views see JOHNSON (2002).

inspired free love movements, and justified alternative healing systems, including homeopathic medicine.¹²

In other words, it shaped what some scholars have called the “metaphysical tradition” in America or what I call “occult” (or “esoteric”) traditions (JUDAH 1967; ALBANESE forthcoming). I should be clear that I am not referring to the “esoteric” Buddhism of the Shingon tradition in Japan, though there are commonalities in the emphasis on hidden sources of religious truth.¹³ In fact, that is the definition of the English term “occult”: it means hidden or concealed. By extension, as I use it, the phrase “American occult traditions” refers to a cluster of changing, contested, and loosely-organized cultural movements that have highlighted “matters that are ‘hidden’ or ‘secret’” in one way or another. In that sense, it refers to a confluence of practices, beliefs, values, and institutions—not a single immutable and univocal tradition. One scholar (GALBREATH 1983, pp. 18–19) identified three primary meanings of “occult” or “hidden” for these diverse occult traditions. “Occult” refers to:

- 1 extraordinary matters that by virtue of their intrusion into the mundane world are thought to possess special significance (e.g., omens, portents, apparitions, prophetic dreams);
- 2 matters such as the teachings of the so-called mystery schools that are kept hidden from the uninitiated and the unworthy; and
- 3 matters that are intrinsically hidden from ordinary cognition and understanding but are nonetheless knowable through the awakening of hidden, latent faculties of appropriate sensitivity.

The Source of Suzuki’s Swedenborgian Interest

American occult traditions that affirmed all three kinds of “hidden” religious truths—including Swedenborgianism’s emphasis on extraordinary visions and revealed mysteries—made their way to Japan during the late-nineteenth and early twentieth century. But how did Suzuki come to know and appreciate Swedenborg’s writings? Scholars have speculated about the source of Suzuki’s interest in the Swedish thinker. Andrew Bernstein, the English language translator of *Suēdenborugu*, offered a somewhat vague, though accurate, observation: Swedenborg’s thought was “fashionable” during the years Suzuki was in America, 1897–1908. In the same volume, Nagashima Tatsuya, the author of the foreword, offered two speculations: that it “may be” that his wife, Beatrice Erskine Lane, introduced Swedenborg’s writing to Suzuki or that “it is possible that he first became aware of Swedenborg from the World’s Parliament of Religions.” In an

12. For a study of Swedenborgianism’s impact in the United States see SILVER (1983). The older study by BLOCK (1932) is still useful in some ways.

13. On Shingon Buddhism see ABÉ (1999), KIYOTA (1978), and YAMASAKI (1988).

afterword to the same translation, David Loy presented his own speculation in the form of a question: “Did Suzuki read *The Buddhist Ray* while he was working for Open Court?”¹⁴

Let me briefly consider these proposals about the possible source of Suzuki’s interest. First, I have found no surviving evidence that *The Buddhist Ray* prompted Suzuki’s personal interest in Swedenborg, though he, like some other Meiji Buddhists, might have read a note or article by the book’s author in a Japanese Buddhist periodical before he left for America in 1897. *The Buddhist Ray* (1888–1894), which was published in Santa Cruz, California, was the first English-language Buddhist periodical in the United States, and it was edited by Herman Carl Vetterling (1849–1931), a Swedish immigrant who was ordained as a minister in the Church of the New Jerusalem in 1877.¹⁵ He served Swedenborgian congregations in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Michigan until 1881. During the 1880s, Vetterling joined the Theosophical Society and wrote a series of articles for one of its periodicals, *The Theosophist*. Around this time, he also identified himself as a Buddhist and began to call himself Philangi Dasa. In 1887, he published a book under that name, *Swedenborg the Buddhist; Or, The Higher Swedenborgianism: Its Secret and Thibetan Origins*, which was translated into Japanese in 1893 (VETTERLING 1887; VETTERLING 1893).¹⁶ In that book he suggested that a form of esoteric Buddhism is the highest spiritual teaching, and Emanuel Swedenborg, who had “a piece of Asia in him,” actually had been a Buddhist (VETTERLING 1887, p. 3). Swedenborg learned Buddhist teachings, Vetterling argued, through direct contact with “Great Buddhist Ascetics” from Mongolia on a supersensual plane. As YOSHINAGA Shin’ichi (2003, p. 8) has noted, articles from Vetterling’s periodical, *The Buddhist Ray*, were translated into Japanese and published in Japanese Buddhist periodicals.¹⁷ Vetterling sent articles by leading Theosophists to the young reform-minded Japanese Buddhists, who in 1886 had formed Hanseikai (The Temperance Association). From 1887 to 1893, that group published three journals: an English-language periodical, *Bijou of Asia*, which was sent abroad to “propagate” Buddhism, and two periodicals in Japanese, *Hanseikai zasshi* (Buddhist monthly journal or, in the English title, The Temperance) and *Kaigai Bukkyō jijō* (Report of the Foreign

14. For the assessments by Nagashima, Bernstein, and Loy see D. T. SUZUKI (1996), pp. ix, xii, xviii, 121. See also NAGASHIMA’S (1993) earlier speculation, which was somewhat broader: “...Suzuki must have encountered Swedenborg when he was in the United States between 1897 and 1908.”

15. On Vetterling, see TWEED (2000), pp. 40–41, 58–60, 82, 84, 86, 128, 131, 149.

16. Vetterling’s book has been reprinted. That reprint edition (VETTERLING 2003) also includes an introduction by Andrei Vashestov.

17. On Vetterling’s exchanges with Japanese Buddhists, and, more broadly, the influence of Theosophy and Swedenborgianism in Meiji Japan see also YOSHINAGA (2005). Yoshinaga also is cited in Vashestov’s introduction to the reprint edition of *Swedenborg the Buddhist*, as Vashestov notes Vetterling’s influence in Meiji Japan (VETTERLING 2003, p. xxii). Yoshinaga also has been compiling a list of Theosophical articles that appeared in Buddhist journals between 1887 (Meiji 20) and 1896 (Meiji 29).

Buddhist Affairs). *Kaigai Bukkyō jijō* reprinted selections from *The Buddhist Ray* as well as other writings from Western Theosophical sources, and the November 1888 issue of the *Bijou of Asia*, for example, not only included a “Brief Outline of Buddhism in Japan” but also published a call by the editor to establish a branch of the Theosophical Society in Japan (MATSUYAMA 1888, p. 9).¹⁸ In fact, all three of the periodicals included articles on Theosophy, some of them authored by Vetterling or sent by him to his Japanese correspondents, including Matsuyama Matsutarō. All this is important for understanding the flow of Theosophical and Swedenborgian ideas to Japan and Buddhist ideas to America during the 1880s and 1890s, and it is possible that Suzuki encountered some mention of Swedenborg in the pages of these Japanese Buddhist periodicals. This does not appear to be the source of D. T. Suzuki’s personal interest in Swedenborg, however. Nor was Vetterling, as far as we can tell: Suzuki did not cite Vetterling’s periodical or book in his own works on Swedenborg.¹⁹

The two other possible sources of Suzuki’s personal interest in Swedenborg, according to Nagashima, were the Parliament of Religions and his wife, Beatrice Erskine Lane Suzuki. It is true, as Nagashima notes, that there were six addresses about Swedenborgianism at the 1893 Parliament of Religions, yet even though Suzuki translated the talks of his spiritual mentor, Shaku Sōen, he did not attend the proceedings in Chicago and did not leave Japan until 1897 (SUZUKI 1996, p. xii). So it is difficult to see how that event might have sparked his interest, nor can I find evidence that he read about Swedenborg in the published proceedings of the Parliament, although that is possible. His wife Beatrice, who had interest in various alternative traditions, also might have been a source, though I can find no evidence of that either.

Beatrice’s own religious identity seems to have shifted in some ways over the course of her adult life. As late as 1928, Daisetsu wrote to his wife about the importance of having “a religious faith”: “You have not got a *religion* yet. Try to take hold of it, it is worth your hard seeking for” (SDZ, vol. 36, pp. 478–79). Beatrice’s mother, Emma Erskine Hahn, had been one of the early American converts to Baha’i on the East Coast, and some scholars of the Baha’i faith have claimed Beatrice as well for that tradition.²⁰ For example, one history of the Baha’i faith in Japan notes that Beatrice knew Agnes Baldwin Alexander (1875–1971), a prominent Baha’i in Japan, and it claims that Suzuki told the potter Bernard Leach (1887–1979) “that his wife was a Baha’i” (SIMS 1989, p. 84).²¹ One reference in a 1912 periodical claimed that Beatrice also translated the *Baha’i Message* into Japanese, though this seems doubtful, and, in 1907, before

18. On *Hanseikai* see THELLE 1987, pp. 199–202.

19. On Vetterling see TWEED 2000, pp. 58–60 and TWEED and TWORKOV 1991, pp. 6–7. See also Andrei Vashestov’s introduction to *Swedenborg the Buddhist* (VETTERLING 2003, pp. xiii–xxxi).

20. For a history of those early Baha’i converts see STOCKMAN 1985.

21. For her account of missionary efforts in Japan see ALEXANDER 1977.

they were married, Beatrice and her future husband attended the Greenacre summer retreat in Eliot, Maine, where they would have encountered Baha'is.²² Yet it seems fair to say that she was not Baha'i. She affirmed Zen and Shingon Buddhism and expressed enduring interest in American occult traditions. She studied with Shaku Sōen, the Rinzai Zen priest; and, as her husband's diary for 9 June 1929 indicates, Beatrice took the Bodhisattva vows in a Shingon ceremony at Tōji. Yet, acknowledging her occult interests, a few years earlier Beatrice had described her own religious affiliation this way for the twenty-fifth reunion of her class at Radcliff: "I am a member of the Theosophical Society and am interested in Christian Science." She also went on to note that "I am co-editor, with my husband, of 'The Eastern Buddhist' and for nearly every number I write an article on Buddhism."²³ Even if Beatrice and Daisetsu not only shared a commitment to Buddhism but also an interest in occult traditions—I will say more about that later—there still is no evidence that she was the source of his interest in Swedenborg.

So, none of these informed speculations seems fully convincing. Instead, as I proposed earlier, it seems that—as Edmunds boasted, Suzuki acknowledged, but most scholars have failed to notice—it was the obscure American librarian, Edmunds, who sparked the influential Japanese Buddhist's personal interest in Swedenborg.²⁴ As I have indicated, Suzuki had occasion to encounter Swedenborgianism before that meeting with Edmunds, and there is another bit of evidence that he at least had heard of the Swede earlier: in 1895 Shaku Sōen, who seems to have read Vetterling's *Swedenborg the Buddhist*, had written the preface to Suzuki's Japanese translation of Paul Carus's *Gospel of Buddha* (*Budda no fukuin*), and that preface noted the idiosyncratic interpretations of Buddhism by Western interpreters—not only by Max Müller, Edwin Arnold, and Henry Steel Olcott but also Emanuel Swedenborg, who, Shaku Sōen proposed, "came to Buddhism through his interest in mysticism" (SNODGRASS 2003, p. 248).²⁵ So

22. On the notice about the Lane translation see *Star of the West*, vol. 2, no. 18 (Feb. 1912), p. 13. For the information about Greenacre I am indebted to Wayne Yokoyama: Personal correspondence, Wayne Yokoyama, 6 April 2004. Yokoyama bases this judgment on the records in the archival sources in Suzuki's Pine Hill library in Kamakura. For an early attempt at a history (and assessment) of Greenacre see RICHARDSON (1931).

23. Typescript booklet, "The Class of Ninety-Eight: Twenty Five Years Later," Beatrice Hahn Lane Suzuki, [1923], MB. On this, I am indebted to Jane Knowles, Radcliff Archivist, Schlesinger Library and to Wayne Yokoyama, who sent me a copy of the entry by Beatrice.

24. I identified Edmunds as the source of Suzuki's interest in Swedenborg (TWEED 2000, pp. 185–86). A recent article on Suzuki and Swedenborg also has noted Suzuki's contacts with Edmunds (YOSHINGA 2005, p. 38).

25. The original version of *Budda no fukuin* appeared in 1895 and the second edition in 1901. That has been reprinted in SDZ, vol. 25. As SNODGRASS (2003) notes, substantial portions of Shaku Sōen's preface to *Budda no fukuin* were translated into English by Suzuki and published in *Open Court* 9 (1895), p. 4405. YOSHINAGA (2005) suggests that it seems that Shaku Sōen read the Japanese translation of Vetterling's *Swedenborg the Buddhist*.

it seems likely that Suzuki had encountered Swedenborg's name in his teacher's introduction to Carus's *Gospel of Buddha*, in the Japanese translation of Vetterling's *Swedenborg the Buddhist*, or in a passing reference in a Japanese Buddhist periodical.

Yet even if Suzuki had heard of Swedenborg at least as early as 1895, it seems that his later contact with Edmunds was decisive for stimulating his personal interest. The two met as early as the summer of 1901, when Edmunds visited Marie Canavarro in Chicago and Paul Carus in LaSalle. In fact, it was Suzuki who picked him up at the La Salle train station, as Edmunds noted in his diary on 25 June. Less than a month later, he already was sending Suzuki some of his work to read.²⁶ And in 1903, Edmunds again visited Carus in LaSalle, Illinois, where he worked eight days for Carus and Open Court Publishing, before deciding to return to Philadelphia. During that stay, however, Edmunds had more face-to-face encounters with Suzuki, including some conversations about religious matters. For example, Suzuki seems to have talked with him about Zen *kōan*: "At evening," Edmunds reported in his diary, "Suzuki told me a fine story of a Japanese monk and his pupil."²⁷ The exchange went the other way too. Just after that encounter in the Midwest, Edmunds wrote this in his journal: "Suzuki felt the parting from me very much. Meantime, I have got him interested in Swedenborg and [Frederic] Myers—a mission well worth coming hither."²⁸ In turn, in 1922, two years before Suzuki would write his last interpretation of Swedenborg, the Japanese Buddhist acknowledged his debt to Edmunds publicly in a review of one of Edmunds's books: "It was he who initiated the present writer into the study of Swedenborgian mysticism" (SUZUKI 1922, pp. 92–94).

Suzuki made the same point years later, this time offering more details:

"Well, it was like this. When I was in America, it was some 55 years ago. When I was there (at Paul Carus's place) I met a person named Albert Edmunds. This person, from the mountains of Wales, was a Quaker, a Swedenborgian, and a Pali scholar. It was through this connection... that I made his acquaintance. He was the one who told me about Swedenborg."²⁹

26. The information about the 1901 trip, and subsequent communication by letter, is found in several entries in Edmunds's diary: Albert J. Edmunds, *Diary #10*, vol. 18: 24 June 1901; 25 June 1901; 19 July 1901 (AEP).

27. Albert J. Edmunds, *Diary #10*, vol. 18, AEP.

28. Albert J. Edmunds, *Journal #10*, vol. 18, entry dated 18 July 1903, AEP. Frederic Myers, whom Edmunds referred to in this journal entry, was the major theorist for the Society for Psychical Research, a transatlantic organization that claimed William James among its members. EDMUNDS (1914), who also was a member, later wrote about Myers, Swedenborg, and Buddhism for the Society's American periodical. See also EDMUNDS (1913b). On Myers, and James, see TAVES (1999, pp. 253–60; 2003, pp. 303–26).

29. Suzuki, as quoted in MASUTANI (1964, pp. 20–21). Translation from the Japanese by Wayne Yokoyama.

Suzuki went on to explain how that introduction indirectly led to his translations of the Swede's writings. "It interested me enough to start reading *Heaven and Hell*," Suzuki reported. "I read it and was not moved by it, but there were points in it that impressed me. How my interest [in this thinker] got out I do not know, but there was in England the Swedenborgian Society that inquired [about my interest] and...so I ended up translating that work into Japanese..."³⁰ Of course, it is possible that other interpersonal and literary contacts reinforced or extended Edmunds's originating influence, but if we are to trust these two accounts by Suzuki, and the one by Edmunds, it seems that Edmunds was a primary conduit of information about the Swedish writer. And he continued to encourage that interest for years. For example, in 1935 Edmunds was still prodding Suzuki: "Please write an article on Swedenborg," Edmunds pleaded, "from your Mahayana standpoint."³¹

Yet this clarification does not end the questions. It just prompts more. Who was Edmunds? How did the exchange with Suzuki change Edmunds? How did it change Suzuki? What does this transpacific contact reveal about religion in late Meiji and Taishō Japan and Gilded Age and Progressive Era America? What can we learn from this case study about how to write translocative histories of religion?

The Buddhist Edmunds

Edmunds was born to German parents in Tottenham and educated at Friends schools and at the University of London. He came to the United States in 1885 and the next year settled in Philadelphia, where he worked as a librarian at Haverford College (1887–1889) and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (1891–1938). Paul Carus might have offered an inflated assessment of Edmunds's skills when he proposed in 1905 that "there is perhaps no one in the world so well acquainted with both religions [Buddhism and Christianity] as he." Edmunds was not trained as a scholar of either tradition, although he had a long-term friendship with J. Rendel Harris, a professor of church history at Haverford, and he corresponded with Buddhists and Buddhist scholars in Asia, Europe, and America. Edmunds also apparently spent a good deal of his spare time working on Buddhist texts and Asian languages, as one entry in his diary in 1902 suggests: "Saw the sunrise over Fairmount Park and saw the Schuylkill [River], and spent the morning over Pali, Sanskrit, and Chinese."³² He even received some minimal recognition for his work, as when the University of Pennsylvania

30. Suzuki, as quoted in MASUTANI (1964, pp. 20–21). Translation from the Japanese by Wayne Yokoyama.

31. Albert J. Edmunds to Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō, 8 July 1935, MB.

32. Albert J. Edmunds, Diary #10, vol. 18, 1 Jan. 1902, AEP.

awarded him an honorary Master of Arts degree in 1907 “in recognition of his work as a Pali scholar and a student of comparative religion.”³³

A lifelong seeker, Edmunds’s religious affiliation was complicated. D. T. Suzuki once described Edmunds as “a devout Christian, that is a Quaker, Swedenborgian, and a great sympathizer with Buddhism.” He might have been “devout,” but Edmunds hardly was an orthodox Christian by almost any standard—and he never gave full and final allegiance to any religion. He never severed his life-long relationship with the Quaker tradition, and he had enduring interest in Swedenborgianism, Spiritualism, Theosophy, and “psychic phenomena.” His interest in Swedenborg began as early as 1888, when he first entered a New Jerusalem church, and, as he notes in his diary, he “fell under the spell of Swedenborg” from 1891 to 1898.³⁴ In 1891, Edmunds listed nine “valuable” themes in the Swede’s writings, including “The Inner Sense Remains” (that is, the emphasis on individual and “interior” sources of religious authority) and “The Word in Central Asia” (that is, the claims about revealed sources of truth from Asia). The effects of that “spell” continued, as his published writings and private musings on Swedenborg confirm. Into his old age, it seems, Edmunds remained a Buddhist sympathizer who was shaped by occult traditions, including Swedenborgianism.³⁵

His personal interests in Swedenborgianism and Buddhism—and “the coming world-religion” that will emerge from Christianity and Buddhism and revere the writings of Swedenborg as one of its “classics”—were apparent in his letters and diaries and transparent in his contributions to periodicals published by the Society for Psychical Research, including “Has Swedenborg’s ‘Lost Word’ Been Found?” and “F. W. H. Myers, Swedenborg, and Buddha” (EDMUNDS 1914;

33. The information about his honorary degree is from local newspaper clippings from the *Public Ledger* (12 December 1907) and the *Evening Bulletin* (13 December 1907) that were pasted into Edmunds’s diary: Albert J. Edmunds, 13 December and 22 December 1907, AEP.

34. Edmunds mentions the date of his first entrance into the New Jerusalem Church in an entry years later: Albert J. Edmunds, Diary #11, vol. 22, 2 June 1907, AEP. He mentions the “spell” earlier, as he offers an overview of the history of his personal religious views: Albert J. Edmunds, Diary #10, vol. 18, 30 May 1902, AEP.

35. There are no entries on Edmunds in the standard reference works, but the self-promoting Edmunds, who also had the skills and perspective of a librarian, wrote an autobiographical pamphlet called *Who’s A. J. Edmunds?* (Cheltenham, Pa.: n.p., 1922) that cites biographical entries in *Who’s Who in Pennsylvania* (1908), *Men and Women of America* (1910), and the article on “Bible” in *Encyclopedia Americana* (1918–20). The pamphlet gives almost no biographic details but focuses instead on his writings. The main source of biographical information on Edmunds is two archival collections: AEP and Haverford College’s Albert J. Edmunds Collection, which is part of the Quaker Collection and includes a copy of *Who’s A. J. Edmunds?* That Haverford Collection also includes a very helpful biographical overview in its description of his papers (“The Albert J. Edmunds Collection,” typescript, no date). There are a number of references to Edmunds in TWEED (2000): See note 4 above. Carus offered the assessment of Edmunds in his editorial introduction to EDMUNDS’s article (1905a, p. 538). Suzuki’s account is in his review (SUZUKI 1922, p. 92).

EDMUNDS 1913b).³⁶ Those theological commitments were somewhat less clear in his comparative philological work, however. Even though the proposed table of contents of the “fragmentary” second edition of *Buddhist and Christian Gospels* included a mention of “psychical powers” in Part III, for the most part his esoteric interests were not obvious in that book, which did not reach its final and full form until the fourth edition of 1908–1909. Instead, Edmunds tried to present parallels between the Greek New Testament and the Pāli Buddhist Canon. He did not claim, as Felix Oswald and others had, that Jesus visited India and his tradition influenced Christianity (OSWALD 1891). “No borrowing is alleged on either side—Christian or Buddhist—in these parallels” (EDMUNDS 1905b, p. 3). He acknowledged some possible influence on Luke’s gospel, and in *Buddhist Texts Quoted as Scripture by the Gospel of John* (1906) he explored other cross-cultural exchanges. Yet in *Buddhist and Christian Gospels* Edmunds only highlighted parallels by juxtaposing passages from the sacred texts, although by the third edition he was ready to offer a preliminary summary of the continuities between Buddha and Jesus: “their fasting and desert meditation; their missionary charge; their appointment of a successor; their preaching to the poor; their sympathy with the oppressed” (EDMUNDS 1905b, p. 49).³⁷

Edmunds’s book appeared in a Japanese edition, with a note by Anesaki, and the American seems to have been shaped not only by his exchange with that pioneering Japanese scholar—whom Suzuki had introduced him to—but also by the conversations with Suzuki in Illinois as well as their subsequent correspondence. Even if Edmunds’s journal entry after the 1903 meeting emphasized his influence on Suzuki—and in 1919 Edmunds proudly penned a note in the margin of that diary entry that read “Suzuki afterwards translated several of Swedenborg’s works into Japanese”—it seems clear that this exchange also reinforced and expanded Edmunds’s interest in Buddhism. For years, the two continued to correspond, usually about Buddhism and often with signs of affection. Almost from the start of their exchanges, Suzuki had signed his letters “your friend ever,” and Edmunds came to address his letters to Suzuki affectionately too: “Dear Soul” or, revising it to conform to traditional Buddhist doctrine, “Dear Anatman.” As Suzuki’s journal notes, in 1930 Suzuki sent Edmunds a copy of his newly printed *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*—he cited and sent many books over the years—and in 1939 Edmunds thanked Suzuki for sending yet another Buddhist text. He also comforted his Japanese friend on the death of Beatrice: “You are especially good to me at such a crisis in your life as the loss of your Chief Helper.”³⁸

36. On the “coming world-religion” see EDMUNDS 1913b, pp. 262, 265–66, 270–71.

37. The second edition of EDMUNDS’s *Buddhist and Christian Gospels* has been reprinted (TWEED 2004, vol. 5).

38. Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō, Journal, 19 May 1930, MB. The full entry reads: “Rain/ to Otani in the morning./ Lanka sent to Edmunds./ Okono went back to Kamakura in the evening./ Faculty

The Occult Suzuki

If Edmunds received information about Buddhism—and even Buddhist texts—from Suzuki, what did Suzuki get out of the exchanges with Edmunds? The short answer: it seems that those exchanges deepened and redirected Suzuki's personal interest in occult traditions, including Swedenborgianism, "psychic phenomena," and Christian Science—or as Edmunds called it in one letter "Eddyism."³⁹ In other words, Edmunds stirred occult interests that Beatrice intensified and expanded.

To put it differently, if we can imagine Suzuki's intellectual development as a series of distinguishable but overlapping phases, each with a different Suzuki emerging as predominant, Edmunds played a small but significant role in one of those phases.⁴⁰ I will leave it to biographers of Suzuki and specialists in modern Japanese Buddhism to say more—and there is much more to say since his works include approximately thirty volumes in English and one hundred in Japanese—but from my perspective as a scholar of religion in the United States who has tried to trace Suzuki's movements on both sides of the Pacific, it seems that there was, first, a *Rinzai Suzuki* during his Zen training from 1891 to 1897.⁴¹ Just before and during the early part of his first extended stay in America from 1897 to 1909, when he worked at Open Court Publishing Company with the rationalist philosopher and editor Paul Carus, Suzuki shared some beliefs and values with those, like some Meiji Buddhists in Japan and Carus in America, who emphasized reason and science. Even if he soon became critical of Carus—and went on to highlight other themes—in some ways it makes sense to talk about a *Rationalist Suzuki*.⁴² Even this early in his career, however, an *Experien-*

meeting in the afternoon." Wayne Yokoyama sent me a copy of this entry in personal correspondence dated 23 April 2004. Suzuki's use of "your friend" is found, for example, in Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō to Albert J. Edmunds, 24 March 1902, AEP. The consolation about Beatrice's death is found in Albert J. Edmunds to Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō, 23 August 1939, MB.

39. For example, they communicated about Christian Science, or "Eddyism," even after Beatrice's death: Albert J. Edmunds to Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō, 7 October 1941, MB.

40. By proposing different overlapping phases of intellectual development, as I do below, I am not suggesting that this is the only way to imagine the biography of Suzuki or that these categories exhaust all aspects of Suzuki's life and work. Nor do I mean to suggest that there are no intellectual continuities across his lifespan or that there is a linear progression of some sort. I propose these phases—and the concomitant notion of different Suzukis—as an interpretive strategy. In that sense, these categories might be understood as what Max WEBER (1949) called "ideal types." As I noted in another context, "Ideal types, as I use the term, are theoretical constructs that function as more or less useful interpretive tools." No type corresponds perfectly to the shifts in Suzuki's intellectual development, and these categories emerge from my particular interests and guiding questions (TWEED 2000, pp. 49–50).

41. For a list of works by Suzuki see SDZ, vol. 40, pp. 139–246.

42. It is interesting to note that Suzuki acknowledged Carus's influence on his first published volume, a theory of religion, which appeared before he had left for the United States (SUZUKI 1896). In a letter to Carus on 14 May 1896 Suzuki suggested that "I am now writing a booklet on religion as I understand it. What I am going to say is your philosophy plus Buddhism plus my own opinion"

tial Suzuki began to emerge in Illinois, after he read, and appreciated, William James's 1902 volume, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (JAMES 1982).⁴³ He would return to that theme, and, in a slightly different form (as a concern for mysticism) it would predominate during the final years of his life. Just before and during his years at Open Court, another emphasis became clear: a *Philological Suzuki* emerged as Suzuki translated a number of texts, including the *Daodejing* (1898) and *The Awakening of Faith* (1900).⁴⁴ His interest in translating, editing, indexing, and interpreting religious texts lasted for decades, at least from 1895 to 1945. He translated works by Paul Carus into Japanese and works by Shaku Sōen into English, and, as I have emphasized in this essay, Suzuki rendered four works by Swedenborg into Japanese between 1910 and 1914. As Kiritā Kiyohide has noted, in some ways Suzuki's interest in translating religious texts peaked after his move to Ōtani University in 1921 and before the end of World War II in 1945 (KIRITĀ 1995, p. 59). During that period he published works on the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, the *Platform Sūtra*, the Tun-huang manuscripts, as well as other Chan and Shin Buddhist texts.

During the middle of the twentieth century, from 1936 to 1960, there also was a *Cultural Suzuki*, or to be more precise an *Aesthetic Suzuki*, *Existentialist Suzuki*, and *Psychological Suzuki*, as he turned his attention to the relation between religion and culture, including in his 1937 book *Zen and Its Influence on Japanese Culture* and in his 1960 volume *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis*.⁴⁵

(SDZ, vol. 36, pp. 75–76). In turn, Suzuki apparently still thought highly enough of Carus's *Gospel of Buddha* as late as 1955 to recommend it to a woman who wrote for advice about Buddhism (SUZUKI Daisetsu Teitarō to Miss Carol Bowman, 16 Feb. 1955): "If you do not know anything about Buddhism, you might begin with Dr. Paul Carus' Gospel of Buddha.... If you feel interested enough in further pursuance of the study you may wirtē [write] to me again" (SDZ, vol. 38, p. 122). A different sort of "practical" rationalism emerges in Suzuki's correspondence with his wife, Beatrice. It is a gendered rationalism that is framed in opposition to the "sentimentalism" that he thought was the strength and weakness of "woman." This comes up in a number of letters. See, for example, the letter dated 15 April 1928, when he writes the following: "Things must be carried on scientifically if you want to act with a reasonable sphere of doing other kind of work. Woman is so given away to temporary feelings, too bad she has not done much abstract thinking. This is her strength no doubt, but a great drawback in practical life..." (SDZ, vol. 36, pp. 487–88). He puts it in a similar way in another letter dated 14 January 1928: "Too bad women have no executive faculty—just a bundle of feelings with no intellectually unifying principle behind it is a great and most lamentable fault" (SDZ, vol. 36, pp. 478–79).

43. I am indebted to Yoshinaga Shin'ichi for reminding me to mention Suzuki's interest in William James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*. That is important, I think, for understanding Suzuki's long-standing interest in individual religious experience, though it took different forms throughout his life. It is interesting to note that James, though certainly not as much as his father, had some knowledge of the thought of Swedenborg. On that, see VÄRILÄ (1977). Most interpreters of William James, however, do not make too much of the influence of his father's idiosyncratically Swedenborgian views. See LEVINSON (1981, pp. 10–14) and MYERS (1986, pp. 17–18).

44. At the IAHR conference in Tokyo, Elsa I. Legittimo Arias suggested that I add the *Philological Suzuki*, to acknowledge the importance of his translations. I am grateful for her helpful suggestion.

45. I thank Richard Jaffe for suggesting that I include the *Existentialist Suzuki*. Suzuki's engagement with that religious and philosophical movement was important for this period of his life.

As Edward Conze noted, another stage in his thought emerged in 1957, with the publication of *Mysticism: Christian and Buddhist*.⁴⁶ From 1957 until his death in 1966, the *Mystical Suzuki* seems to have predominated. As I have noted, it was a thematic emphasis that had its origins in his earlier considerations of religious experience, but it was transformed as he considered new cases, including the writings of Meister Eckhart, the medieval Dominican mystic. And, even though Western scholarly accounts and Suzuki's published autobiographical narratives have underemphasized or overlooked this, from his discovery of Swedenborg in 1903 until 1924, when he published his last piece on the Swede, there was another phase in his intellectual development and another, somewhat overlooked, Suzuki—the *Occult Suzuki*.⁴⁷ During this period Beatrice seems to have reinforced his interest in Theosophy, and Edmunds, my focus here, seems to have kindled his interest in Swedenborgianism.

The expressions of those shared occult interests are clear, even if those interests should not be overemphasized. First, Suzuki's theosophical interests were expressed, for example, when he and Beatrice opened a Theosophical Lodge in Kyoto during the 1920s as well as in the pages of the periodical they co-edited. *The Eastern Buddhist* contained a section that reviewed other journals from around the world, and some of those periodicals were sponsored by occult groups, including Theosophy and New Thought. In Suzuki's library, Matsugao Bunko, there are many occult journals, including issues of the *Far Eastern Theosophical Society Notes*, which, in one issue, included information about the fourteen members of the Kyoto Lodge, Beatrice's role as secretary, and Suzuki's talk to the group on 14 June 1924.⁴⁸ Beatrice seems to have sustained and intensified Suzuki's theosophical interests to some extent, then, but it is important to note that the influence sometimes went in the other direction too.⁴⁹ For instance, Suzuki had lectured at the Theosophical Society in San Francisco as

46. CONZE (1968, pp. 13–14) argued: "In 1957 Suzuki published 'The Basis of Buddhist Philosophy'...and his famous essay on Meister Eckhart.... They represent a new phase in Dr. Suzuki's thought, which for a time became quite saturated with Meister Eckhart."

47. For example, the two autobiographical accounts reprinted in ABE (1986, pp. 3–26) do not mention this occult phase, or his work on Swedenborg—neither do the other reflections in that book. Only in the chronology and bibliography do readers find clues about his interest in Swedenborg (ABE 1986, pp. 219–24, 235–46). In his brief biography of Suzuki, SWITZER (1985, p. 19) offers a five-sentence account of his publications on Swedenborg, but offers no assessment of their place in his intellectual development. In the "biographical notes" Suzuki (SDZ, vol. 38, pp. 49–53) sent Christmas Humphreys in a letter dated 22 June 1954 Suzuki made one brief reference to Swedenborg: "1910 [sic: 1912]: Second visit to Europe invited by Swedenborg Society for 4 months in London in order to continue translations of Swedenborg's works: The Divine Providence, Wisdom, Love, New Jerusalem, etc. into Japanese." This was one of thirty-seven items in the list of events he sent Humphreys.

48. The founding of the Lodge, Beatrice's role as secretary, and Suzuki's talk is reported in *Far Eastern Theosophical Society Notes*, vol. 1, no. 6 (Nov.–Dec. 1924), p. 3. This occult periodical, and others, were noted by Wayne Yokoyama in personal correspondence dated 30 March 2004.

49. On Beatrice's theosophical interests see ALEGIO (2005).

early as 1903, and one periodical quoted Suzuki as saying that he had sent a copy of a book by the Theosophical Society's co-founder, Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, to Beatrice before they were married: "I saw *The Voice of the Silence* for the first time while at Oxford. I immediately got a copy and sent it to Mrs. Suzuki at Columbia University, writing to her: 'Here is the real Mahayana Buddhism.'"⁵⁰

Suzuki's interest in Swedenborg, whom he called "the Buddha of the North," is also evident in this period. Although there are only scattered references to Swedenborg in Suzuki's later writings, between 1910 and 1924 Suzuki published four translations of works by the Swedish writer, a book-length study of his life and thought, and an article on his view of heaven and "other power."⁵¹ His 1913 book, *Swedenborg*, is especially revealing (SUZUKI 1996). That six-chapter volume offered a biographical overview and two chapters on his "spiritual vision" and "character and lifestyle." It concluded with an analysis of Swedenborg's theology, including the Swede's views on heaven, love, and correspondence, which, as I have noted, affirms that things on earth have correspondences in heaven or hell, a view that, Suzuki believed, has continuities with Buddhist notions of rebirth.⁵² Suzuki identified a number of other parallels between Swedenborgianism and Buddhism, including "that true salvation is the harmonious unification of belief and action," "the Divine manifests itself as wisdom and love," "love is greater and more profound than wisdom," and "there is not a single thing in the world left to chance" (SUZUKI 1996, p. 6).

Swedenborgianism, as Suzuki understood it, also found expression in less obvious ways in his thought during this occult period. For example, in the downstairs room of his library in Kamakura there is a 1905 English translation of a Swedenborgian work, *God, Creation, and Man*, that Suzuki read and pondered. We know he pondered it since he wrote notes in the margin near this passage: "Thought is said to be the primary effect of life, but it must be understood that there is thought which more and more interior, and thought that is more and more exterior." "Inmost thought," the volume continues, "is actually the primary effect of life." Suzuki underlined the words interior and inmost, and then in the margin queried that sentence: "Are interior and inmost synonymous?" he

50. I discussed Suzuki's lecture in San Francisco in TWEED 2000, p. 53. See the published version of that lecture (SUZUKI 1903). The alleged quote from Suzuki is included in *The Canadian Theosophist*, vol. 14, no. 100 (June 1933). The book he was referring to was by H. P. BLAVATSKY (1889). The volume was "translated and annotated" by H. P. B. As my periodization of this occult phase indicates, Suzuki seems more negative about Theosophy by the end of the 1920s. For example, in a letter to Beatrice dated 4 August 1930 Suzuki suggested that "the T. S. [Theosophical Society] is too mixed up not only in its teaching but in its organization [sic]. People want something more direct and simple" (SDZ, vol. 36, pp. 546-47).

51. On the scattered references to Swedenborg in Suzuki's writings from the 1950s and 1960s, see Bernstein's introduction to SUZUKI 1996, pp. xv-xvi.

52. As Bernstein notes, Suzuki continued to affirm this notion of "correspondence" later in life (Suzuki 1996, p. xvi). For example, see SUZUKI 1957, p. 116.

wondered.⁵³ He seems to have decided that “inmost” was the most useful term, since he used it when he defined religion in a book that appeared in 1907, two years later, *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*. “Religion,” Suzuki proposed, “is the *inmost voice* of the human heart that under the yoke of a seemingly finite existence groans and travails in pain....” According to this view, “the abiding elements of religions come from within, and consist mainly in the mysterious sentiment that lies hidden in the deepest depths of the human heart” (SUZUKI 1963, pp. 24, 27–29).⁵⁴ Although there might have been other American and Japanese sources for this interpretation of religion—including his distinctive understanding of Emersonian Transcendentalism, Jamesean experientialism, and Rinzai Zen—Suzuki seems to have found this idiom of interiority and concealment (or at least found it confirmed) in texts by and about Swedenborg.

So there seems to be evidence that Edmunds’s encouragement of Suzuki’s investigations of Swedenborg bore some fruit, but, in the end, what did it all amount to and why did Suzuki find it appealing during this occult phase? Andrew Bernstein, the American translator of Suzuki’s 1913 book on Swedenborg, proposed two responses to this question. First, he noted that Swedenborgianism was “fashionable” when Suzuki lived in the United States. Yet so was Christian Science. Why didn’t Suzuki engage that tradition as vigorously or consider it as systematically? So I think that Bernstein’s first explanation points to a necessary but not sufficient condition for Suzuki’s interest: it was in the air in America, at least among some intellectuals like Edmunds, whom Bernstein does not mention. However, Bernstein offers a second, and more persuasive, explanation for Swedenborgianism’s appeal for Suzuki: it provided a useful response to the “spiritual crisis” in Japan at that time. “What makes Swedenborg so appealing?” Bernstein asks. “Although Suzuki certainly admires his theology, he is especially interested in portraying Swedenborg the *person*” (SUZUKI 1996, p. xxiv). Swedenborg the person managed to steer between “mindless statism” and “self-centered introspection” (SUZUKI 1996, p. xxii). As a scientist and statesman, Bernstein proposed, the Swede embodied the Meiji values of self-sacrifice and nationalism; as a mystic, he effectively challenged the materialism and superficiality of contemporary Japanese culture (SUZUKI 1996, p. xxv).

While I think this account is persuasive in some ways, Bernstein underemphasizes Suzuki’s own explanation of why a study of Swedenborg is worthwhile. In his 1913 book, Suzuki listed four reasons: 1) “First of all, Swedenborg said he traveled in heaven and hell and witnessed in detail the actual state of people

53. This is an English translation of Swedenborg’s *Sapientia angelica de Divina amore et de Divina sapientia*. I am indebted to Wayne Yokoyama for calling my attention to this work and transcribing Suzuki’s marginal notes, which are written in English, in personal correspondence dated 1 April 2004.

54. Joseph J. SPAE (1972, p. 148) highlights this understanding of religion, though not its possible Swedenborgian sources. Italics mine.

after death”; 2) He showed that “there seems to be a spiritual realm separate from that of the five senses; and when we enter a certain psychological state, we apparently can communicate with that realm”; 3) “Swedenborg’s theological doctrines greatly resemble those of Buddhism.”; 4) For Suzuki, as Bernstein emphasized, Swedenborg is “historically unique” since “scientific and religious genius marvelously combined” in him, so “he serves as a model for the individual, teaching numerous lessons” (SUZUKI 1996, pp. 5–7).⁵⁵ If we take Suzuki’s justification for the study of Swedenborg as, at least in part, an expression of his own fascination, it seems that Suzuki was drawn to Swedenborg because he promised access to the spiritual realm and served as a model of human flourishing that harmonized with the teachings of his own Buddhist tradition and, as Bernstein’s emphasized, spoke to the spiritual needs of the increasingly urban and industrial Japanese.

Conclusion: Toward Translocative Histories

So for a variety of reasons and in several ways, during the first three decades of the twentieth century Suzuki’s thought was shaped by Swedenborg and, I have tried to suggest, it seems to have been Edmunds—not Beatrice, Vetterling, the Parliament, or the “spirit of the age”—that prompted that personal interest, even if Suzuki had heard of Swedenborg earlier and even if others, including Beatrice, sustained his broader interest in occult traditions during a phase that lasted at least until 1924 and, in some ways, almost until her death in 1939.

But what, then, does this tentative and limited analysis of one instance of transnational exchange reveal? Why should we care? First, it suggests that Edmunds, the obscure and idiosyncratic librarian from Philadelphia, might have had more of an indirect impact than previous studies have acknowledged. Edmunds is not as important as Olcott, Fenollosa, or Hearn, but for his influence on Suzuki (and maybe Anesaki)—and, concomitantly, his influence on twentieth century Japanese and American religion and culture—he deserves to be recognized in our historical narratives. Second, this transnational analysis suggests that we might not know Suzuki as fully as we think. We know the *Rinzai* Suzuki, the *Aesthetic* Suzuki, the *Psychological* Suzuki, the *Mystical* Suzuki—and even, as Robert Sharf might suggest, the *Nationalist* Suzuki (SHARF 1993).⁵⁶ We

55. A related reason that Suzuki might have praised Swedenborg’s personality, Yoshinaga points out, might have been *jinkaku-shugi*, the shared moral emphasis after 1897 among some liberal intellectuals on the cultivation of individual personality, rather than fervent nationalism or religious dogmatism. Yoshinaga Shin’ichi to Thomas A. Tweed, personal communication, 17 April 2005. For a more recent attempt to consider Swedenborgianism and Buddhism see LOY 1996.

56. For another interpretation see KIRITA (1995, p. 62), who acknowledges that Suzuki “did not take a firm stance against the war or write essays criticizing the military or Shinto nationalists head-on,” but he suggests that Suzuki’s views about nationalism were complicated and departed from “the mood of the times” in many ways.

need to learn much more about the *Occult* Suzuki, the Suzuki who pondered the “inmost” and hidden sources of religious truth in Theosophy, parapsychology, Christian Science, and Swedenborgianism as well as in Buddhism. Some scholars, especially YOSHINAGA Shin’ichi (2003; 2005), already have begun that work. Yet there is much more to do, and that research promises to enrich our understanding not only of D. T. Suzuki and Albert Edmunds but also the shifting transnational flows of religious artifacts, practices, and ideas during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century. Just as Buddhism shaped late-Victorian and early-Modernist America and became a “live option” for the spiritually disillusioned, occult traditions—including Swedenborgianism and Theosophy—were part of the complex mix of religious influences that transformed religion, especially Buddhism, in Meiji and Taishō Japan.

This case study also invites reflection about how to research and write histories that cross national boundaries, including histories of religion in Japan and the United States since the 1850s. For the first time since the seventeenth century, complex networks of transregional exchange formed in the late Tokugawa and early Meiji period, and those exchanges shaped religious life in both Japan and America. A number of scholars of Japanese Buddhism—including James Edward Ketelaar, Notto R. Thelle, Robert Sharf, Judith Snodgrass, and Richard Jaffe—have traced the flow of people, practices, and ideas. As Jaffe argued in “Seeking Śākyamuni: Travel and the Reconstruction of Japanese Buddhism,” those exchanges have not been unidirectional—nor were they only between Japan and the West. Japanese Buddhists traveled to other parts of Asia, and constructed their notion of Buddhism in relation to the practices, texts, and artifacts they discovered in South and Southeast Asia. Just as much recent scholarship on Japan in this period has focused on the theme of nationalism, a number of scholars have moved toward more transnational histories that take seriously the criss-crossing cultural flows that transformed religious practice during the past century and a half (THELLE; KETELAAR; SHARF; MORIYA; SNODGRASS; JAFFE). Some recent international conferences have self-consciously announced this shared concern to trace “Global Flows and the Restructuring of Asian Buddhism in an Age of Empire.”⁵⁷

57. Richard Jaffe organized the international conference I mention here: “Global Flows and the Restructuring of Asian Buddhism in an Age of Empire,” Duke University, 21 February 2004. Even if there has been a concern to consider transnational influences in early modern and modern Japanese religious history, there have been some countervailing—or, really, complementary—impulses too. That makes sense especially for the early and middle Tokugawa period, when there was little foreign exchange. For example, in their introduction to an issue of this journal that focused on “Local Religion in Tokugawa History,” Barbara AMBROS and Duncan WILLIAMS (2001, p. 210) celebrated the work of Tamamuro Fumio and pointed to “a growing consensus in the field that Japanese religion as ‘lived religion’ was practiced in local settings, with regions, villages, towns, and cities as socially significant units to understand religion.” Of course, as others have noted, many sites and practices can be simultaneously local and translocal. These scales of influence interact in complex

At the same time, historians of the United States have begun to highlight what has been called transnationalism or globalization. For example, Thomas Bender led a collaborative effort sponsored by the Organization of American Historians, The Project on Internationalizing the Study of American History, which brought together seventy-eight scholars in four conferences between 1997 and 2000.⁵⁸ That project issued several reports and led to the publication of a collection of essays, *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*. That process of rethinking, Bender suggested, begins with challenging the primacy of the “nation” as the unit of analysis. We should not do away with the nation, Bender argued, but rather “imagine a spectrum of social scales, both larger and smaller than the nation and not excluding the nation.” So, in this view, historical analysis involves “carefully follow[ing] the movement of people, capital, things, and knowledge across national and other boundaries” (BENDER 2002, pp. 8, 12). A similar emphasis has emerged among some scholars of US religious history, especially those who study the “borderlands” of the Southwest and those who embrace what Catherine L. Albanese has called “the contact model” (ALBANESE 2002, p. 5). Albanese and I, and our other collaborators in The Narratives Project, advocated that contact model in a volume we produced—*Retelling U.S. Religious History* (TWEED 1997a). In that book I argued that scholars should place the story of religion in the United States “in wider geographical contexts”—the Atlantic World, the Americas, and the Pacific World (pp. 11–12). All historians employ motifs to organize their scholarly stories, and contact and exchange are among the most useful motifs for narrating histories in those wider geographical frames, my colleagues and I argued (pp. 17–19).

In that spirit, this case study of Suzuki and Edmunds, which has highlighted one instance of contact and exchange, is a self-conscious attempt to offer a narrowly framed *translocative* history. I use the term “translocative,” which I coined for other purposes (TWEED 1997b, pp. 94–98), to signal that this historical analysis does not focus on the nation as the primary unit of study, yet neither is the geographical reach best understood as either “global” or “transnational.”⁵⁹ From my point of view, the term global implies that universalizing and homogenizing impulses are at work, but the complex flows that I have been tracing

ways, as when cultural forms or economic forces emerging outside a region shape local practices in a rural village in Japan or a small town in the United States.

58. For a list of the participants in those conferences see the Appendix (BENDER 2002, pp. 397–99). Bender authored a report after each of the international conferences that were held in Florence at La Pietra, New York University’s campus in that city, and the group issued a final report in 2000. That report, and the others, are posted to the web site for the OAH: Thomas Bender, “La Pietra Report: A Report to the Profession” Organization of American Historians, www.oah.org/activities/lapietra/index.html (accessed 14 May 2005).

59. My thinking about translocative history has been shaped not only by my experience doing fieldwork among migrants in Miami (TWEED 1997b), but also by the anthropological and geographical literature on transnationalism and globalization. For a collection of some of the most helpful contributions to that conversation see INDA and ROSALDO 2002.

do not reach everywhere or homogenize everything. They are, paradoxically, more local than that, and they establish discontinuities as much as continuities. In a similar way, the exchanges between Suzuki and Edmunds were sometimes *about* the nation and they expressed nationalism; or, to be more precise, in some ways their exchanges directly or indirectly made sense of their identity as “Japanese” and “American”—as well as “Buddhist” and “Christian.” To refer to this sort of history as “transnational,” however, is not helpful, since that unwittingly reaffirms the nation as the default unit of analysis. That way of putting it still assumes the lines being crossed are only national boundaries—and not also linguistic, economic, geological, religious, ethnic, and racial. Instead, by using the term *translocative* I want to emphasize that this sort of historical analysis tries to follow transversal cultural trajectories as they cross all sorts of temporal and spatial boundaries, larger and smaller than the “nation” and larger and smaller than the “era.”

What, then, does this case study suggest about how to do translocative religious history? It reminds us to reconsider periodization and spatialization and—because there are so many challenges involved—to seek collaboration. In other words, it encourages us to think more about the time, place, and method of this sort of historical analysis.⁶⁰

First, periodization, or the historian’s marking of historical eras, is problematic enough when doing single-sited histories and can be especially challenging for multi-sited histories, since dividing chronological boundaries highlights one theme and inevitably obscures much that went on during those years. Historians of Japan usually divide periods by the transitions in political rule, as historians of the United States sometimes have done too: the Meiji period and the Age of Jackson. Conflicts, especially wars, also serve as dividing lines for historians of the United States—as in the Revolutionary Era—and, despite challenges to this scheme, many college courses and most textbooks continue the convention of marking the decisive shift at the Civil War in the 1860s. Many more narrowly focused studies, and some more ambitious essays, have pointed to the problems with this convention. For example, the American historian John Higham has argued that the 1840s and the 1890s were more significant turning points in US cultural history than the Civil War (HIGHAM 1969; HIGHAM 1970). In a similar way, Daniel Walker Howe has highlighted transatlantic links and proposed that we talk about Victorian America, from 1837 to 1901 (HOWE 1976), just as Daniel

60. A specialist in East Asian history, Prasenjit Duara (BENDER 2002, pp. 25–46), points to ways that transnational histories challenge period and space, but he also identifies another important issue—causation—that I have addressed elsewhere but do not have time to reflect on here. I briefly consider the challenges of tracing non-linear cultural flows in TWEED forthcoming, pp. 171–78. I first explored some of these issues in a paper delivered in Taipei in 1999, when I argued that we needed to “re-map” and “internationalize” the study and teaching of US religion (TWEED 1999).

Singal has suggested we identify Modernist America, which is dated variously, but emerged sometime between the 1890s and the 1910s (SINGAL 1987).

In that spirit, as I hinted at the start, for some purposes—and periodizations always serve particular purposes—it might be useful to emphasize transpacific pathways and talk about Meiji America, at least when discussing the West Coast and Hawai‘i and migration, art, and religion during that time. In turn, that period in Japanese history also might be reimagined as Gilded Age Japan, adopting a term that Americanists use to designate history from the 1865 to 1900, when big business, among other things, emerged with some force.⁶¹ As two world historians have noted, if we focus on economic and political developments, the US and Japan during the late-nineteenth century were both “moving along a trajectory” that was “strikingly parallel.” They were both “industrial newcomers, forged in the violence of the 1860s and part of the increasingly competitive global environment thereafter.” They were involved in “industrial catch-up” and aimed at “autonomous development based on mass industrial consolidations behind high tariffs, a close nexus of productive forces and state power, and competing, but surprisingly complementary, ideologies of national self-discipline and mobilization.” Despite these domestic developments, both “were engaged in a fundamentally transnational process” in which industries “were tied to the world and one another in relations of exchange, competition, and reciprocal mimicry.”⁶²

More relevant to religious history, a number of scholars have identified a “spiritual crisis” among some elite Christians in Gilded Age—or late-Victorian—America, and, for reasons that both converge and diverge, some elite Buddhists in Japan faced their own sort of crisis—in an 1896 letter Suzuki called it religious “indifference”—and they attempted different kinds of responses.⁶³ Unlike in America, the Japanese Buddhist crisis was brought on, to a large extent, by governmental hostility, though in both nations advocates for the predominant tradition defended it against intellectual and moral challenges and presented their religion as scientific and progressive, a proper faith for the age and the nation.⁶⁴

61. For a use of the label “Gilded Age” as early as 1873 see TWAIN and WARNER 1972.

62. All of these quotations are from a single passage in the essay by Charles Bright and Michael Geyer, “Where in the World is America?: The History of the United States in the Global Age,” in BENDER (2002, p. 80).

63. The quotation from Suzuki about religious “indifference” is from a letter to Paul Carus dated 14 May 1896 (SDZ, vol. 36, pp. 75–76). Three of the classic accounts of the spiritual crisis in nineteenth-century America are by MEYER (1976), SCHLESINGER (1930–1932), and CARTER (1971). For a helpful analysis of the context of the “crisis” for Buddhists in late Tokugawa and Meiji Japan—and Snodgrass does use that term (116)—see SNODGRASS (2003, especially pp. 115–54). She summarizes the “focal issues of the anti-Buddhist rhetoric”: it was seen as a “foreign” religion with an “irrational” worldview that is “inconsistent with the findings of science” and “of no benefit to modern society” (pp. 117–18). See also KETELAAR (1990) and THELLE (1987).

64. Suzuki noted that this emphasis on reason and science, which had been so prominent in the Meiji period among Japanese Buddhist intellectuals, had shifted by the 1930s: “Formerly Buddhists

As in this example about parallel—and divergent—spiritual crises in Gilded Age Japan and Meiji America, imagining the periodization of one place in terms of the other can be both misleading and helpful. It would be a mistake to conflate the two—there were enormous differences—just as it would be a mistake to fail to notice the striking parallels, especially in the discussion about what constituted a “scientific” religion suited to promote the “progress” of the nation. In turn, for this case study of Suzuki and Edmunds, it might be illuminating to reframe the periodization of their exchanges between 1901 and 1924: as we follow the flows back and forth across the Pacific, and across the United States, it might be useful to think about Meiji and Taishō America and Gilded Age and Progressive Era Japan. That reminds us that transculturation—to again use the term that Fernando Ortiz coined to emphasize this sort of active and reciprocal interaction—was going on, and not only for Suzuki who spent so long in the United States, but also for Edmunds, who rarely left his boarding house in Philadelphia.

So the recalibration of time prompted by this case study, in turn, has involved a new spatialization of the historical narrative. Cartographies and chronologies both shift. As we think about one place in terms of a periodization derived from the other, historians and their readers are propelled back and forth between (at least) two locales. In this sense, translocative history—and this is the second methodological implication of this case study—is inevitably multi-sited, and it demands that we reconsider the scale of historical analysis and remap the directionality of cultural flows.

Consider some of the multiple sites that appear during the occult period that I highlight (1903 to 1924). Edmunds, one focus of this translocative study, was born in Britain and moved to America, spending his life in Philadelphia, though he traveled to Chicago and LaSalle. There he had the decisive conversations with Suzuki about Swedenborg. That thinker, of course, was from Sweden, so was Vetterling, who after he emigrated to America supplied Buddhists in Japan with his own distinctive brand of Swedenborg and Buddhism and, like Edmunds, celebrated Theosophy, a movement co-founded by a Russian-born woman. Suzuki, who praised Blavatsky and had some interest in Theosophy, worked in LaSalle for Carus, who was born in Germany. Although poverty, among other things, kept him in Illinois from 1897 to 1908, Suzuki then traveled to New York. From there he went to Germany and Britain, and other places in Europe, including London where he had contacts with the Swedenborg Society. After returning to Japan, he remained in Tokyo until 1921 with his American-born wife, and found

were glad to welcome a scientific approach to their religion. But nowadays a reaction seems to have taken place among them. Instead of relying on scientific arguments for their rationalization [sic] of Buddhist experience, they are at present trying to resort to their own dialectics. There is a growing conviction among the Buddhists that their philosophy does not require the support of Western logic, especially modern science.” Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō to [James Bissett] Pratt, 27 June 1933 (SDZ, vol. 36, pp. 598–603).

some time for travel to China and England, on the second invitation from the Swedenborg Society in London. By the end of his occult period, Daisetsu and Beatrice were living in Kyoto, where Suzuki was teaching at Otani University.

I point to these diverse sites not to disorient the reader—though I would not be surprised if it had that effect—but to note that this case study was multi-sited, and multi-sited histories raise important questions about the scale of analysis and the direction of influence. Clearly, the study moves beyond the boundaries of a single nation, though it is not “global,” whatever that might mean. This study did not take us everywhere—to Africa, for example—and did not identify transregional forces that led to cultural homogenization. The action recounted, however, does move back and forth between varied sites in America and Japan, and other places too. On the one hand, the scale is larger than the nation. This story, as my reflections about periodization already have suggested, might be imagined as a narrative about transpacific exchange, or about the Pacific World, though that way of seeing it obscures the important connections with England, Germany, and Sweden. On the other hand, the scale is much smaller than the nation. It is a biographical microstudy that focuses on one issue—an exchange about Swedenborg and Buddhism—between two people. In that sense, the scale is very small indeed, as small as Suzuki’s bedroom in LaSalle and Edmunds’s boarding house accommodations in Philadelphia. There is a place for studies with longer temporal spans and larger geographical reach, and my book, *The American Encounter with Buddhism, 1844–1912*, was such a study, though not fully translocative in the sense that I am proposing here. As I hope I have shown, there also is a place for very narrowly framed case studies of contact and exchange. This analysis of Suzuki and Edmunds indicates, I think, that such studies can open out to wider arenas and larger issues as the historian traces the non-linear and multidirectional cultural flows back and forth between LaSalle and Philadelphia and from there out to the other intersecting trajectories that nudged the historical actors this way or that.

Finally, tracing these multi-directional cultural flows across multiple locales and reimagined historical periods, the interpreter quickly reaches the limits of his or her specialization, and this points to a third reminder about translocative analyses: they not only challenge us to reconsider the temporal and spatial frames of our narratives, but they also encourage, even require, collaboration. Some of that collaboration can come from secondary sources written in one of the historian’s research languages. Not everything relevant will be published in one of those languages, however, and even when sources are accessible it is difficult for any single scholar to know how to sort through the stacks of scholarship available in libraries, journals, and archives. There is just too much to know. The study of religion, I have argued elsewhere, always involves “blind spots,” but there are degrees of visual incapacity (TWEED forthcoming, pp. 1–28, 164–83). Just as a scholar of Buddhism in Meiji and Taishō Japan might come to

this translocative project with a limited understanding of US cultural and religious history, as a specialist in US religion, I approached this case study knowing more about Gilded Age and Progressive Era America, even if I did some study of Japanese religions in graduate school and even if the research for my earlier book led me to trace some international links with Japanese Buddhists. I suspect plenty of blind spots remain in this case study, but I am sure that I have avoided many more errors and omissions because of informal collaborations with Buddhist scholars in Japan and America. I am not just being polite, or falsely modest. This project, as I have imagined it, was not possible without the generous collaboration of colleagues, as my acknowledgments in the footnotes document. One scholar, for example, found an important marginal note in one of Suzuki's books in Kamakura; another alerted me to the presence of Swedenborgianism in Japanese periodicals during this period. This case study, however, is not the exception. Most translocative histories will cross all sorts of boundaries, too many to make the passage alone. So scholars need to find ways to encourage, and institutionalize, such international and cross-disciplinary academic cooperation in conferences, workshops, and working groups. In a sense, then, those who want to write translocative histories are called on to reenact the exchanges between Suzuki and Edmunds in that summer of 1903 when they met in LaSalle, as Suzuki told Edmunds about the monastic interchanges preserved in *kōan* and Edmunds described Swedenborg's encounters with other worlds—and both of them set in motion a criss-crossing flow of ideas and artifacts, anecdotes and texts, that would play a small, but significant, role in the construction of Buddhism in Meiji and Taishō America and Gilded Age and Progressive Era Japan.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

- AEP The Albert J. Edmunds Papers. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- MB Matsugaoka Bunko. Kamakura.
- OC The Open Court Collection. Morris Library. Southern Illinois University. Carbondale, Illinois.
- SDZ *Suzuki Daisetsu zenshū* 鈴木大拙全集. Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō 鈴木大拙貞太郎, 40 vols. Revised and edited by Hisamatsu Shin'ichi 久松真一, Yamaguchi Susumu 山口益, Furuta Shōkin 古田紹欽. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1999–2003.
- UTA Archives. Department of Religious Studies. The University of Tokyo.

PRIMARY SOURCES

BLAVATSKY, H. B.

- 1889 *The Voice of the Silence and Other Chosen Fragments from the Book of the Golden Precepts: For the Daily Use of Lanoos (Disciples)*. New York: Theosophical Publishing Co.; New York: "for sale by The Quarterly Book Department."

CARUS, Paul

- 1894 *The Gospel of Buddha*. Chicago: Open Court.
 1895 *Budda no fukuin* 佛陀の福音. Trans. Suzuki, D. T. Tokyo: Satō Shigenobu.

EDMUNDS, Albert J.

- 1905a Buddhist and Christian gospels. *Open Court* 19: 538–46.
 1905b *Buddhist and Christian Gospels Now First Compared with the Originals*. 3rd ed. Tokyo: Yuhokwan Publishing House.
 1906 *Buddhist Texts Quoted in Scripture by the Gospel of John: A Discovery in the Lower Criticism*. Philadelphia: M. Brix and Albert J. Edmunds.
 1913a Professor Anesaki at Harvard. *The Buddhist Review* 5/4: 272–76.
 1913b Has Swedenborg's "Lost Word" been found? *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research* 7: 257–71.
 1914 F. W. H. Myers, Swedenborg, and Buddha. *Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research* 8: 253–85.

JAMES, William

- 1982 *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: Penguin.

JORDAN, Louis Henry

- 1905 *Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

MATSUYAMA Matsutaro

- 1888 A branch of Theosophical Society in Japan. *The Bijou of Asia* 1: 9.

OSWALD, Felix

- 1891 Was Christ a Buddhist? *Arena* 3: 193–201.

RICHARDSON, Robert P.

- 1931 The rise and fall of the Parliament of Religions at Greenacre. *Open Court* 46: 129–66.

SUZUKI, D. T.

- 1896 *Shin shūkyō ron* 新宗教論. Kyoto: Baiyō Shoin.
 1898 *Lao-Tze's Tao-The King*. Translated in collaboration with Paul Carus. Chicago: Open Court.
 1900 *Asvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*. Chicago: Open Court.
 1903 Individual immortality. *Light of Dharma* 3: 67–72.

- 1922 Rev. of *Christianity Reconstructed* by Albert J. Edmunds. *The Eastern Buddhist* 11: 92–94.
- 1957 *Mysticism: Christian and Buddhist*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- 1963 *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*. New York: Schocken.
- 1996 *Swedenborg: The Buddha of the North*. West Chester, Penn.: Swedenborg Foundation.

SWEDENBORG, Emanuel

- 1905 *God, Creation, Man: Being a Translation of a Work Entitled "The Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom."* London and New York: Frederick Warne.

TAKAKUSU, Junjirō

- 1906 Rev. of *Buddhist and Christian Gospels, Now First Compared from the Originals*, by Albert J. Edmunds. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (Jan.): 243–46.

TWAIN, Mark and Charles Dudley WARNER

- 1972 *The Gilded Age: A Tale of Today*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

VETTERLING, Herman Carl

- 1887 *Swedenborg the Buddhist; Or, the Higher Swedenborgianism, Its Secrets, and Thibetan Origin*, by Philangi Dasa. Los Angeles: The Buddhistic Swedenborgian Brotherhood.
- 1893 *Zuiha Bukkyōgaku* 瑞派佛教學, by Philangi Dasa. Ohara Kakichi 大原嘉吉, trans. Tokyo: Hakubunkan.
- 2003 *Swedenborg the Buddhist: Or, the Higher Swedenborgianism, Its Secrets, and Thibetan Origin*, by Philangi Dasa. Charleston, S.C.: Arcana Books.

SECONDARY SOURCES

ABE Masao, ed.

- 1986 *A Zen Life: D. T. Suzuki Remembered*. New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill.

ABÉ Ryūichi

- 1999 *The Weaving of Mantra: Kukai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse*. New York: Columbia University Press.

AHLSTROM, Sydney E.

- 2004 *A Religious History of the American People*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

ALBANESE, Catherine L.

- 2002 *American Religious History: A Bibliographic Essay*. Currents in American Scholarship Series. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs at the United States Department of State. Available <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/amstudy>.

Forthcoming *A Republic of Mystics and Metaphysicians: A Cultural History of U.S. Metaphysical Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- ALEGIO, Adele
 2005 Beatrice Lane Suzuki and Theosophy in Japan. *Theosophical History* 11: 3–16.
- ALEXANDER, Agnes B.
 1977 *History of the Baha'i Faith in Japan, 1914–1938*. Osaka: Baha'i Publishing Trust Japan. www.bahai-library.com/east-asia/history.japan/ (accessed 15 February 2005).
- AMBROS, Barbara and Duncan WILLIAMS
 2001 Local religion in Tokugawa history: Editors' introduction. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 28: 209–25.
- BENDER, Thomas, ed.
 2002 *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- BLOCK, Marguerite Beck
 1932 *The New Church in the New World: A Study of Swedenborgianism in America*. New York: Henry Holt.
- BERGQUIST, Lars
 2001 *Swedenborg's Dream Diary*. West Chester, Penn.: Swedenborg Foundation Publishers.
- BUDDHIST CHURCHES OF AMERICA, ed.
 1998 *Buddhist Churches of America: A Legacy of the First 100 Years*. San Francisco: Buddhist Churches of America.
- CARTER, Paul A.
 1971 *The Spiritual Crisis of the Gilded Age*. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University.
- CONZE, Edward, ed.
 1968 Introduction. In *On Indian Mahayana Buddhism*, by D. T. Suzuki, pp. 1–29. New York: Harper and Row.
- FONTEIN, Jan
 1992 A brief history of the collections. In *Selected Masterpieces of Asian Art, Museum of Fine Arts*, Boston, pp. 6–15. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Tokyo: Japan Broadcast Publishing.
- GALBREATH, Robert
 1983 Explaining modern Occultism. In *The Occult in America: New Historical Perspectives*, ed. Kerr, Howard, and Charles L. Crow, pp. 11–37. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- HIGHAM, John
 1969 *From Boundlessness to Consolidation: The Transformation of American Culture, 1848–1860*. Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library.
 1970 The reorientation of American culture in the 1890s. In *Writing American*

History, by Higham, John, pp. 73–102. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

HOWE, Daniel Walker

1976 Victorian culture in America. In *Victorian America*, ed. Daniel Walker Howe, pp. 3–28. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

INDA, Jonathan Xavier, and Renato ROSALDO, ed.

2002 *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.

ISOMAE Jun'ichi

2000 The discursive position of religious studies in Japan: Masaharu Anesaki and the origins of religious studies. *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 14: 21–46.

JAFFE, Richard M.

2004 Seeking Śākyamuni: Travel and the reconstruction of Japanese Buddhism. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 30: 65–96.

JOHNSON, Gregory R., ed.

2002 *Kant on Swedenborg: Dreams of a Spirit-Seer and Other Writings*. West Chester, Pa.: Swedenborg Foundation.

JUDAH, J. Stillson

1967 *The History and Philosophy of the Metaphysical Movements in America*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

KETELAAR, James Edward

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

KIRITA Kiyohide

1995 D. T. Suzuki on society and the state. In *Rude Awakenings: Zen, The Kyoto School and the Question of Nationalism*, ed. Heisig, James W., and John C. Maraldo, pp. 52–74. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

KIYOTA Minoru

1978 *Shingon Buddhism: Theory and Practice*. Los Angeles: Buddhist Books International.

LARSEN, Stephen

1984 Introduction. In *Emanuel Swedenborg: The Universal Human and Soul-Body Interaction*, ed. Dole, George F., pp. 1–33. Classics of Western Spirituality Series. New York: Paulist Press.

LEVINSON, Henry Samuel

1981 *The Religious Investigations of William James*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

LOY, David

1996 The Dharma of Emanuel Swedenborg: A Buddhist perspective. *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 16: 11–35.

- MASUTANI Fumio, ed.
 1964 Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙. In *Nihon shisō taikai* series. Vol. 8. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.
- MEYER, D. H.
 1976 American intellectuals and the Victorian crisis of faith. In *Victorian America*, ed. Daniel Walker Howe, pp. 59–77. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- MYERS, Gerald E.
 1986 *William James: His Life and Thought*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- MORIYA, Tomoe
 2000 *Yemyo Imamura: Pioneer American Buddhist*. [Hawai'i]: Buddhist Study Center Press.
- MORSE, Anne Nishimura, and Nobuo TSUJI, ed.
 1998 *Japanese Art in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*. 2 vols. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts; Tokyo: Kodansha.
- NAGASHIMA Tatsuya
 1993 Daisetsu T. Suzuki, internationally known Buddhist: Crypto-Swedenborgian? *New Church Life* 113: 202–17.
- PRATT, Mary Louise
 1992 *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- ROSENSTONE, Robert A.
 1988 *Mirror in the Shrine: American Encounters in Meiji Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- SCHLESINGER, Sr., Arthur
 1930–1932 A critical period in American religion, 1875–1900. *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 64: 523–46.
- SEAGER, Richard Hughes
 1995 *The World's Parliament of Religions: The East/West Encounter*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- SHARF, Robert H.
 1993 The Zen of Japanese Nationalism. *History of Religions* 33: 1–43.
- SILVER, Richard
 1983 The Spiritual Kingdom in America: The influence of Emanuel Swedenborg on American society and culture, 1815–1860. PhD dissertation, Stanford University.
- SIMS, Barbara R.
 1989 *Traces That Remain: A Pictorial History of the Early Days of the Baha'i Faith among the Japanese*. Japan: Baha'i Publishing Trust.

SINGAL, Daniel Joseph

- 1987 Towards a definition of American Modernism. *American Quarterly* 39: 7–26.

SNODGRASS, Judith

- 2003 *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism, Occidentalism, and the Columbian Exposition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

SPAE, Joseph J.

- 1972 Dr. D. T. Suzuki on Christianity. *Japan Christian Quarterly* 38: 147–58.

STOCKMAN, Robert H.

- 1985 *The Baha'i Faith in America: Origins, 1892–1900*. Wilmete, Illinois: Baha'i Publishing Trust.

SUZUKI, Norihisa

- 1970 Nobuta Kishimoto and the beginnings of the scientific study of religion in modern Japan. *Contemporary Religions in Japan* 11: 155–80.

SWITZER III, A. Irwin

- 1985 *D. T. Suzuki: A Biography*. London: The Buddhist Society.

TAVES, Ann

- 1999 *Fits, Trances, and Visions: Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 2003 Religious experience and the divisible self: William James (and Frederic Myers) as theorist(s) of religion. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 71: 303–26.

THELLE, Notto R.

- 1987 *Buddhism and Christianity in Japan: From Conflict to Dialogue, 1854–1899*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

TSUCHIYA, Hiroshi

- 2000 “Religious Studies” in Japan and future prospects. *Nanzan Bulletin*, 24: 8–21.

TWEED, Thomas A.

- 1997a Introduction: Narrating U.S. religious history. *Retelling U.S. Religious History*, ed. Tweed, Thomas A., pp. 1–23. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1997b *Our Lady of the Exile: Diasporic Religion at a Cuban Catholic Shrine in Miami*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1999 Documenting North American religions: The role of the Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative. *Proceedings of the 1999 EBTI, ECAI, SEER, and PNC Joint Meeting*, pp. 503–14. Taipei, Taiwan: Academic Activity Center, Academia Sinica.
- 2000 *The American Encounter with Buddhism, 1844–1912: Victorian Culture and*

- the Limits of Dissent*. Rev. ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- 2004 *Buddhism in the United States, 1840–1925*. 5 vols. London: Ganesha.
- Forthcoming *Crossing and Dwelling: A Theory of Religion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- TWEED, Thomas A., and Helen TWORKOV
 1991 The original ray. *Tricycle: The Buddhist Review* 1: 6–7.
- VÄRILÄ, Armi
 1977 *The Swedenborgian Background of William James' Philosophy*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia.
- VERHOEVEN, Martin
 1998 Americanizing the Buddha: Paul Carus and the transformation of Asian thought. In *Faces of Buddhism in America*, ed. Prebish, Charles S., and Kenneth K. Tanaka, pp. 207–27. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- WEBER, Max
 1949 “Objectivity” in the social sciences and social policy. In *Methodology in the Social Sciences*, pp. 49–112. New York: Free Press.
- YAMASAKI Taiko
 1988 *Shingon: Japanese Esoteric Buddhism*. Boston: Shambhala.
- YOSHINAGA Shin'ichi 吉永進一
 2003 Japanese Buddhism and the Theosophical movement. Unpublished paper.
- 2005 Daisetsu to Swēdenborugu: sono rekishiteki haikai 大拙とスウェーデンボルグーその歴史的背景. *Shūkyō tetsugaku kenkyū* 22: 33–50.