

From *Gokyō-dōgen* to *Bankyō-dōkon*:

A Study in the Self-Universalization of Ōmoto

Richard Fox YOUNG¹

Twice in 1972, Shinto rituals of the Ōmoto 大本 sect, founded in the late nineteenth century by Deguchi Nao 出口なお (1837–1918) and Deguchi Onisaburō 出口王仁三郎 (1871–1948), were performed in Christian churches in New York City and San Francisco. Five years later, ministers of the same churches reciprocated by conducting services of Christian worship at Ayabe and Kameoka, the twin centers of Ōmoto in the Tamba region near Kyoto.² These events were heralded in an Ōmoto denominational publication (ANON. 1978, p. 1) as the beginning of a new age of *shūsaika* 宗際化. This neologism, of which the official translation, “interreligious cooperation,” is hardly adequate, connotes more than “working together” organizationally. If coining an equally monstrous English term can be excused, the idea might be expressed as “interreligionization,” the process by which a plurality of religions are integrated into a unity. What precisely that unity consists of, and how Ōmoto perceives itself as the catalyst of that process, are questions this paper will address, as a study in the history of ideas. In so doing, it will examine the origin and early development of *bankyō-dōkon* 万教同根, “all religions (are derived from) the same root,” a seminal concept that has undergone—and is undergoing—complex

¹ I am indebted to a number of persons who offered insights into my research, in particular Daniel Overmyer and Miyata Mami of the University of British Columbia, Koba Tsugimori 木庭次守 of Ōmoto in Kameoka, Nemoto Hiroshi 根本 宏 of the Tokyo (Ginza) Nihon Kōmanji-kai. Any errors are not theirs but mine. Also, an earlier version of this article appeared in the *Meiji Gakuin ronso* No. 426, March 1988, pp. 63–81.

² The Shinto ceremonies occurred as part of the festivities surrounding the openings of an exhibition of Ōmoto art at New York's Cathedral of St. John the Divine and San Francisco's Grace Cathedral, both Episcopalian, under the ministries of J. P. Morton and S. F. Rodgers.

transformation, conceptually and functionally. This investigation will necessarily be a limited one, confined to the first quarter of this century of Ōmoto history. Long before it claimed to have a distinctive role in *shūsaiika*, Ōmoto referred to itself more simply as an “international religion” engaged in the “internationalization” of other religions. Internationalization in this sense (perhaps also peculiar to Ōmoto and in use since early Shōwa; NAKAMURA 1932), arose in the context of Ōmoto’s own experience of *shūsaiika* during the period of its rapid overseas expansion into Europe, South America (Brazil), Indo-China (Vietnam), China, and in areas under Japanese military occupation (Manchuria and Taiwan).

Among its extensive contacts with other religions, this study will focus primarily on Ōmoto’s relationship to the Dō-in 道院 (Tao Yüan, “Society of the Way,” also known as Kōmanji-kai, Hung-wan-tzu hui, or “Red Swastika Society,” 紅卍字会 the name of its humanitarian wing).³ This was a Chinese sectarian religion with which Ōmoto began in the 1920s to celebrate joint liturgies that set precedents for those of the 1970s mentioned above. Even younger than Ōmoto, the Dō-in was nevertheless more advanced in conceptualizing and denominating a theory of interreligious unity, *gokkyō-dōgen* 五教同源 (*wu-chiao t’ung-yuan*), “the five religions [Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam] (arise from) the same

³ After the Dō-in, Ōmoto’s first formal overseas contacts were with spiritualist organizations in Europe and South America including Weisse Fahne in Germany (1926), the White Fraternity of Bulgaria (1926), the Greater World Spiritualist League in Britain (1931), and the Liga espirita of Brazil (1931). The basis of Ōmoto’s affinity for western spiritualism was its fascination with “spirit writing” especially as understood by the French medium, Allan Kardec (1809–1869). On Kardecism in Brazil, where Ōmotoist Japanese immigrants were numerous, see BASTIDE 1978, pp. 313–339, and for a comparison of western planchette techniques with those of Chinese origin, see JORDON/OVERMYER 1986, pp. 280–288. In the 1920s, Ōmoto was in contact with Baha’i missionaries in Japan. Insofar as Asia is concerned, Ōmoto first interacted with Tibetan Buddhism in 1924 when Onisaburō travelled to Mongolia and pronounced himself the new “Ōmoto Dalai Lama.” Ōmoto’s formal relationships with Chinese sectarian associations date to the early years (1931–1934) of the Sino-Japanese conflict. In addition to the societies discussed in this paper, Ōmoto was affiliated with the now defunct *Tsai-li hui* 在理會, *P’u-ch’ing hui* 普清會, and *An-ch’ing hui* 安清會. In Korea Ōmoto was linked with the short-lived *Poch’ŏn-gyō* 普天教 (PRUNNER 1980, p. 5). In Japanese-occupied Manchuria, Ōmoto cultivated relations with virtually any group, even the “Siberian Association of (White Russian) Muslims.” Apart from the Dō-in, Ōmoto’s most significant contact was with the *Cao Dai* 高台 (“High Tower” or “High Palace”) of Vietnam, a millenarian planchette cult that originated in 1919. Ōmoto’s relation to the *Cao Dai* began in 1935 but was terminated the same year due to the second Ōmoto “incident.” In 1956 Ōmoto renewed its ties with the *Cao Dai* and another Vietnamese millenarian sect, the *Hoa Hao* 和好 (“Peace and Plenty”; f. 1939). Both had supported Japanese expansion into Indochina (see note 16). On Vietnamese millenarianism, see OLIVER 1976 and TAI 1983.

source.” As the matrix out of which *bankyō-dōkon* evolved, *gokyō-dōgen*, itself a derivative of the much older Three-in-One doctrine 三一教 (*san-ichiao*; the first three of the above five) is nonetheless not strictly identical to its Ōmoto counterpart. As is always the case where issues of Sino-Japanese interaction are concerned, origin does not necessarily imply equivalence. Moreover, insofar as Ōmoto itself is concerned, *bankyō-dōkon* is an article of faith, a revealed truth, unrivalled though not unparalleled by earlier formulations of a similar truth over which it now has priority.

As such, this is a study in the universalization of a particular religion, of how Deguchi Onisaburō, a little-known “doctor of the human soul” 稲荷教師 (*inari-kyōshi*; IROKAWA 1985, p. 42) who diagnosed cases of fox and badger possession, transformed Ōmoto, a local sectarian movement of unimpressive dimensions, into a religion which perceived itself as the fountainhead of all other religions, including those that were chronologically prior to it, and embarked upon a world-wide mission to convince others that this was so.

Bankyō-dōkon alone cannot fully explain this process. A more comprehensive study would approach the problem from at least two other angles: 1) the frequent renaming of the central deity of Ōmoto (from Ushitora no Konjin 良ノ金神, an originally Taoistic and temperamental directional god, to, *inter alia*, the abstract Ōmoto-sume-ō-mikami 大本皇大御神 of contemporary usage; cf. STOESZ 1986), which reflects a broadening of Ōmoto’s self-understanding; and 2) Onisaburō’s myth of *ananaikyō* 三五教 (literally, the “Religion of the Three and Five [Religions]), according to which the Shinto *kami* Haniyasu-hime-no-mikoto 埴安姫命 and Haniyasu-hiko-no-mikoto 埴安彦命 founded, respectively, the Three-in-One and Five-in-One doctrines, thereby divinely generating the conditions — for which Ōmoto finds history itself an insufficient cause — that made the appearance of *bankyō-dōkon* possible (DEGUCHI E. 1986, p. 206).

On a more modest scale, this study is, as stated, primarily concerned with *bankyō-dōkon* in the context of interaction with the Dō-in during the leadership of Onisaburō, and therefore commences with the contention of Ōmoto (ANON. 1977, p. 21) that *bankyō-dōkon*, although never explicitly mentioned in the revelations received and recorded by Nao, was implicit therein and predated Ōmoto’s liaison with the Dō-in, which occurred after her death.

Nao and Bankyō-dōkon

Nao did not at first view Ōmoto as distinct from other sectarian movements

that preceded hers; she saw them as complimentary and her own mission a continuation of theirs, especially Konkōkyō 金光教 (f. 1853), which was also centered on Konjin. Disappointed when the validity of her experience of *kamigakari* 神懸り (spirit possession) was not acknowledged in return, especially by Konkōkyō, of which she had been a member, Nao began to stress the primacy of Ōmoto over others as the vehicle of “world-renewal” (expressed with varying connotations as *yonaoshi* 世直し, *tatekae* 建て替え, or *tatenaoshi* 建直し). In the *Ofudesaki* お筆先,⁴ the collection of revelations she received while possessed, the first entry (dated January, 1892) contains the following: “First came Tenri [天理], Konkō, Kurozumi [黒住] and Myōrei [妙霊]. . . . Although these other religions understand something about the transformation of the world, they do not know how to carry it out” (Ooms 1984, p. 71). An increasingly strident tone is evident in subsequent passages, of which the following are a selected but representative sampling:⁵ other gods, who governed the world in the absence of Konjin,⁶ are responsible for the deplorable condition into which it has fallen (12 July 1893); other religions do not offer true grace (24 March 1898); in a rare direct reference to an established religion, Buddhism is held responsible for Japan’s spiritual decline (5 July 1898); other religions will come under judgment (January 1899); Ōmoto’s divine vision of world-renewal

⁴ Caution must be exercised in using the *Ofudesaki* as a basis for generalizations about Nao’s views on this or any other topic. The original text in phonetic script was later transcribed by Onisaburō into characters, a process which offered ample scope for revision and refinement. His influence is said to be particularly evident in certain sections of the Taishō editions where a tight logical structure prevails over the less coherent but more authentic passages of Nao. The present edition of the *Ofudesaki*, the *Ōmoto shīnyū*, is largely based on selections from the Taishō editions. An attempt is being made to reconstruct the original text in a series of volumes under the title *Ōmoto shīryō shūsei* edited by IKEDA Akira. I look forward to the thesis of Miyata Mami who is also working on this problem.

⁵ I have mainly used the official Ōmoto English translation of selected passages of the *Ofudesaki* by Hino (1974), which can be located in and compared with the Japanese *Ōmoto shīnyū* (see note 4) by means of the date of revelation which I have supplied. While reasonably reliable, Hino’s version is a further step in the process of revision begun by Onisaburō: when, for instance, Nao singled out Tenri, Konkōkyō and Myōrei as religions that knew something of what “world renewal” meant but could not implement that knowledge, Hino omits their names and merely glosses as “other Pillars of the Spirit”.

⁶ Nao’s interpretation of the collapse of Konjin’s rule shows her anti-foreign bias, which Onisaburō did not share, expressed in her belief that Japan under his reign had been pure and uncorrupted until other rebellious deities conspired together and overthrew him. “The present evil ways of doing things”, she said, “come from the victory of the four-legged foreign demons which crossed over and triumphed in Japan” (NADOLSKI 1975, pp. 31–32). On Onisaburō’s reformulation of the fall and return of Konjin (identified as Kunitoko-tachi, first of the seven generations of heavenly 天 [*amatsu*] deities), see NADOLSKI 1975, pp. 49–53.

is unknown to other religions (24 February, 11 August 1900, 24 August 1901); the “root” (Ōmoto) is more important than the “branches and twigs” (other religions; 8 January 1902); Konjin would never condescend to possess a Shinto priest or priestess (16 April 1905). The overall impression, as E. Ooms has observed (1984, p. 130), is that, in Nao’s vision of the ideal society to be established on earth, there is no place for other religions, either traditional or recent, Japanese or foreign. Neither was Nao willing to admit that other individuals beside herself could be worthy of entering into an authentic state of *kamigakari*. Her experience, as Ooms again observes (1984, p. 129), “convinced her that she was the only legitimate intermediary between the sacred and profane worlds” and that the doctrines of other religions were of merely human origin.⁷

When *bankyō-dōkon* is said to be implicit in the *Ofudesaki*, Ōmoto means it can be extrapolated from Nao’s insistence on the unity of humanity and the vanity of conventional distinctions of power and status (Kerr 1982, p. 30), e.g., “All are equally my children. The whole world shall be equal and protected as one” (25 December 1896). However, insofar as the idea of human solidarity is concerned, it can be asked why other religions which arose in the same period and articulated similar teachings in a nearly identical idiom, did not go on, as Ōmoto did, to advocate a unity of all religions. According to Tenri, “all are brothers” 一列は皆兄弟 (*ichiretsu wa mina kyōdai*), and Kurozumikyō describes mankind as a single family (HAROOTUNIAN 1982, p. 56). On the one hand, the *Ofudesaki* does not directly contradict the idea of *bankyō-dōkon* as formulated by Onisaburō; on the other, the two have no unforced, organic connection. Nao and Onisaburō differed from each other at numerous points, including how they viewed Ōmoto vis-à-vis other religions.

Onisaburō and Bankyō-dōkon

Bankyō-dōkon first occurs as the title of the twenty-third chapter (dated

⁷ Nao came into conflict with Onisaburō who had popularized a form of auto-induced *kamigakari* called *chinkon-kishin* 鎮魂帰神, which threatened her own sense of distinctiveness, as if there might be access to sacred knowledge outside of herself. As Ōmoto developed in the 1920s, Nao came to be understood as exemplifying but not monopolizing spirit-mediumship. As an Ōmoto English tract, intended for distribution by its European centers, put it: ““Kishin” is the state in which one’s spirit harmonize [*sic*] completely with the divinity [*sic*] of the great God. . . . In other words, in the state of “Kishin,” God and man are completely united. Therefore “Kishin” is most important for a prophet in conveying the truths of the spiritual world, because in that state he (or she) receives directly the inner stream of the great God” (ANON. 1925, p. 14).

January 1922) of the sixth volume of Onisaburō's account of his shamanic experiences on Mt. Takakuma, the *Reikai monogatari* 霊界物語. Its context has no direct relation to the *Ofudesaki* as described above. Transported to the astral world, he is granted a vision of the *kami*. Solicitous of mankind, they one by one refract themselves, and a part of each 分霊 (*bunrei*) descends to earth, transformed into one or another of the deities, saints and saviors revered by other religions.

The following is a complete list in order of appearance:

- Tsuki-teru-hiko-no-kami 月照彦神 became the Buddha
 Daruma-hiko-no-kami 足真彦司 became the first Zen patriarch, Bodhidharma
 Sukuna-hiko-no-kami 少名彦司 was born in Israel, where, though not explicitly said to have become Jesus Christ, he propagated the "Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven"
 Ama-ji-wake-no-mikoto 天道別命 became Moses
 Ame-no-ma-michi-hiko-no-mikoto 天真道彦命 became Elijah
 Takami-musubi-no-kami 高皇産霊神 became Dainichinyorai
 Toyo-kuni-hime-no-mikoto 豊国姫命 became the Bodhisattva Jizō
 Hiro-yasu-hiko-no-kami 弘子彦司 became Confucius
 No-dachi-hiko-no-mikoto 野立彦命, whom the Buddhists call Lord Yama, divided off a portion of his spirit and became Lao-tsu out of concern that the teachings of Confucius were insufficiently spiritual.

The vision, now over and not mentioned again, would indeed be baffling if one expected from it a clue to a larger structure of meaning that would explain why, for instance, Sukuna-hiko was identified as Jesus Christ rather than Jizō.

Reasons might be found, and many have been proffered. Instead of enumerating the diverse and contradictory reasons given by individual Ōmotoists with whom I have discussed this question, I suggest that a solution may emerge from a deeper study of the connection between Sukuna-hiko and the myth of *Tokoyo* 常世 and its possible influence on millenarian cults (see OUWEHAND 1964, pp. 82–102). Although nowadays Ōmoto does not appear to actively encourage veneration of Jesus Christ as a Shinto *kami*, the Sukuna-hiko cult is perpetuated by Fujita Himiko 藤田妃見子, of Osaka, foundress of *Ryūgū* Fellowship 龍宮フェローシップ (now

known as *Megami no Umi* 女神ノ海).⁸ Insofar as Onisaburō the shaman was concerned, *bankyō-dōkon* was not theology. It was, on the contrary, a different order of truth verified by his own experience in the astral world.⁹

Apart from its shamanic aspect, nothing profoundly differentiates *bankyō-dōkon* from its Shinto corollary, *shinpon-butsujaku* 神本佛迹. Articulated in various idioms compatible with Onisaburō's, it considered the Indian gods, buddhas and bodhisattvas of Buddhism to be avatars (*butsujaku*) of Japanese *kami* who are primary or original (*shinpon*). The "root" metaphor is similar to one that appears in the medieval *Jinnō shōtōki* 神皇正統記 of Kitabatake Chikafusa 北畠親房 (1293–1353), who held that Shinto was the trunk of the tree of true religion, Confucianism its branches, Buddhism its leaves, and that "all the myriad ways have a common potentiality" (VARLEY 1980, pp. 39–40, 41). The Yūitsu 唯一 (un-amalgamated or primal) Shinto of Yoshida Kanetomo 吉田兼俱 (1435–1511), underscored the radical distinction between esoteric religion (Shinto) and exoteric (Buddhism) that one finds in *bankyō-dōkon* instead of the sacred-profane dualism upheld by Nao.¹⁰

Onisaburō would have become familiar with *shinpon-butsujaku* when he studied under a disciple of Hirata Atsutane 平田篤胤 (1776–1843), its primary mediator in the Tokugawa Era, and when he enrolled in the Institute

⁸ Fujita, whose beliefs largely overlap those of Ōmoto, has self-consciously modelled herself on the example of Nao, and enjoys considerable support from certain elements within Ōmoto itself. In 1973 she experienced *kamigakari* and became the medium of Ryūgū Otohime 龍宮乙姫, and is now, in addition to being a "living god" 生き神 (*ikigami*), the "divine shamaness" 神巫女 (*kami-miko*) of Izumo Daijingu Shrine in Kameoka, where Ryūgū Otohime had previously been enshrined. On a visit to Israel (to which Fujita feels she has a special mission; see note 24) in 1982, she bought a statue of Jesus Christ, whom she believes is Sukuna-hiko, and had it installed at Izumo Daijingu. When I visited Fujita in October, 1987, the statue had been transferred from the shrine – which had received an anonymous threat that it would be bombed if the statue were not removed – and now it can be seen in her personal shrine in the house she occupies on monthly visits to Kameoka. On her movement, see the now rather outdated but otherwise excellent study of SHILLONY (1984).

⁹ Likewise, the remarkable and often-published photographs of Onisaburō dressed as the Bodhisattva Maitreya and other divinities are considered – at least by "old guard" Ōmotoists who personally knew the founder – as visual proofs of what they looked like when he visited the astral world.

¹⁰ Kitabatake Chikafusa and Yoshida Kanetomo were both related to the Watarai 度会 priestly family that administered the outer shrine 外宮 (*gekū*) of Ise. The Watarai advanced the claim that their deity, Toyouke 豊受, was superior to Amaterasu 天照, and that this deity was the same as Kunitoko-tachi, the first deity to appear in the creation process (Varley 1980, pp. 12–13). I have stressed these two figures because Nao claimed descent from the Watarai and journeyed to the outer shrine on a symbolic pilgrimage to enhance the legitimacy of her fledgling movement (see NADOLSKI 1975, pp. 33–46).

for the Study of Japanese Classics (Kōten Kōkyū-jo 皇典講究所) in Kyoto, a bastion of opposition to Buddhism after the Meiji government abandoned its policy of *shinbutsu-bunri* 神佛分離, the forced separation of Buddhist from Shinto divinities.¹¹ It was also not unprecedented in Hirata Shinto to identify the deities of non-Asian religions with the *kami* of Japan: Watanabe Ikarimaro 渡辺重石丸 (1837–1915) had already argued that the God of Christianity was none other than Ame-no-mi-naka-nushi-no-mikoto 天御中主尊 (MURAOKA 1964, p. 21). If *bankyō-dōkon*, as the preceding observations indicate, is a variation on the same theme as *shinpon-butsumajaku* — the syncretic primacy of Shinto — it does not necessarily follow that *bankyō-dōkon*, the concept or the term, arises out of Japanese religion.

Dō-in and Gokyō-dōgen

Although Chinese in origin, the Dō-in has numerous characteristics in common with Ōmoto. Both are popular associations hierarchically organized but based on voluntary membership and lay leadership, with distinctive beliefs, congregational rituals and scriptures distinguishing them from established religions. The Dō-in was founded in Peking in 1922 but can be traced to 1916 in Shantung Province where gentry and local officials, informally gathered for devotional purposes, received planchette 扶乩 (*fu-chi*) oracles from a Taoist Immortal identified as the Most Holy Venerable Patriarch of Primordial Times 至聖先天老祖 (Chih-sheng hsien-t'ien lao-tsu; OVERMYER 1976, p. 256). The Dō-in incorporates features of Taoism but is not Taoist as such. It is better understood as a syncretistic sect in the tradition of the Three-in-One cult of Lin Chao-en 林兆恩 (1517–1598), whose harmonization of the *san chiao* had parallels as early as the Sung Dynasty (860–1279). In one of its numerous and now defunct antecedents, a process of sectarian modernization took place, marked by a transition from *san chiao* to *wu chiao* 五教 (five religions). Little is known about this except that planchette revelations from Mohammed, Jehovah, and Jesus Christ began in the late nineteenth century to circulate in addition to others based on oracles from Confucius, Śākyamuni and Taoist divinities.¹² *Gokyō-dōgen* first appeared in this context, but

¹¹ Hirata's disciples, under whom Onisaburō studied, were of course as indebted as their master to his predecessor, Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 (1730–1801), who insisted that the "Way of the Gods" is superior to Confucianism, Buddhism and other teachings. The new translation by S. NISHIMURA (1987) of the *Uiyamabumi* うひ山ぶみ ("First Steps into the Mountains") is a major contribution to an understanding of this aspect of Norinaga's thought.

¹² Personal communication with D. Overmyer, 28 September 1987.

not as a developed theory of interreligious unity comparable to the Three-in-One doctrine. It is, on the contrary, a deduction based on the belief—often millenarian—that in this age of moral decline, the Venerable Patriarch—or Mother Goddess—instructed all gods, buddhas, bodhisattvas, saviors, prophets, saints, seers and other worthies who had appeared in earlier ages, to again descend to earth and reveal, through planchette oracles, the morality that would save mankind from destruction. The homogeneity of this morality is considered proof of the identity of the five religions. An extract from a contemporary Taiwanese planchette text will illustrate how Christianity reinforces or legitimizes virtues that are essentially Confucian. In an oracle from the founders of the five religions, Jehovah says: “The disciples of [Christianity] . . . take brotherly love as their basis. . . . Brotherly love is the same [as] Confucian benevolence. If brotherly love is combined with loyalty and filial piety, then the Dao can be achieved, and one can rise to heaven” (WELLER 1982, p. 473).¹³ Christian and Confucian virtues are here viewed as compatible because Jehovah, through the planchette, said they are—not because they were reflected upon theologically and found to be in harmony. The Bible itself is irrelevant to the question; the oracle has become a scripture and supercedes others. The validity of *gokyō-dōgen* thus depends on planchette divination as a new source of primordial truth, obscured by time but revealed as mankind’s last hope.¹⁴

A form of shamanic possession, the planchette divination ritual (called “phoenix worship” 拜鸞, *pai lüan*), originated in the Sung Dynasty and was practiced by common folk to communicate with immortals and deified culture heroes, by literati and officials to cheat on civil service examinations, and by opium addicts as a form of psycho-religious therapy. Oracle writing as a source of moral and religious instruction became prominent in the seventeenth century when sectarian societies used it to inculcate traditional values (JORDAN/OVERMYER 1986, pp. 36–88). Celestial beings

¹³ For a full translation of this text, see THOMPSON 1982. I have in my possession—and regret being unable to use—a collection of Dō-in planchette oracles entitled *Ta-tao chih pen wu-chiao l’ung-yuan* 大道之本五教同源 Taipei, 1982: Shih-chieh hung-wan-tzu hui.

¹⁴ Tan Chee-Beng’s study of unity cults in Malaysia and Singapore finds little evidence of systematic reflection on Islam and Christianity as religions but rather a veneration of Mohammed and Jesus Christ as saints (1985, pp. 70–71). Jordan and Overmyer say all syncretists they met in Taiwan were “impressively ignorant” of Islam and Christianity: references to them “seem important more as an assertion of supporting authority and cosmic inclusiveness than as a source of doctrinal or practical inspiration” (1986, p. 232). On Cao Dai, Hue-Tam Ho Tai says, “On the theological level, Christianity provided little more than a reinforcement for universally held beliefs” (1983, p. 83).

would transmit messages admonishing cult members to be good. In a more egalitarian idiom, the founders of the five religions now urge mankind to eradicate distinctions based on religion, sex and class for the sake of world peace and brotherhood (TAN 1985, p. 64). The most prevalent form of the ritual uses a “y”-shaped willow stick, from which a stylus is suspended, to write on a tray of sand. The individual holding the left side is the medium and the individual on the other side imitates his movements. When prayers and incantations invoking the presence of a deity put the medium into trance, an oracle is traced out in characters, recorded and interpreted. The unseen hand of the deity is said to produce the often eloquent, quasi-classical prose messages – not the medium, who may or may not be literate. As an intimate form of communion between the deity and the person it possesses, planchette divination is a fertile source of revelation constantly generating new scriptures and cults, each claiming supremacy over its predecessors.¹⁵

Ōmoto and the Dō-in

Ōmoto had already been officially suppressed once (1921) when its organizational ties with the Dō-in were cemented (1923), and the second Ōmoto “incident” (1935) would sever the relationship until it was renewed in the post-war era. In the context of the ever expanding Sino-Japanese imbroglio, the relationship was intrinsically precarious. Although Ōmoto had never been anarchic or violently millenarian, Nao’s apocalyptic oracles warning that Japan would be defeated in a coming world conflict had alarmed her followers and aroused the ire of the state whose competence she had impugned (NADOLSKI 1975; GARON 1986). In Taiwan, where oracles sometimes sanctioned sedition and insurrection, a 1908 blanket prohibition against the planchette did not prevent a bloody anti-Japanese uprising from breaking out in 1915 in a sectarian temple (JORDAN/OVERMYER 1986, pp. 33–34). Despite these risks, Ōmoto and the Dō-in became mutually dependent: Ōmoto needed to atone for its crime of *lèse majesté*, and the China connection offered an opportunity to express its support for the national policy of overseas expansion; the Dō-in desperately needed its Japan connection to insure its own survival in a time of colonial encroachment which witnessed the decline into oblivion of numerous other sectarian associations similar to itself. During the Sino-Japanese conflict, planchette divination was often used by subject peoples to express discontent and millenarian hopes. Oracles were not, however, intrinsic-

¹⁵ Personal communication with D. Overmyer, 28 September 1987.

ly anti-Japanese and, as often as not, offered ample scope for political manipulation by Japan. Indochinese planchette cults, in contrast to those of Taiwan, welcomed Japanese expansionism in Asia as a means to free the region from European colonial domination. In 1937–38, the Cao Dai, with which Ōmoto was formally affiliated from 1935 (see note 3), began receiving oracles saying that Hitler and Mussolini were Caodaists sent to earth to save Europe and that Japan would seize power from France and hand it back to the Vietnamese monarchy. The Cao Dai even went so far as to raise substantial funds for the Japanese war effort in China.¹⁶ One must be cognizant of this complex political stage on which their courtship was acted out, but if their affinity for each other had not been predominantly religious, they would have had no reason to reunite in radically different circumstances after the Pacific War ended.

According to denominational sources, Ōmoto first came into official contact with the Dō-in in 1923—one year after Onisaburō dictated the *bankyō-dōkon* chapter of the *Reikai monogatari*—when a delegation from China arrived in the aftermath of the Great Kantō Earthquake with timely humanitarian assistance and instructions, received by planchette, to explore the possibility of formal affiliation (HINO 1968, pp. 3–4). Other sources indicate that the visit, if not providential, had at least been arranged well in advance by several of Ōmoto's numerous sympathizers in China, including the Japanese consul at Nanking (ONNS, Vol. 1, pp. 702ff.).¹⁷ When the fact is also taken into account that Ōmoto had had liaison offices in Peking and Shanghai since 1921, it appears that each party had courted the other through intermediaries before the 1923 disaster offered an appropriate pretext for closer cooperation. In 1924 a Dō-in branch-temple was established in Kobe, followed by others in Ayabe and Kameoka, and in 1929 the Tokyo headquarters was inaugurated with festivities in which Onisaburō, dressed as a Dō-in planchette medium, was honored as the founder of the Kōmanji-kai in Japan. In 1925 in Peking, after Onisaburō's Manchuria debacle,¹⁸ He participated in a conference of the rather grandiloquently titled World Religious Federation 世界宗教連合会 (*Sekai-shūkyō-rengō-kai*), organized by the Dō-in at the head temple of the still-existing Wushan She 悟善社 (Association for Awakening

¹⁶ So far as I know, there is as yet no thorough study of the often contradictory Japanese policy toward Chinese and Indochinese planchette cults. For Vietnam, see the excellent study of TAI 1983, pp. 113–15, 126–28.

¹⁷ A Chinese diary of this visit, kept by the Dō-in delegation, is *Tung-yin pu-lao jih-chi tz'u-hsü* 東瀛布道日記次序 Taipei, 1966: Shih-chieh hung-wan-tzu hui.

¹⁸ The episode is thoroughly discussed in NADOLSKI 1975, pp. 123–131.

Righteousness; f. 1915), also called the Society of the Six Religions because it differentiated Judaism from Christianity (DOZ, Vol. 6, 259–261; KITAMURA 1925, pp. 71–81). Ōmoto and the Dō-in interacted far more extensively than what is adumbrated here might indicate, so much so that, as a planchette oracle put it, the Dō-in of China is the Ōmoto of Japan, and the Ōmoto of Japan is the Dō-in of China (HINO 1970, p. 5).

Onisaburō's personal experience of the planchette divination ritual, first as an observer in China and later as a participant in Japan, brings us closer to an understanding of *bankyō-dōkon* and *gokyō-dōgen* in Ōmoto and the Dō-in than a summary of their interreligious activities can. The key evidence is an undated speech by Onisaburō on planchette writing (DOZ, Vol. 6, 520–21),¹⁹ delivered at the Kobe Dō-in to a mixed Ōmoto and Dō-in audience, accompanied by an editor's postscript that describes the divination ceremony that followed in which the founder himself was the medium. Onisaburō used the occasion to emphasize the essential identity between Nao's experience of *kamigakari*, issuing in the revelations recorded in her *Ofudesaki*, and the planchette ritual in which a medium becomes the divine channel of oracular messages. Not only did Nao not have a formal education, she was absolutely illiterate and therefore her writing, he says, had to have been automatic 自動的 (*jidōteki*). If anyone doubts this, he suggests that the planchette ritual is empirical proof: the medium is like the conductor of an electric current. That is to say, the medium has no active, self-conscious function in the revelatory process. It may be the medium whose hands are seen on the divination stick, but the invisible hand of the deity is what causes the stylus to trace characters in the tray of sand.²⁰

A caveat is added to the effect that, even though Nao's automatic writing belongs to the past and cannot now be observed, the reliability of planchette divination is diminished by the possibility that the second individual, still in a profane state of consciousness, might interfere, accidentally or deliberately—a potential problem that in Nao's case would not have arisen. In the ritual that followed, Onisaburō went into trance and was first visited by the Bodhisattva Kannon. An unidentified deity then appeared, to whom he bowed reverently. In a subsequent message, the Venerable Patriarch explained that Onisaburō had been granted a vision of

¹⁹ Onisaburō indicated that he had first seen a planchette ritual in China, but did not specify when. At the earliest, the Kobe speech can be dated to 1925, by which time he had returned from Mongolia and Manchuria.

²⁰ For a typology of *fu-chi* mediums, see JORDAN/OVERMYER 1986, pp. 85–86, and for a description of how planchette writing is done, see TAN 1985, pp. 6–7.

the founder-deity of the nation, Ō-kuni-toko-tachi-no-mikoto (whom Onisaburō had earlier identified as the same Konjin who had possessed Nao and was now the focal point of “imperial” 皇道, *kōdō*, Ōmoto). In this very characteristic planchette seance, the finale itself has special significance: Ō-kuni-toko-tachi had not appeared alone, but accompanied by, in the first rank, the founders of the various world-religions, and, in others, by countless buddhas, bodhisattvas and other celestial beings. The truth of interreligious unity that Ōmoto finds in the *Ofudesaki* – which this research suggests must be reassessed – owes more to planchette rituals such as this one in Kobe and to others, undocumented, in China. The same Ōmoto sympathizers who brought the Dō-in to Onisaburō’s attention, cannot have failed to notice the similarity of this type of shamanic experience to Nao’s but having the additional advantage of the imprimatur of the founders of the five religions.

Okada Mokichi, founder of Sekai Kyūseikyō, was deeply influenced by a Dō-in planchette ritual that took place in 1930 at the Kōjimachi Ōmoto branch of which he was the director. After it ended, he received a large calligraphic sheet of the character for “purity,” which had been written in Ayabe “under the direction of the Venerable Sage-Founder” (ANON. 1983, pp. 131–32). The character 淨, which can be read *jō*, signified to him that he should initiate a movement of his own, and, as Jōrei 淨靈 (Purification of the Spirit), it is now used as the name of an offshoot of Sekai Kyūseikyō.

To rank religions is as characteristic of Ōmoto and the Dō-in as to insist on their intrinsic unity, though this is done in strikingly different ways. The Dō-in, like other Five-in-One cults, does it visually and symbolically. Practice varies from temple to temple, but a common pattern is to erect an altar with tablets in a three-tier pyramidal shape, the higher tablet representing the Venerable Patriarch, the middle the founders of the five religions, and the lower various other spiritual entities. Within the second tier a hierarchy is also apparent: the central position of Lao-tzu, flanked by Jesus Christ and the Prophet Mohammed on the less prestigious right and by Confucius and Śākyamuni on the more honored left, confirms his leading position among the five founders (cf. TAN 1985, p. 44; FRANCKE 1972, pp. 123–124). Insofar as I know, Ōmoto has never done this, although one of its offshoots, Ananaikyō, has. (At its main hall of worship, Ananaikyō gives recognition to five religions: Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism and Shinto.)

Rather, Ōmoto places itself at the head of other religions by propounding a theory of shamanic revelation derived from its experience of

planchette divination which had enabled it to understand more clearly the implications of Nao's *kamigakari*. Onisaburō himself did not explicitly elaborate such a theory,²¹ but some of his closest disciples did. *Ōmoto no Oshie*, a standard and often reprinted treatise of the Ōmoto doctrinal department, admits that other religions differ from or even contradict it. Ōmoto is cognizant of this but does not look for a deeper theological unity, a “discordant concord” as it were. The theory depends on the assumption – academically untenable – that the founder of each religion took a writing-brush in hand and, like Nao or the planchette medium, entered into trance and wrote down what the deity dictated.

Insofar as Ōmoto itself is concerned, to stress the written mode of revelation is indeed valid, and E. OOMS' study (1984, pp. 5–6) of Nao helps to explain why. In Japanese folk religion, the most authentic *kamigakari* is characterized by violent gestures and loud animal-like noises. Nao's experience, in which her self-control was totally abandoned, confirmed that she had “potential access to and control of sacred power.” However, this alone would indicate only the power of the controlling spirit but not hers. Only a return to normal behavior would be evidence of her power. Proof of this is seen in the fact that she began to write what the possessing deity said to her instead of bellowing out its pronouncements. This she did in a trance-like state in which she wrote automatically, with a sudden literacy she was not known to have previously had. As Ooms notes, “This shift from an oral to a written mode of communication or mediumship represents the successful culmination of Nao's efforts to control her wild states of *kamigakari*.”

Just as the oracle received by the medium can be distorted by the uninspired individual who holds the other end of the planchette rod, it is said that the revelations given to the founders of other religions can be – in fact have been – corrupted by their scribes and students who were not in a “sacred” state of mind. The difference between religions that concerns Ōmoto is therefore not one of dogma or faith but “authenticity,” and its ranking 差等 (*satō*) of religions depends on whether a scripture (the Bible, Koran, Kojiki, Lotus Sūtra, etc.) is a “direct” or “indirect” revelation. Other

²¹ The following extract is the clearest indication that Onisaburō ranked religions, but, like other passages, it does not specify what the rankings are: “The dwellers of the Kingdom of Heaven are grouped according to religions. For example, the Buddhists are in a Buddhist group, the Christians and Mohammedans likewise are in their respective groups, and so on. . . . In the Shintoist group, one must distinguish between the religions; they are not all equal in wise teaching, etc. Therefore from certain religions one can more easily rise into the higher Paradise than from other religions (RM, Vol. 22, 291–92)” (ANON. 1958, p. 3).

religions are subordinated in the Ōmoto hierarchy with a diplomatic ambiguity uncharacteristic of Chinese Three-in-One cults. While it is generally difficult to determine which religions it thinks are superior to others, Ōmoto is frank about its own position. The *Ofudesaki* and *Reikai monogatari* are more authentic and directly inspired than others because Nao and Onisaburō, being almost divine 神人合一の境にあって (*shinjin-gōitsu no sakai ni atte*), were worthier than others to be recipients of the primal 根本 (*konpon*) revelation (ANON. 1985, pp. 148–149).

The difference between Ōmoto and the Dō-in is at this point significant: the founders of other religions are less glorious than in the Dō-in where their prestige enhances planchette oracles. Insofar as Onisaburō was concerned, this was not originally the case: their appearance at the Kobe divination ritual confirmed his special status and Ōmoto is proud of this fact. What we find is that Ōmoto stresses its own centrality even more than the Dō-in emphasizes its. If *bankyō-dōkon* means that all religions were identical at their point of origin, it does not follow that in this moment of history they still are. Their errors, aberrations, and deviations, however, need not be rectified—they can just be overlooked and dismissed. The Three-in-One and Five-in-One cults appear to take the individual religions, of which they constitute unities, more seriously, if not theologically, than this.²²

The Mathematics of Bankyō-dōkon and Gokyō-dōgen

The permutations of *bankyō-dōkon* are manifold. Insofar as post-Onisaburō Ōmoto is concerned, the preceding observations are far from comprehensive. A fuller study would need to take into account the contribution of Deguchi Eiji 出口栄二 (b. 1919) to a more philosophically sophisticated version of *bankyō-dōkon* and also its utilization by Deguchi Kyōtarō 出口京太郎 (b. 1936) to promote an “internationalized” image of Ōmoto as an active unifier of other religions around the world. These trends are part of a conscious and deliberate process of self-universalization that began after Nao died. When Tenri and others denied the authenticity of her revelations, she consistently emphasized thereafter the particularity of Ōmoto vis-à-vis all other religions. Only in the context of its expansion

²² Ōmoto's claims seem less extraordinary if seen in the larger context of East Asian religious history. I am grateful to D. Overmyer for the observation that as early as the Warring States period (403–221 B.C.) the Taoists portrayed their texts as new revelations of ancient truths that were superior to the lesser or lower manifestations of the same truths in the teachings of their Confucian and Mohist rivals, even though they had appeared earlier.

into China, did Ōmoto undergo *shūsai*, of which it is now an agent. Indeed, the experience is not yet over: in 1972 the Hong Kong headquarters of the Dō-in was instructed by a planchette oracle to elevate Onisaburō to the status of a celestial immortal, and a tablet honoring him now stands on the left-hand altar, adjacent to the Venerable Patriarch, of the Ginza branch of the Nihon Kōmanji-kai, under which name the Dō-in was revived in 1962. Ōmoto believes this was done in recognition of his contribution from the astral world to the normalization of relations between China and Japan, a concern that he had since the aborted “peace” mission to Manchuria and Mongolia in 1924 (HINO 1972, pp. 1–2)²³ – a further indication that *tatenaoshi* in Ōmoto is essentially spiritual and politically conventional.²⁴ It might even be said that the Kōmanji-kai of Tokyo is the Ōmoto of Kameoka and Ayabe, and the Ōmoto of Kameoka and Ayabe is the Kōmanji-kai of Tokyo: membership in the Tokyo area overlaps; all eighty-one volumes of the *Reikai monogatari* are prominently displayed in the Ginza branch, and Ōmoto administrators in Kameoka are avid readers of the *Manji-gekkan* 卍字月刊, a monthly collection of planchette oracles published by Kōmanji-kai.²⁵

If the Dō-in and Ōmoto have a shared history, it is also true that *gokyō-dōgen* differs from *bankyō-dōkon*, for the transition from “five religions” to “all religions” is surely as significant as the change from the Three-in-One doctrine to the Five-in-One. The character *ban* 万 in the compound is obviously intended not to circumscribe a closed set of religions that can be numbered from 1 to 5. Rather it is open-ended in the cosmically inclusive sense of the indefinite word “myriad” by which it is sometimes translated. In the Chinese context, the limitations of *San chiao* had become apparent in the more complex religious texture of late nineteenth-century society: which religions could be factored into an equation of $1 + 1 + 1 = 3$? If the

²³ The two ornate and Taoistic Chinese titles bestowed on Onisaburō by the Hong Kong Red Swastika Society were *Ling-chi chen-jen* 靈續真人 (*Reiseki shinjin*) and *Chung-ho ch'eng-hua p'u-tu l'ien-tsun* 中和成化普渡天尊 (*Chūwa-jōkafuto tenson*).

²⁴ Further evidence that “world renewal” in the Ōmoto family of religions tends to be visionary, spiritual and irrelevant to ordinary political processes is found in the movement of Fujita Himiko (see note 8). According to her, Jehovah is Susa-no-ō, the banished brother of Amaterasu, and Allah is an *aramitama* 荒御靈 (rough, wild, angry or unpredictable spirit). The tensions of the Middle East are due, she says, to the wrath of these deities who must be pacified before the conflict can be resolved. Fujita, who has enshrined both Jehovah and Allah along with Ryūgū Otohime in her personal shrine in her Osaka apartment, conducts rituals on their behalf. A frequent traveler to Egypt and Israel, she attributes the normalization of relations between them to her intervention. See Shillony (1984).

²⁵ Based on personal observations of Ōmoto (Kameoka) and the Dō-in (Ginza branch), August and September, 1987.

traditional answer was Taoism, Confucianism and Buddhism, then what of Islam and Christianity? Even the higher number “5” was inadequate if Judaism was to be counted as a distinct religion, as it was by the Wushan She that Ōmoto had known in Peking in 1925. And what of the sect itself that comprises the unity of the other three or five? Is it to be numbered or not? And where Japan is concerned, what should be done with Shinto, which was never figured into the Chinese calculation at all?

If the reasons why Onisaburō rejected *gokyō-dōgen* in favor of *bankyō-dōkon* are largely undocumented, there is at least some evidence that he struggled with the mathematical dimension of the problem. Among the many refracted Shinto *kami* who appear on earth, the *Reikai monogatari* includes some who are — by an elastic definition of the term — founders of religions (Lao-tzu, Śākyamuni Buddha, and Jesus Christ) but also others who are not (Bodhidharma, Moses, Elijah, Jizō, Dainichi-nyorai). Either this means that Onisaburō’s factual knowledge of the history of religions was woefully inadequate, or it signifies that his earliest understanding of *bankyō-dōkon* was not as closely connected with so-called great, or world, religions as the usage of the term in Ōmoto nowadays would indicate. He did, however, later come to view other religions in a more formalized sense, tantamount to a closed set. Sometime before the second Ōmoto “incident,” he executed a series of ink drawings of the founders (historical and divine) of Shinto (Amaterasu), Taoism (Lao-tzu), Buddhism (Śākyamuni), Confucianism (Confucius), Islam (Mohammed), Christianity (Jesus Christ), and Ōmoto (Maitreya), which in an accompanying calligraphy is said to be the alpha and omega of religions. The *bankyō-dōkon* ink drawings include one of Mohammed, despite the antipathy of Muslims to pictorial representation of the Prophet. In the Chinese Five-in-One cults of Singapore and Malaysia, his presence on the altar is indicated by the Islamic symbol of a star and crescent moon and his name in Chinese, Malay, or English (TAN 1985, p. 8). The ink drawings can be viewed in the large upper hall of the main Ōmoto administrative building in Kameoka.²⁶ If Ōmoto designates itself the “seventh” religion, the fact has not come to my attention.

Other religions may have chronologically come into existence earlier than Ōmoto, but, if its truth is primordial, Ōmoto’s recent origin as an institution hardly matters. A certain number of other religions exist as historical phenomena, and Ōmoto is cognizant of them, regardless of how they are counted: three or five or more. From this perspective, “unity” is

²⁶ For a full description, see Itō 1984.

a “1”-ness beyond which there is nothing else to be numbered. There is, however, a double sense in which other religions “do not count,” for they have all failed in their divinely assigned tasks. The unity that Ōmoto sees is simply there; it needs only to be implemented symbolically by means of the interreligious rituals mentioned at the beginning of this study, which in recent years have also been performed in Katmandu in Nepal and Puliyankulam in Sri Lanka.

Until recent years, Hinduism was excluded from the five (or more) religions to which the unity cults attributed significance. Its absence might have been due to the historical association of Buddhism with India and to the negligible presence of Hindus in East Asia, but probably it has more to do with the absence of any easily identifiable founder who could be enshrined, revered, and invoked. However, in 1977 Ōmoto took the first step in rectifying this omission by conducting a ritual enshrinement of the Hindu deity, Śiva, along with Śākyamuni and Ōmoto-sume-ō-mikami at its Nepal branch of the Ōmoto Universal Love and Brotherhood Association in Katmandu. In the Sri Lankan village of Puliyankulam (Trincomalee District), Ōmoto began construction in 1984 of the Gokyō-dendō 五教殿堂 (Palace of the Five Religions), with an altar each for Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam and Christianity, which, as a whole, constitute the sanctuary of Ōmoto as the fifth, or universal religion. Although Ōmoto has not yet erected such a structure in Japan itself, Brazilian Ōmotoists constructed a temple to “all” religions as early as 1929.

Bankyō-dōkon and Other Japanese Religions

Zwi Werblowsky has observed, “The very fact that Ōmoto . . . has exhibited the capacity to be seminal and to generate other groups is itself a very important and fascinating fact that requires close analysis” (GILKEY 1981, p. 10). Even insofar as *bankyō-dōkon* or the complex of ideas associated with it is concerned, such a study would be a difficult undertaking. In one way or another, Ananaikyō, to which reference has already been made, Sekai-yūseikyō 世界救世教 (Church of World Messianity), and Sūkyō Mahikari 崇教真光 (the True-Light Supra-religious Organization), to mention only a few Ōmoto-derived world-renewal religions, have benefited from the creative impulses released by the encounter of Ōmoto with the Dō-in.

Dō-in influence, mediated through Ōmoto, is evident in the symbolic structure of the main worship hall of Ananaikyō in Shizuoka. The altar on the left is dedicated to sixty-four saints, including Moses, Jesus Christ, Śākyamuni, and Mohammed; another is dedicated to the five religions;

and the central altar is dedicated to the creator-deity. Sekai Kyūseikyō's Okada Mokichi 岡田茂吉 (1882–1955) subscribed to the same *shinpon-but-sujaku* theory, as did Onisaburō: “The Buddhas [are said to be] the original forms and the Shinto deities are merely their Japanese incarnations. However, on the basis of his divine revelations, Okada took the view that the gods are the original forms and that the Buddhas followed” (ANON. 1983, p. 223).

Until 1950, Okada regarded Kannon as the original ground of other deities, and envisioned that the return of this bodhisattva would herald a future unification of other religions:

The teachings of the Buddha,
Confucius, and Jesus, as well
Will finally
Be brought to life
By Kannon.

Kannon was later replaced by a more amorphous *bankyō-dōkon*-like notion of interreligious unity. Okada's official biography admits that his knowledge of Christianity and other religions was negligible (OKADA 1983, pp. 11, 164–165).

Of special interest is the Mahikari neologism *sūkyō* 崇教, “supra-religion,” coined by Okada Kotama 岡田光玉 (1901–1974), who “insisted that the Japanese word for religion (*shūkyō*) should not be used by his followers because of its associations with ‘secondary deities’ and established religions” (DAVIS 1980, p. 7). Okada may have been influenced by earlier discussions in Ōmoto circles on whether the Dō-in was a religion or a “supra-religion” 超宗教 (*chōshūkyō*; KITAMURA 1924, pp. 16–24). Ueshiba Morihei 植芝盛平 (1883–1969), founder of the quasi-religious martial arts cult called Aikidō and an intimate associate of Onisaburō, stated that “Aikidō is the religion that is not a religion; rather it perfects and completes all religions” (STEVENS 1987, p. 101).

But also beyond and entirely apart from this context, *bankyō-dōkon* (or its correlative, *bankyō-kiitsu* 万教歸一, the “unity of all religions”), is gradually becoming a common interreligious property to which Ōmoto no longer has an exclusive claim. I have noted its occurrence in denominational publications of religions as divergent from Ōmoto and from each other as Shintō Taikyō 神道大教 (ANON. 1964, p. 135)²⁷ and Risshō Kōsei-

²⁷ Shintō Taikyō was founded between 1884 and 1886 by Inaba Masakuni 稲葉正邦 (1834–1898) in the wake of the failure of the “Great Promulgation Campaign” 大教宣布運動 (*Taikyō senpu undō*) of 1870–1884, an early attempt to create State Shinto. See Hardacre 1986, p. 52.

kai 立正佼成会 (Society for Establishment of Righteousness and Personal Perfection through Fellowship; NIWANO 1978–1983; vol. 4, p. 419; vol. 5, p. 69; vol. 6, pp. 279, 319, 377, 381). Here indeed is evidence that Ōmoto has made a substantial contribution to the already rich stock of terminology that Japanese religions find useful in resolving the problems of diversity and unity, particularity and universality.

ABBREVIATIONS

- DOZ *Deguchi Onisaburō senshū* 出口王仁三郎選集 [Selected writings of Deguchi Onisaburō]. 8 volumes. Tokyo, 1934–35.
- ONNS *Ōmoto nanajūnen-shi* 大本七十年史 [The Ōmoto seventy-year history], 2 volumes. Kameoka, 1964: Ōmoto Nanajūnen-shi Hensankai.
- RM *Reikai monogatari* 靈界物語 [Stories from the astral world]. Kameoka, 1983 (reprint of the 1st edition, 1922): Ōmoto Kyōten-kankō-kai.

REFERENCES

- BASTIDE, Roger
1987 *The African Religions of Brazil: Toward a Sociology of the Interpenetration of Civilizations*. Helen Sebba, transl. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- BERLING, Judith A.
1980 *The Syncretic Religion of Lin Chao-en*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- DAVIS, Winston
1980 *Dojo: Magic and Exorcism in Modern Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- DEGUCHI Eiji 出口栄二, et. al.
1986 *Konkō to Ōmoto—Kyōten sono kokoro to yomikata* 金光と大本—教典その心と読み方 [Konkō and Ōmoto: Their scriptures, essence, and how to read them]. Tokyo: Ochanomizu Shobō.
- FRANCKE, Wolfgang
1972 Some remarks on the “three-in-one doctrine” and its manifestations in Singapore and Malaysia. *Oriens Extremus* 19:121–30.
- GARON, Sheldon M.
1986 State and religion in imperial Japan, 1912–1945. *Journal of*

Japanese Studies 12: 273–302.

GILKEY, William

1981 An interview with Zwi Werblowsky. *Ōmoto International*, October-December, 9–11.

GRAPARD, Allan G.

1984 Japan's ignored cultural revolution: The separation of Shinto and Buddhist divinities in Meiji (*shimbutsu bunri*) and a case study: Tōnomine. *History of Religions*, 23:240–65.

HARDACRE, Helen

1986 Creating State Shinto: The great promulgation campaign and the new religions. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 12:29–63.

HAROOTUNIAN, Harry

1982 Ideology as conflict. In *Conflict in Modern Japanese History*, Tetsuo Najita and J. Victor Koschmann, eds. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 25–61.

HINO, Iwao

1968 The universal flag fluttered: The Master's adventure in Mongolia. *Oomoto* 13/7–8:3–5; 13/11–12:4–7, 12.

1972 Vast strides made through Master Onisaburo's planning. *Oomoto* 15/1–2:2–6; 15/3–4:2–4; 15/5–6:2–3.

1974 *Ofudesaki: The Holy Scriptures of Oomoto*. Kameoka: Ōmoto.

IKEDA Akira 池田 昭 ed.

1982 *Ōmoto shiryō shūsei* 大本史料集成 [Collected historical materials on Ōmoto]. Tokyo: San'ichi Shobō.

IROKAWA, Daikichi

1985 *The culture of the Meiji Period*. Marius B. Jansen, ed. and transl. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

ITŌ Eizō 伊藤栄蔵

1984 *Bankyō-dōkon no fu* 万教同根の譜 [A *bankyō-dōkon* album]. *Ōmoto*, August, 24–27.

JORDAN, David K. and OVERMYER, Daniel L.

1986 *The Flying Phoenix: Aspects of Chinese Sectarianism in Taiwan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

KERR, Alex

1982–1983 Ōmoto and other religions. *Ōmoto International*, April–June (1982), 30–34; January–June (1983), 9–13.

KITAMURA Takamitsu 北村隆光

1924 Chōshūkyō no shinkō-dantai—Dō-in oyobi Kōmanji-kai to wa donna mono ka 超宗教の信仰団体—道院及び紅卍字会とはどんなものか [Supra-religious societies: What are the Dō-in and Kōmanji-kai?], *Kami no kuni*, June, 16–21.

1925 Sekai-shūkyō rengō-kai ni tsuite 世界宗教連合会に就いて [Concerning the Federation of World Religions]. *Kami no kuni*, March, 76–81.

MURAOKA, Tsunetsugu

1964 *Studies in Shinto Thought*. Delmer Brown and James T. Araki, ed. and transl. Tokyo: Ministry of Education.

NADOLSKI, Thomas Peter

1975 *The Socio-Political Background of the 1921 and 1935 Ōmoto Suppressions in Japan*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

NAKAMURA Tazuō 中村田鶴男

1932 Kokusai-shūkyō Ōmoto-kyō 国際宗教大本教 [Ōmoto, the international religion]. *Kami no kuni*, December, 44–49.

NISHIMURA, Sey

1987 First steps into the mountains: Motoori Norinaga's *Uiyamabumi*. *Monumenta Nipponica* 42:449–93.

NIWANO Nikkyō 庭野日敬

1978–1983 *Niwano Nikkyō hōwa-senshū* 庭野日敬法話選集 [selected sermons of Niwano Nikkyō]. Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha.

OLIVER, Victor L.

1976 *Caodai Spiritism: A Study of Religion in Vietnamese Society*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

OOMS, Emily Groszos

1984 *Deguchi Nao and Ōmoto-kyō: An Analysis of a Millenarian Cult in Meiji Japan*. M. A. dissertation, University of Chicago.

OUWEHAND, Cornelius

1964 *Namazu-e and Their Themes: An Interpretive Approach to Some Aspects of Japanese Folk Religion*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

OVERMYER, Daniel L.

1976 *Folk Buddhist Religion: Dissenting Sects in Late Traditional China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

PRUNNER, Gernot

1980 The new religions in Korean society. *Korea Journal* 20/2:4–15.

SHILLONY, Ben-Ami

1984 The princess of the dragon palace: A new Shinto sect is born. *Monumenta Nipponica* 39: 177–82.

STEVENS, John

1987 *Abundant Peace: The Biography of Morihei Ueshiba, Founder of Aikidō*. Boston and London: Shambhala.

STOESZ, Willis

1986 The universal attitude of Konkō Daijin. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 13:3–30.

TAI, Hue-Tam Ho

1983 *Millenarianism and Peasant Politics in Vietnam*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

TAN, Chee-Beng

1985 *The Development and Distribution of Dejiao Associations in Malaysia and Singapore: A Study on a Chinese Religious Organization*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

THOMPSON, Laurence

1982 The moving finger writes: A note on revelation and renewal in Chinese religion. *Journal of Chinese Religions* 10:92–147.

VARLEY, H. Paul, transl.

1980 *A Chronicle of Gods and Sovereigns: Jinnō Shōtōki of Kitabatake Chikafusa*. New York: Columbia University Press.

WELLER, Robert P.

1982 Sectarian religion and political action in China. *Modern China* 8:463–83.

ANONYMOUS

1925 *Oomoto, The New Spiritual Movement*. Ayabe: Oomoto Overseas Office.

1958 The fundamentals of the soul. *Oomoto* 3/4:2–3.

1964 *Shintō taikyō yōron* 神道大教要論 [The Shintō Taikyō compendium]. Tokyo: Meibunsha.

1977 *Cooperation between Religions: Symposium of November 8, 1977*. Kyoto: Kyoto Religion Council and the Oomoto Foundation.

1978 *Heiwa to itchi* 平和と一致 [Peace and cooperation]. Kameoka: Ōmoto-hombu kyōmu-kyoku.

- 1983 *The Light from the East: Okada Mokichi*. Atami: MOA Productions.
- 1984 *Johrei, Divine Light of Salvation: Okada Mokichi*. Kyoto: The Society of Johrei.
- 1985 *Ōmoto no oshie* 大本のおしえ [The teachings of Ōmoto]. Kameoka: Ōmoto-kyōgaku kensanjo.