

The Thought of Hiratsuka Raichō: Considering a Kinship of Buddhahood and Motherhood*

Mizutani Kana**

Translated by Joseph C. Williams***

Introduction

2018 was the sesquicentennial of the Meiji Restoration. After the Restoration, Japan modernized politically, economically, militarily, educationally, culturally, and in other various fields during the Meiji period (1868–1912)—which laid the foundation for the development of social movements during the Taishō (1912–1926) and Shōwa (1926–1989) periods, which of course included the women’s liberation movement. While some men were granted the right to vote in restricted elections on the basis of tax payments and other factors in 1889, universal suffrage for men was recognized only in 1925 when such restricted elections were abolished. Women remained disenfranchised for a long time, on the other hand, like foreigners (Taiwanese and Koreans) and the poor, and they were also disadvantaged in other ways; for example, under the Japanese household (*ie* 家) system, if they had a husband, they were denied their rights to make independent decisions about property, litigations, and labor.

Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう (born Hiratsuka Haru;1886–1971) was one

*Being a translation of “Hiratsuka Raichō no siso: Kensyo to Bosei tonokanren ni kansuru ittikousatsu”

**水谷 香奈, Visiting Researcher, The Institute of Oriental Studies, Toyo University

***Joseph C. Williams is a freelance translator-sinologist.

of the women activists who opposed this state of affairs by championing the enfranchisement of women and women's rights more broadly defined. "Raichō" (rock ptarmigan) was also a writer, and upon publishing the magazine *Seitō* 青鞜 (Bluestocking) in 1911, as an appeal for the true liberation of women, she included her relatively long article "In the Beginning Woman was the Sun" (hereafter "In the Beginning"). This article is still known today as a symbolic declaration of the liberation of women.

The context of Raichō's remarkable activities as a young woman was her interest and exploration of various religions and philosophies including Zen Buddhism, and this influence can be seen throughout her entire life as Raichō herself describes many times in her autobiography and her collected writings. In her autobiography, Raichō gives a relatively detailed description how she came to be enthusiastically inclined to Zen Buddhism. As many previous studies which have already discussed Raichō's interests in Zen or religion, I will focus here on those aspects of her life and writings which have previous not received much attention while considering this previous scholarship to first identify the circumstances of her involvement with Buddhism and her understanding of it.¹ I will then discuss the relationship between her *kenshō* experience at the age of twenty and the motherhood she advocated under the influence of Ellen Key (1849-1926), a Swedish intellectual and women's activist.

1. Murakami Senshō's Lecture

Raichō was born and raised in the Sanban-chō area of Kōjima-chi in Tokyo City, as the third daughter of Hiratsuka Sadajirō and his wife Tsuya. Her father, Hiratsuka Sadajirō, learned German at a foreign language school, had a successful career as a government official owing to his knowledge of foreign language and law, and eventually served as Deputy Director General

of the Board of Audit. Raichō's mother, Tsuya, was the daughter of a wealthy doctor of Chinese medicine who ran a shop in Hongō, and she was said to be a woman who served her husband well. Raichō recalled herself as having good grades in elementary school.

In 1898, Raichō began her studies at the all-girl high school of Ochanomizu attached to the Girls Normal School of Tokyo, but she recalled her opposition to “good wife and wise mother” education, school tradition which stressed women to learn not only academics but things like sewing and housework, and her father's reply of “that's not for girls” to her burning desire to climb Mount Fuji.² Raichō seems to have developed her identity in her adolescence, and as Mizuta points out, this was also the beginning of her feminism.³

Although the mid-teens are a period when girls are interested in romance, Raichō wrote of her recollection of herself at that time that, “I was a late bloomer and amazingly innocent about relations between the sexes.”⁴ Raichō read literary works, but was more interested in religious and philosophical writings, and she wrote the following of the distinguished scholar of Japanese Buddhist history Murakami Senshō 村上專精 (1851–1929):

It was probably when I was a fifth-year student when I sat next to the daughter of Professor Murakami Senshō, who was famous at that time as a scholar of Buddhism. This girl was rare amongst the students of Ochanomizu in that there was nothing pretentious about her in her ever modest and simple dress, so I became interested in going a lecture by Miss Murakami's father which I found out about in a newspaper or somewhere. This was still a time when schoolgirls didn't go to these kinds of lectures, so it took a lot of courage for me to go there by myself.

The venue was the Kinkikan Hall, in Kanda, and it was a memorial lecture commemorating some kind of centennial celebration for either

Venerable Shinran or Venerable Hōnen. This was my first opportunity to hear about Buddhism, and also my first experience of going to a lecture by myself. As I had never heard anything but the dry and insipid talk of schoolteachers, I was greatly impressed by this lecture and the atmosphere of the venue. I couldn't forget that Professor Murakami seemed just like an old farmer, and I had the impression, "What a nice and interesting father!"

After this, I took great pride in retelling Professor Murakami's lecture as part of my "Speech" lessons. [. . .] I think, looking back, that my impression of Professor Murakami's lecture was undoubtedly a favorable circumstance which brought me closer to such things as religion and philosophy.⁵

Previous scholarship has almost never discussed this account, perhaps because it is unclear. Still, this is the first time Raichō mentions Buddhism in her autobiography, and for her to say that this event sparked her interest in religion and philosophy shows how impactful this was for her.

If Raichō is remembering this correctly, she met Senshō's daughter during her fifth year at her all-girls school, so she would have attended this lecture in 1902. However, as 1901 would have marked well-defined anniversaries for Shinran or Hōnen, being the 690th and 740th anniversaries of their respective memorial services, some points of doubt remain concerning Raichō's recollection here.⁶ As for this lecture around the year 1902, the Yomiuri Shimbun newspaper of April 14, 1900, reported on a birthday celebration for Shakyamuni Buddha which was held on the 8th of April of that same year. At that time Senshō gave a lecture at the Kinkikan Hall on the "The Past and Future of Buddhism," and he is described as saying the follows:

Today we commemorate the birthday of the Shakyamuni Buddha, who passed into nirvana about 2,500 years ago. Asking why Buddhism continued to spread for this long, there are about five causes: the first is political change, the second is the progress of the human intellect, the third is the corruption of society, the fourth is the corruption of the Buddhist monastics who aided society, and the fifth is the appearance of great and heroic persons. He said that for these reasons, there are many examples of the ups and downs faced by Buddhism since the time of the Buddha, and speaking of our current situation, he said our country has now had unprecedented political reforms, that the advance of human intellect has seen steady progress, and that the corruption of society is almost unbearable . . . *Speaking of this abominable language of the giving and receiving of bribes and so on, he said the monks who should be remedying this corruption are secretly living wretched lives absorbed in increasing this corruption of society, and that people like Ishikawa Shuntai must be said to be the true driving force behind this, [. . .]* He spoke of the movement related to the Religions Bill . . . He scolded the utter corruption of the main branch of Shin Buddhism, which was equal to that of the other denominations, and he said that the remedy of this would have to be the responsibility of a great and heroic person who would eventually emerge from amidst the youth. . . . He said, however, that even from amongst the youth there might be those who, would get caught in the maelstrom of the superiors of the temple, and on the contrary only facilitate corruption, so actually the condition of the Buddhism of our country is one where all five of these causes are likewise present—therefore, he thinks the time is right for then for the emergence of a great and heroic person who will promote the Buddhism which we greatly revere.⁷

Senshō supported this reformist faction together with Inoue Enryō 井上 円了 (1858–1919) and Nanjō Bun'yū 南条文雄 (1849–1927), but it was Ishikawa Shuntai 石川舜台 (1841–1931) who had become a senior leader of the Otani branch, and responded on behalf of the denomination to Manshi and the reformists. Ishikawa publicly defended Buddhism to counter the growing influence of Christianity and the Religions Bill of 1899 which treated Buddhism and Christianity the same, but at the same time he internally adopted a crafty approach to the reform movement.⁸ Ishikawa ended a series of reformation initiatives in 1897, and waited for the reform movement to collapse on its own.⁹

Senshō's lecture was a critical discussion of the situation of the Otani branch and, "in order to promote the Buddhism of Shakyamuni we revere," he published his *Bukkyō tōitsuron: daiippen daikōron* 仏教統一論: 第一編大綱論 (On the Unification of Buddhism Part One: Outline) the next year in the April of 1901. However, Senshō also said that:

When we discuss Shakyamuni as a human being or discuss the "body of the Buddha," there is nothing other than this material Shakyamuni; and when we discuss the "buddhas of rewarded bodies," we must determine that in the end they are no more than abstract descriptions of the ideal realm. This determination will have the greatest influence on Mahayana Buddhism, for it seems that if we take Mahayana Buddhism as the teachings of Shakyamuni, then common sense would tell use that this is not the human being Shakyamuni.¹⁰

The "theory that Mahayana scriptures are not sermons of Buddha" (*Daijō hibussetsu ron* 大乘非仏説論) was strongly opposed by the Buddhist community at that time, and on October 25th of that same year Senshō was exiled from the monastic order of the Otani branch of Shin Buddhism (though he was later

reinstated).

Although it seems that Raichō had not attended this lecture on Buddha's birthday, it is possible that the content of the lecture she attended was similar. That Raichō did not specify the content of this lecture suggests that she possibly did not completely understand what Senshō was talking about as a teenage girl encountering Buddhism for the first time. Even so, it is fascinating that Raichō went against the conventions of her time, dissatisfied with the oppressive classes of her all-girls school and the conservative attitude of her father, to attend this lecture and be "greatly impressed by this lecture and the atmosphere of the venue." It is interesting to note that Senshō's main concerns were criticism of the existing religious orders and Buddhist unity, considering Raichō's later syncretic religious views.

2. Kenshō

After graduating from her all-girls school, Raichō went against the inclinations of her father that academics are not for women by enrolling in what is now Japan Women's University with the support of her other. Although Raichō enrolled as a student of home economics, it was philosophical thought which captured her attention, and in her first year she eagerly listened to the "practical ethics" lectures given by Naruse Jinzō 成瀬仁藏 (1858-1919), the president of her university. Naruse was a Christian minister who believed in a universal God who ruled all nations, people, and things, rather than only Christian nations, and these ideas resonated with Raichō as she listened to these lectures with great enthusiasm. However, while Raichō became interested in Spinoza, Eckhart, and German idealists such as Hegel, Naruse began to emphasize the practical, pragmatic, and positivistic, rather than the metaphysical to keep his student from dangerous ideas, and Raichō

lost her admiration for Naruse.

In that spring of 1905, Raichō was amazed when she read declaration by Tsunashima Ryōsen 綱島梁川 (1873–1907), whose writings she had long enjoyed, called *Yo ga kenshin no jikken* 予が見神の実験 (My Actual Experience of Seeing God).¹¹ Raichō hoped in the abstract that she could also experience the God which existed within her, and just then she happened upon her answer in the dorm room of her classmate Kimura Masako in a line of the book *Zenkai ichiran* 禪海一瀾 (A Surge in the Sea of Zen) by Imakita Kōsen 今北洪川 (1816–1892) (Wang Xue 王雪 2017): “The Great Way is sought within heart-mind, and cannot be sought outside of this. The marvelous functioning of our bodies and minds is our Great Way.”¹² Raichō stated, “I think what we call *ken* 見 (seeing) *shō* 性 ((our original Buddha-nature) is the same consciousness experience as Ryōsen’s *ken* 見 (seeing) *Shin* 神(God), there’s no difference,” and she went with Kimura to the Ryōbōan Hermitage in Nippori to study with Shaku Sōkatsu 釈宗活 (1870–1954). Sōkatsu was only in thirties, but having received *inka* seals of approval from his roshi Kōsen and Shaku Sōen 釈宗演 (1860–1919), he was already a well-known instructor of Zen. Raichō was permitted to have sanzen instruction from her first visit, and the first koan she was instructed to grapple with was, “What was your original face before even your parents had been born?”¹³ Raichō participated in the week-long sesshin which were held once a month, and she listened to Sōkatsu’s teishō with great enthusiasm. However, while a woman named Inoue Sakiko, who was a classmate of Raichō, had kenshō after just a week in her Zen practice with Nakahara Tōshū 中原鄧州 (Nantenbō 南天棒; 1839–1925), Raichō had not had kenshō even though she practiced Zen every morning before going to university. Having finally graduated from Japan Women’s University in 1906, Raichō began going to an English language school to improve her English, began attending classes on the Chinese classics at Nishogakusha to improve

her ability to read Zen texts, and was also taking work as a stenographer at this time to pay for her school expenses. Even though Raichō was very busy every day, she continued to diligently go to the zendo at the Ryōbōan Hermitage. Raichō said that her health improved and that she felt great as she continued to sit zazen: she never had headaches anymore; her sinuses were always clear; she could speak with greater ease; and, even when she only slept a few hours, she felt energetic and clearheaded.

As Raichō continued her practice of Zen, one day during sesshin she had a wonderful experience in which she suddenly began to cry during a group recitation of *Zazen wasan* 坐禪和讚 (A Japanese Language Anthem to Zazen) by Hakuin Ekaku 白隱慧鶴 (1686 –1769). Raichō had a great realization that same day while listening to Sōkatsu's teishō on the recorded sayings of Linji: Memories become a bit suspect after sixty years, but as I remember it now the bodies of a buddha are of three kinds—the dharmakaya, the rewarded bodies of a buddha, and the metamorphosed bodies of a buddha—yet these distinctions are only in name, and aren't things which are in themselves true. As for fundamental source of all buddhas, see that the here and now person listening to the dharma being taught, without form or identity, is this boundless true person who really exists. As long as one can see and ascertain this, whoever that person is, they will be no different from the Buddha. If this is so, this would mean then at all times everything the eye touches will be so and everywhere will be liberation.

Even now I can hear the perfect voice of Roshi saying, "Upon this red lump of flesh is a boundless true person always going out and coming in out of the face. Look! Look!" It was as though electricity were passing from the top of my head straight into my body and just at that moment I thought, "Got it!" I later heard the teishō on various Zen texts from many different instructors, but none has made as strong and lasting impression on me as Sōkatsu Roshi's

teishō on the recorded sayings of Linji, and I also remember a lot of the other things he said then—such as on Linji’s four measured selections—which are to taking away the person but not taking away borders, taking away borders but not taking away the person, taking away both person and borders, and taking away neither borders nor person.¹⁴

In Sōkatsu account here, Sōkatsu combined two passages of the *Linji lu* in his *teishō*, as Wang Xue indicates.¹⁵ Here are those two passages from the *Linji lu*:

①上堂。云、赤肉團上有一無位真人、常從汝等諸人面門出入。未證據者看看。

Ascending the hall [Linji] said, “Upon this red lump of flesh is a boundless true person always going and coming from the visages of all of you and everyone. To those who haven’t confirmed this—HAVE A LOOK!¹⁶

②爾要與祖佛不別、但莫外求。爾一念心上清淨光、是爾屋裏法身佛。爾一念心上無分別光、是爾屋裏報身佛。爾一念心上無差別光、是爾屋裏化身佛。此三種身、是爾即今日前聽法底人。

Should you desire to differ not from the progenitor Buddha, just don’t seek outwardly. The pure light upon the heart-mind in your single thought is the dharmakaya Buddha within your own abode. The indiscriminatory light upon the heart-mind in your single thought is the rewarded body of the Buddha within your own abode. The undifferentiating light upon the heart-mind in your single thought is the metamorphized body of the Buddha within your own abode.

These three kinds of bodies are the person listening to the dharma right now before your eyes.

此三種身是名言、亦是三種依。古人云、身依義立、土據體論。法性身、法性土、明知、是光影。大德、爾且識取弄光影底人、是諸佛之本源、一切處是道流歸舍處。

These three kinds of bodies are nominal language, three kinds of positions. A person of old said, “The bodies are established according to meaning, the lands are established according to fundamental substance.” The bodies of dharma nature, and the lands of dharma nature are, when clearly known, as lights and shadows. Venerables! You must discern the person manipulating the lights and shadows. This is the foundational source of all buddhas, and everywhere will be the place of coming home for friends of the path.¹⁷

Although we cannot reproduce the exact teishō which Raichō heard, the Zen practitioners of the Ryōbō Kyōkai Association transcribed the September 1921–July 1922 talks by Sōkatsu in the published *Rinzai roku kōwa* 臨濟錄講話 (*Linji lu Lectures*). We will now consider Sōkatsu interpretation of this text:

①Here *jōdō* 上堂 (ascending the hall) refers to ascending the Rinzai Hall 臨濟院 of Chinshū 鎮州, and the “red lump of flesh” in, *shaku nikudan jō ni ichi mui no shinnin ari* 赤肉団上に一無位の真人あり “Upon this red lump of flesh is a boundless true person” is [. . .] in other words, this is our respective five-shaku-long human bodies. . . and upon our physical bodies, and the *rokkon montō* 六根門頭 (vicinity of the gates of six senses), there is a boundless true person. These names called “bodhi,” “nirvana,” “worldling,” “sage”—all of them are something added later. Originally there weren’t such positions as the highest rank and the lowest rank. *This boundless true person—to say nothing of the thing*

itself, there's not even a chance that it has any such distinctions as that between man and woman, or that between court aristocratic family, the samurai family, and the heimin. In regard to this boundless true person— all are equally endowed, even Bumpkin Gonbe'e, and even Dilly-Dally Tarobe'e. The sixth progenitor, the great teacher Enō 慧能, called this the "true face." Uncovering this boundless true person is the aim of the initial step of Zen. The reason we sit zazen on our futon cushions is to thoroughly perceive this, yet we can't pursue this only theoretically or by hearsay. A boundless true person must be seen thoroughly, as thoroughly as the innate knowing of feeling that something is hot or cold.¹⁸

This "boundless true person" was a unique expression of Linji which is said to have the same meaning as Buddha-nature. Sōkatsu said the "boundless true person" (Buddha-nature) that manifests through the "red lump of flesh," or physical body, is without gender or class distinctions, and is possessed equally by everyone. He said that this is also called the "*honrai no menmoku*" 本来の面目 (face of original truth), and that before anything the practice of sitting in zazen is to thoroughly see this. I would say this must be the answer to the koan given to Raichō, "What was your original face before even your parents had been born?" Still, in Zen, there is no question that this is not something which can be explained or understood linguistically. The moment Raichō heard Sōkatsu's talk, it was as if there were as sudden outpouring of her accumulated daily Zen meditation by which she could immediately understand the meaning of these words.

We will now turn to the second passage of the Linji lu which Sōkatsu combined into the teishō Raichō heard in her account together with Sōkatsu's interpretation of it. While this first passage above concerns Linji's ideologically

distinct “boundless true person,” which is alluded to quite often in the academic literature, this second passage concerning the teaching of the three bodies of Buddha is comparatively almost never discussed. Still, this second passage was clearly connected to the above for Raichō:

② *Nanji*, *So Butsu to betsu narazaran koto o hōseba, tada soto ni motomuru nakare* 汝、祖仏と別ならざらんことを要せば、ただ外に求むる莫れ (Should you desire to differ not from the progenitor Buddha, just don't seek outwardly).. . . Here Rinzai again admonishes and cautions against seeking outside. When practitioners haven't yet obtained the view of a clear kenshō, it's inevitable that he or she will seek outwardly. In any case, if you don't introspect from within, I'll keep saying this.

When I say that Buddha-nature must be sought from within the heart-mind, I don't mean to say that this is something hidden particularly deep. This is no different from what is considered the defilement of unenlightenment, and the state of the worlding—all the regret, desire, hatred, and love of this person is still active and not separate from this one thought upon the heart-mind. The pure light of this single thought upon the heart-mind is the unborn and undying dharmakaya. . . .

This is called the “ahem,” and the “harrumph.” Upon this single thought of the heart-mind, regrets and desires are moving, and this one thought sends out its radiance, an indiscriminatory light, is the reward body of the Buddha within your own abode. And yet while this is said to be an indiscriminatory light, it is not like there is anything sparkling. Right within the midst of the differentiated, and the discriminated, even while things are being discriminated, this is not a through and through discrimination. . . .

This *mu shabetsu kō* 無差別光 (undifferentiating light) which Rinzai spoke of. This destroys differentiation, straitens the crooked, lowers the high, equalizes everything, and this is the undifferentiating. You are mistaken if you think this is mysterious. Just like people all have different features being the myriad people that they are, even though they are all humans born into the same world, the faces of everyone in the world will mix with light and shadow so that their visages will never be one in the same. That which they are in themselves, this is undifferentiating light. Furthermore, upon the heart-mind in a single thought of everyone is undifferentiating light which shines always day or night. This is the perfect center of *jōshosa chi* 成所作智 (wisdom which accomplishes all functioning). When differentiating wisdom is exhausted, undifferentiating light is gained. This is called the metamorphosed body of the Buddha within your own abode. . . .

Kore no sanshu no mi wa 此の三種の身は (These three kinds of bodies are)—the dharmakaya, the rewarded body, and the metamorphosed body—for the scripturalists these three bodies are differentiated, but in Zen these are used directly as one body at ease whether walking, standing, sitting, or lying down. This is why Rinzai said that these three bodies “are the person listening to the dharma right now before your eyes” (*kore nanji ga sokkon menzen chōbōtei no hito nari* 是れ爾が即今目前聽法底の人なり). He was speaking from his heart. Now, here is one speaking, and there is one listening. This person is only provisionally divided into three, and these three bodies are established here. The *shujin kō* 主人公 (main actor) is one person, but functions in three ways. . . .

Kore no sanshu no mi wa, kore myōgon, mata kore sanshu no e nari この三種の身は、これ名言、また是れ三種の依なり (These three kinds of

bodies are nominal language, three kinds of positions). That which are called the dharmakaya, the rewarded body, and the metamorphosed body are only nominal language, these only the written words and expressions which were later added by people. These *e* 依 (positions) are easy to understand by means of *e* 衣 (clothes).. . . What kimono will the *shujin kō*主人公 (main actor) wear? A black kimono? A white kimono? A red kimono? This kimono will be different according to the seasons of spring, summer, fall, and winter. To take an *e* 衣 (piece of clothing), that is to say something, this is really a provisional piece of clothing which isn't particularly necessary. . . .

The lands of dharma nature discussed are based on the dharmakaya, and Buddha-nature itself; these are *akiraka ni shin'nu, kore kōyō naru koro o* 明かに知んぬ、是れ光影なることを (when clearly known, lights and shadows). These are silhouettes of the original true mind and true nature. You must depart from these silhouettes and thoroughly ascertain your own true nature. . . .

The *shujin kō*主人公 (main actor) who manipulates the lights and shadows is none other than that which produces all buddhas, and the one who sees this clearly will have obtained the source of all buddha.¹⁹

This is an explanation of the three bodies of the Buddha from the standpoint of Zen. The scripturalists are those sects which are based on the words of the sutras and commentaries as opposed to the Zen school which takes as its slogan, "A separate tradition outside of scripture which is not established on writing."²⁰ Since Jingying Huiyuan 淨影慧遠 (523–592) of the Dilun school of China had organized the teachings of the sutras and commentaries on the bodies of the buddhas—and proposed the three-bodied classification of the dharmakaya, the rewarded bodies, and the responding

bodies—other various schools like the Tiantai, Sanlun, and Faxiang schools all promoted teachings of the three kinds of bodies which consider a buddha as possessing all of these three bodies in principle. The various definitions of the dharmakaya differed according to various teachers and texts, but in general it was taught to be the correct dharma—that is to say the correct teachings of Buddhism— which was represented as the body of a buddha. The rewarded bodies were taken to be the superior bodies which possessed such exalted characteristics as immense lifespan as the recompense of past practice. The responding bodies (metamorphosed bodies) were taken to be provisional bodies which appeared temporarily in response to the abilities of sentient beings to understand Buddhist teachings. According to this teaching of the three kinds of bodies, the historical Venerable Shakyamuni, who met the end of his lifespan by passing into nirvana, was explained to be a metamorphosed-bodied buddha.²¹

Linji said, however, that the buddhas represented by these three kinds of buddha bodies were inseparable from the daily wanderings of our minds. He said that they were exactly you yourselves now listening to this teaching here. As for these three kinds of buddha bodies, they are only linguistic distinctions as insubstantial as the clothes which a people wear. To separate from the shadows created by such language and thoroughly see one's true nature is the source of all buddhas, as this is the true nature and the main actor.

Sōkatsu's explanation of the words of Linji on the three bodies answered Raichō's desire, which she had sought for in Zen, to have the same experience as meeting God. The scripturalist understanding of the teaching of the three bodies has something in common with Raichō's theoretical understanding of God. Linji exemplified a Zen, on the other hand, which discovers, through the practice of zazen, the ultimate existence of Buddha in the ordinary mind of a living person. I think Raichō finally understood the true meaning of Zen at

that time, and it was just at that moment, on that day, that her desire to experience kenshō, and the koan which she had received from Sōkatsu, were resolved at once. For this reason, this was a particularly unforgettable day for Raichō, and this must be why she was able to recall everything she did and the details of this teishō on the *Linji lu* so vividly in her later years.

I should note that these passages about the “boundless true person” and are somewhat separated in both the *Linji lu*, and Sōkatsu’s *Rinzai roku kōwa* 臨濟錄講話 (*Linji lu* Lectures), the three kinds of bodies. Still, from reading Raichō’s autobiography, it seems that these were perhaps taught together that day. Raichō also mentions the *si liaojian* 四料揀 (four measured selections) in her autobiography, which are found in the *Linji lu*, and Sōkatsu’s published commentary on it, between the first and section passages above, so we can conclude that Raichō was able to remember with some degree of accuracy the contents of the teishō she heard when she experienced kenshō.

3. From Kenshō to a Syncretic Religious View

Raichō’s experience of kenshō engraved in her mind that there were no distinctions between men and women at the source of humanity, as Sōkatsu said. A part of Raichō’s spiritual journey was the “Shiobara Incident” of 1908, when she attempted to commit double suicide with a young literary enthusiast named Morita Sōhei.²² Raichō’s preposterous behavior was picked up by the press which featured her in jest as “Lady Zen.” A few years after this incident, the press asked Gotō Sōseki, a layperson of Ryōbōan Hermitage later known as Gotō Zuigan Rōshi, about Raichō’s Zen practice. Although his words were extremely harsh, Raichō had not been practicing for long, and he is said to have commented that her practice was a “kind of wild fox Zen.”²³ Still, Raichō seems to have had little regret for her behavior, and her confidence in her

true self which she gained from her experience of kenshō eventually led her to publish, in 1911, the inaugural issue of *Seitō*. Raichō appeals in her essay for this inaugural issue, “In the Beginning,” for the need to awaken to the *tensai* 天才 (naturally endowed person) and *shin no jiko* 真の自己 (true self) which are not distinguished as either woman or man.

I will omit the details of Raichō’s relationship to the ideology of Zen, which Sueki Fumihiko and others thoroughly describe in their studies, but I will say that Raichō was not merely temporarily interested in kenshō and the pursuit of the true self in her youth. Zen greatly impacted Raichō her entire life. We can see this in several of her written works which include her 1930 “On Immortality,”²⁴ her 1931 “On Zen Practice,”²⁵ her 1933 “Adjusting the Mind in the Morning and at Night,”²⁶ her 1935 “The Girlhood of a Mother Told to a Daughter,”²⁷ and her 1938 “On Sitting” and “On Walking.”²⁸ In “On Zen Practice,” in particular, Raichō reflected on the fact that, more than twenty years after her experience of kenshō, she had become negligent of her practice after awakening due her work and child rearing responsibilities. Still, she describes the significance of her Zen practice as follows:

Indeed, I myself have forgotten Zen for a long time, but I think I can say this. The vigorous Zen practice that I devoted my whole life to when I was a sincere and single-minded girl (and now I think that it was just because I was so young that I was able to do this), even if I’ve now forgotten it, it’s become a strong habit of my present life, or rather my whole life, which will never leave my body and mind. And now, I can’t help but think of it. . . .

If not for my sitting, my life would’ve withered away completely, and perhaps my strength would’ve worn away long ago as I suffocated in fixed ideas and conventions. It’s no exaggeration to say that today I have

a new and different mind from sitting zazen which has given my living nature and life hope, courage, confidence, and many poems. . . .

In the future the realities of life as a women will only become more complicated and distressing. I hope that you can become as determined as possible during your time as students when you might have a little more time, and that you will be able to gain a firm foundation on your inner lives which will enable you to cope well as women in this time of social upheaval.²⁹

In the fall of that year, the Manchurian Incident occurred, and Japan went straight into a dark period of war. As if foreseeing such a future, Raichō stated that young women needed a solid inner foundation to survive the turbulent times. Raichō's hopes were in vain. In reality, the means available to women to deal with society were extremely limited, and even Raichō herself rarely wrote after 1943. Still, in 1947 she wrote an article called "Know Yourself," for the magazine *Reijo kai* 令女界 (Girl's World), which thoroughly reiterated the importance of thorough self-exploration.³⁰ This essay begins, "My young friends, do you know yourselves?" This was Raichō's message to the young women who had to be the support and driving force of Japan's future. She uses very plain language in this message to reiterate that the true nature of humans is a "boundless life," which transcends the physical body, and has an existence which must be called spiritual or divine. She wrote, "My young friends, please know clearly that you are truly boundless life, that you are God. If you say that this isn't enough to convince you (which isn't unreasonable), then sit quietly, let your eyes sink deep into your heart, and inquire so very carefully: What are you? Where are you? What's your true body? You can even begin this today."³¹ Raichō describes one of the reasons for her conviction of this as her experience of kenshō in her youth:

When I was a student, even younger than you are, I sat in zazen for a good while after long anguishing over my faith. In Zen there's something called our "true selves before even our parents were born." This is said to be ourselves as a continuously living life, this is the self-awareness that we're God and Buddha in our fundamental human nature. The Japanese language anthem of the Zen teacher Hakuin says, "Sentient beings are fundamentally Buddha. Just as there's no ice apart from water, there's no Buddha apart from sentient beings. Sentient beings search for the far without knowing what is near, like crying of thirst when they're in the water." This is also the same truth expressed in familiar language.³²

From this we can see that Raichō understood "boundless life," and "ourselves as a continuously living life," which can also be called God, are the same as Linji's "boundless true person," her true self that she attained in her kenshō experience, and the true self.

Raichō also states that this true self is common to all religions including Buddhism, Christianity, and Shinto.

In the 1930s, Raichō became interested in the teachings of new religions like Oomoto and Seicho-No-Ie,³³ and it is possible that she was also greatly influenced by them. In the Oomoto scripture *Reikai monogatari* (Tales of the Spirit World), by Deguchi Onisaburo (1871–1948), there is incorporated not only Japanese mythology but also that of various religions and ideologies from around the world including Christianity, Confucianism, and Buddhism. Taniguchi Masaharu (1893–1985), who later established from Oomoto the independent Seicho-No-Ie, preached that all religions were derived from one God (truth), and that the essence of all religions was the same even though their teachings differed. Raichō agreed with Taniguchi's assertion writing, "That's exactly how I feel," and we can see that her sentiment on this never

changed after the war.³⁴

Still, based on such an understanding of the self, the divine, and Buddha, as well as her syncretic view of religion, Raichō wrote in response to the criticism of the Jodo Buddhist reformer Tomomatsu Entai (1895–1973) by the various Jodo sects, “Today we’re reminded of how oppressive and rusty the established Buddhist organizations are, and how they’ve forgotten the truth of the universe life force, which is the original liveliness of Buddhism.”³⁵ I have already written a paper on this topic, so I will not discuss this here.³⁶

Taking the above statements together, we find that, regardless of the criticism of Raichō’s kenshō, the root of all of her actions and beliefs here were undoubtedly rooted in her experience of kenshō. This was Raichō’s ideological underpinning, even in the latter half of her life when she settled on a syncretic view of religion which combined Buddhism with multiple other religions. We can say that this was also the legacy of a way of life which she could show to the next generation of women.

4. The Relationship of Kenshō to Motherhood

(1) Social and Fundamental Maternal Love

With that said, I think there is an extremely important issue in making sense of Raichō’s life which has not been sufficiently examined. This is the relationship between motherhood, as advocated in Ellen Key’s doctrine of motherhood, which Raichō seems to have devoted herself to in place of Zen—and which greatly influenced her women’s liberation movement—and the true self which she attained in her experience of kenshō. Raichō experienced the liberation of the true self through Zen, and expressed this in her “In the Beginning,” but Sueki points out that there is a duality in the contents of this expression.³⁷ Raichō indicates in the sentence, “I can’t bear to see the women

who thoughtlessly envy men, imitate men, and try to walk the same path that they do just a little bit slower,” from “In the Beginning,” that she was not simply seeking to attain the same lifestyle, and the same rights as those of men, but was also seeking an “awakening as a woman” which was different from that of men.³⁸ This is why Sueki is correct in saying: “There is a duality in Raichō’s way of thinking. First, she says that one must awaken to the ‘authentic person’ without the distinctions of gender, whether they are male or female. Yet secondly, there is another layer to her way of thinking where not only the ‘individual’ must awaken, but ‘females’ as a ‘gender’ must also awaken.”³⁹

However, women could not easily realize Raichō’s ideal in an era when they had to be both socially and mentally dependent on men for their survival. And so Raichō published her “The New Woman” critique a year after “In the Beginning” writing:

The new woman isn’t satisfied with the life of the kind of woman who is made ignorant, made a slave, made a piece of meat by male selfishness. The new woman seeks to destroy the old morality and laws created for male advantage. [. . .] The new woman doesn’t merely destroy the old morality and laws constructed out of male selfishness, but day by day attempts to create a new kingdom, where a new religion, a new morality, and new laws are carried out, based on the spiritual values and surpassing brilliance of the sun.⁴⁰

Raichō clearly rejected the ways of life bound by moral codes which enforced a one-sided subordination to men. We can see that this essay is not the mere presentation of ideals like “In the Beginning,” but broke new ground by expressing to women a concrete way of life.⁴¹ According to Raichō, the new

woman is not an antisocial or amoral being, but seeks for a new system of religion, morality, and law. Still, as for what this was exactly, “The new woman doesn’t yet know.”⁴²

For Raichō, this answer came in Ellen Key’s theories of love and ideology of motherhood. Key was a Swedish female philosopher, an intellectual who taught at Stockholm University. Although Key never married, from her considerations of the many problems caused by women becoming more like men with their increasing participation in society—which included marital discord, and child rearing issues—Key claimed that women became complete through motherhood, and that the freedom of women lies not merely in material conditions, but in the deep and free spiritual exchange between men and women. Key writes in her *Love and Marriage*: “That a man will only be able to find, win, and keep a single woman, a woman a single man. Then it may be that many human beings will experience through love’s selection what is even now the fortune of a few: the highest enhancement of their individual personality, their highest form of life as members of the race, and their highest perception of eternal life.”⁴³ This was not just a love of free volition, but a relationship in which a man and a woman would always respect each other spiritually and physically, and Key considered a love or a marriage incomplete if it would be based on convention, desire, or economic stability. Raichō, around this time in order to put this into practice, decided to marry without registration the artist Okumura Hiroshi. She did not dare to register her marriage because the Civil Code of that time established that a wife would be subordinate to her husband upon marriage.

Still, the truth is that a husband and a wife must both put in constant effort to maintain their loving relationship, and with the birth of a child, Raichō realized firsthand how difficult it is to balance work and family. This is one of the reasons why she resigned as the leader responsible for publishing *Seitō*,

and without sufficient income from Okumura, Raichō continued for many years to write contributions while doing housework, and set aside the money she made from her writing to pay for her living expenses. Raichō wrote:

When I didn't have children, I wasn't at all aware of motherhood. I thought that many women in this world called mothers had maternal love, and rather than that this was something respectable, something to be grateful for, I even thought that this was a foolish thing. Not only had I never thought of giving birth to a child and becoming such a mother, but this was one of the most terrifying things for me. I wanted to avoid this to the end, freely develop my individuality, and work to my fullest.⁴⁴

Raichō came to have the following feelings through her family life when her daughter's beloved kitten, which she adopted, died. We can see this is following passage, which I will call passage ③:

③I'm really not a motherhood type of woman in the usual sense. This is how I think, and this seems to be how others see me too. And yet, why is it that I immediately shed tears in spite of myself in the presence of the entirety of maternal love? Still, *it's just these tears which must be the purest and unadulterated something which flows naturally from the depths of my unconscious, the deepest part of my life.* After tens of millions of years of animal life and throughout the long centuries of human life, the maternal instinct, which has sustained, protected, and eternally extended life to this day, exists in all of the depth of the unconscious of all those of the sex called the "female sex." And I, as a human woman, also have this unyielding maternal instinct. Aren't these tears touching the naked expression of all the maternal instinct in the

world, which awakens a sympathetic resonance as fast as a bolt of lightning or a spark?

Or maybe, just maybe, the maternal instinct which exists in me is actually stronger or greater than I am aware. It may be that I love not only my two children, but all the children in the world, or rather that I vow to love and care for all living things. Still, my past education, male-centered social influences, and my current living environment have made me aware of this. And it may be that this calculating life of the intellect is adding an unforeseen oppression to my motherhood which I don't realize.⁴⁵

Although Raichō did not say so herself, the “vow to love and care for all living things” is the very essence of Buddhist compassion. Even though both men and women can be compassionate, we can see that Raichō used the word “motherhood” to emphasize the feminine aspect of compassion. In other words, this “motherhood” does not refer to the feelings of a mother with her particular child, but to the feeling of treating all living beings as if they were one's own child. This is probably the reason why Raichō said, “Maternal love today is moving away from the narrow instinctual love for one's child, which one has birthed and raised, to a social love which adds reason.”⁴⁶

While Key also acknowledges the contributions of men to the charitable enterprises of Christianity, she writes that, “This, however, does not alter the fact that ‘the milk of human kindness’ flows more richly in women than in the majority of men. This superiority is the natural result of motherliness, which has gradually been developed in the female sex into immediate feeling for all that is weak and in want of help, all that is budding and growing.”⁴⁷ Key states that motherhood is a feeling of caring not only for one's own child, but for all things. So, it is beneficial for woman to participate in public life the same as

men, as woman could contribute to society, in a different way than men, by making use of their maternal love.

As is part of the influence of Key's ideology, it is well known that Raichō engaged in the Motherhood Protection Debates with Yosano Akiko and others. Furthermore, Raichō said in the peace movement of her later years that, "Mothers are the vitality of peace. It's only natural that the mother, who gives birth and nurtures the human being, will draw firsthand from the fountain of God's life to forever sustain and develop human life, and will hate the mutual killing of humanity in war more than anything—indeed, keeping the flame of human life burning is the instinct of all mothers of the world."⁴⁸ This is also based of Key's ideology of motherhood which insisted that mothers must be at the center of the peace movement.

(2) The Hypothesis of Self-Emancipation = Motherhood

Incidentally, this raises a question for me: Is there any connection between the true self which Raichō discovered in her experience of kenshō and the motherhood which Ellen Key taught and which Raichō experienced herself through marriage and childing rearing?

In relation to this issue, Shimada Akiko explains of the Motherhood Protection Debates, which arose as the center of Raichō's thought, shifted from her conviction in the *tensai* 天才 (naturally endowed person) and *shin no jiko* 真の自己 (true self), which she gained from Zen, to motherhood, "We must say that there is 'not' any direct relation of Raichō's ideas in this debate to Buddhism. Still, her reverence for life, overflowing compassion, and her understanding of the role of the mother in the context of social expansion are fully in line with Mahayana Buddhist ideology."⁴⁹ In fact, as mentioned earlier, Raichō's perception of motherhood has commonalities with the compassion emphasized in Mahayana Buddhist. Still, as Shimada Akiko points out, it is also

true that there are few Buddhist expressions in Raichō's writings related to the Motherhood Protection Debates.

However, if the true self which Raichō became aware of in her experience of kenshō had been replaced by the motherhood advocated by Key, how can we explain Raichō's encouragement of young women to practice zazen-like mental focus and self-exploration in the post-war period? If there were two different principles of the fundamental selves in the depths of the mind, then one might experience a mental split when there would be the possibility of a mental split when becoming aware of them. As far as I can see, Raichō gives no clear answer to this question, but it is notable that Raichō said the following to the women who had achieved gender equality (if only partially) in the postwar system in her essay "Has My Dream Come True?":

Therefore, I eagerly feel that the need for all the Japanese women who've been liberated by the system to return to the outset of the women's movement in Japan, and become more clearly aware of their true nature and dignity as human beings, which was the starting point of the movement. The original self isn't a doll, a robot, or a female animal. *The real self is the dignified divinity that's infinite life and infinite capacity. Each of us women must know this truth through a search for the self.* The search for the divinity of the self may seem like a very difficult thing, but it's not. It isn't so difficult because it's just a matter of knowing again what you originally knew, but didn't know you knew. No matter how weak and foolish one looks now, *if one digs deeper straight into one's innermost mind, that person will surely discover God in the deepest level (the real existence of the God which is the source of the universe, and the divinity that's connected to it).* And to discover this is to become aware.⁵⁰

Raichō says here that when we encounter the self at the “deepest level” of the mind, we realize that the self is the “dignified divinity that is infinite life and infinite capacity.” This is based on her experience. We can consider her experience of Zen mediation in her twenties to be the basis of this. When we combine this with the passage ③ on maternal love above, we can hypothesize that Raichō understood the “true self,” which exists in the depth of the unconscious, to be recognized as “motherhood” for women: “It’s just these tears which must be the purest and unadulterated something which flows naturally from the depths of my unconscious, the deepest part of my life,” We can explain, from this hypothesis, that the motherhood which Raichō advocated was not the feelings which a mother had for her own children, but a fundamental characteristic of women which had a social aspect that, when expanded, would have commonalities to Buddhist compassion.

For now, there is no passage of writing which definitively proves this hypothesis, but one piece of supporting evidence is Raichō’s 1949 critical essay “Women These Days: Women’s Liberation and the Emancipation of the Female Self.”⁵¹ Raichō acknowledges in this essay that woman had, after the war, gained the freedom to work and live as they wished the same as men—and while she acknowledges that women had become both more practical, and intellectual—she still questioned whether this gave women the happiness of true freedom. She then recalls her own past as follows:

When I was young—that’s to say at the end of the Meiji period, around the time right before and after my graduating from Japan Women’s University—the most important and fundamental questions for us, even prior to the issues of marriage and employment, were the most important and unavoidably fundamental questions of, “What’s the self?” “What’s the Universe?” and “What’s God?” In other words, those things concerning our

worldview and view of life. This is why, I for example, put my whole life into grappling with these. If one doesn't understand these issues clearly, one won't understand how one should live and how things ought to be. Before anything else, these were something that had to be resolved in order to live. Still, many young people today are indifferent to such issues, or I should say that they seem to be.⁵²

What Raichō describes here is clearly her efforts as a young woman to search for the self through repeated Zen practice to gain the conviction that the true self is God and Buddha. She said of the experience she gained from this that, "To know oneself is to know everything: to know God; to know the world; and to know, simultaneously, the connection between God and human, between nature and human, and that between human and human, in order to emancipate the self."⁵³

Raichō continued, referring to the state of women in recent years, by stating that, while woman had made great progress by adding many scientific and theoretical elements, women were at the same time losing their virtues:

It's problematic that there has been a loss of what has been regarded as the strengths and unique characteristics of women. The functioning of wisdom, instinct, intuition, and so on—which senses the whole, the essence of things, without getting caught up in the parts—the instinct which takes refuge in the absolute, infinite, world; the quiet mind which enriches, softens, and melts everything; the deep and sincere passion—if such a noble and sensitive human function disappears from the hearts of women in the future it would be too sad and too great a loss.⁵⁴

Although Raichō does not use the word "motherhood" here, Key's

description of the qualities of woman that differentiate them from men in her *Love and Marriage* includes “deeper sensitiveness,” “richer tenderness,” “intuition,” and “synthesis.”⁵⁵ By exercising such feminine qualities, or femininity, women could serve an outstanding function in society different from that of men. We can see Raichō’s words are in line with Key’s philosophy. She also draws on the words of the *Laozi*: “Those who understand others are understanding, those who understand themselves are brilliant,” and concludes, “Let’s not lose the key to unlocking the world of life which we hold as women.”⁵⁶ It is hard to know what Raichō means by her abstract “the key to unlocking the world of life” which came from Key’s philosophy, but if we take it to indicate that women are beings with the power to give birth to life (by becoming mothers), then we can interpret this as referring to motherhood.

The following is the summary of Raichō’s arguments in her “Women These Days”:

- Women have lacked, in recent years, inquiry into the true self. Raichō grappled with this issue herself in her youth through Zen practice, and she was able to establish or emancipate her true self.

- With the postwar emancipation of women, women acquired the same logical, scientific, and practical tendencies as men. Although this was progress for women, with this also came an unfortunate loss of the unique strengths of women (femininity), and so we must not forget that women hold the “key to unlocking the world of life” (motherhood).

The fact that descriptions of the true self and femininity/motherhood appear together under the subtitle “Emancipation of the Female Self” suggests that Raichō did not distinguish between them. In other words, the

“emancipation of the self” that Raichō achieved in the self-inquiry of her Zen practice seems to have been something that could be demonstrated, in everyday life, as the femininity represented by motherhood. This is also related to the ideas of the women’s liberation movement as practiced by Raichō. In describing the difference between the social liberation of women and the emancipation of the female self, she concludes:

The Bluestocking movement wasn’t a movement for the sort of liberation of women which has been realized today, to some extent. Rather, it began as a movement for the emancipation of the female self. . . . Though we did think that we would advance socially from this beginning. Still, the women liberated after the war were diametrically opposed to this.⁵⁷

With this Raichō says again that her women’s liberation movement was not only concerned with the gain of social rights, but necessitated the emancipation of the self. In the context of all that came before, this meant that a women’s liberation movement which denied femininity and motherhood could not emancipate the true self of women or make women truly happy.

This was a continuation of the Motherhood Protection Controversy, mentioned earlier, which Raichō and Yosano Akiko argued over. Raichō’s position was somewhat idealistic, and Raichō herself stated that it would be difficult to realize without more respectful social security and support for women. Still, another more realistic perspective on Raichō’s critique of modernity, via the mystification of motherhood, would be that it ultimately failed due to the way the state and society at large made use of motherhood.⁵⁸

However, setting aside such pragmatic critiques, and examining the ideologically issues here—while previous research on Raichō has tended to view her ideas of the true self, which she derived from Buddhism, and

motherhood-ism, which she derived from the writing of Ellen Key, as being ideologically opposed, and representing different periods of Raichō's thought, with no direct connection between the two—I argue that Raichō had integrated these two concepts, in her mind, and in her later years she reconciled them in her ideology so that there was no contradiction between the two. Raichō strongly affirmed the importance of motherhood, not to rehash of Ellen Key's words, but to integrate the states of mind she experienced, through Zen practice, when she was a single woman with those she had upon becoming a mother who closely examining her feelings of maternal love. I think this is the originality of Raichō's thought.

Conclusion

I have focused my discussion in this paper on the relationship between Buddhism and Motherhood-ism in the ideology of Hiratsuka Raichō, with the first half concerned mostly with her acquaintance with Buddhism, and experience of kenshō, and the second half concerned with how this experience was the basis for her original thinking on religious syncretism and the relationship between the true self and motherhood.

Raichō was a woman of exceptional breadth and depth, and her collected writings include works written in a variety of styles, including literary criticism, women's rights advocacy, and fictional descriptions of daily life. Among Raichō's writings, those on politics and law are very logical, and her literary criticism in *Seitō* also include discerning commentary on the authors of, and characters which appear, in literary works; and from these writings, the only image of Raichō which lingers in my mind is that of the truly ideal woman of the modern women's liberation movement who did not rely on men or wavier in her views as a representative of the socially and spiritually

independent woman. Still, I think we should pay more attention to the fact that there are some very mystical, religious, and spiritual ideas and experiences which lie behind all of this, such as those that I discuss in this paper. I think these logical and mystical aspects of Raichō's thinking are an expression of the duality of rationality and mysticism in modernity, and are necessary to understand, not only in situating Raichō's role in the women's liberation movement, but also for a comprehensive understanding of Japanese literature of the Taiso and Shōwa periods. This understanding is particularly essential in interpreting the "true emancipation of women" which Raichō advocated her entire life.

Though the Buddhist, and particularly Zennist, influence on Raichō's thinking has been clear for some time, my main focus of this paper is to show that this influence was not at all short-lived, but was rather the core of Raichō's thinking her entire life, and was connected to her motherhood-ism. As is well-known, Buddhism has taught from the time of the Buddha that awakening was the same whether a man or women achieved it, and this was the source of Raichō's attainment of the state of mind in her Zen practice where she saw that the true self is neither man nor woman. When we examine the Buddhist view of women, we often find it adopts a view of equality between men and women. Nevertheless, women differ from men, not only in terms of biological sex, but also in that of sociological gender, and with the exception of some traditions such as Esoteric Buddhism, it seems quite doubtful that Buddhism recognized the gender differences of women. This may be due to the androcentric construction of traditional Buddhism, but it is quite interesting that Raichō's adoption of Key's ideology of motherhood can be seen as calling into question the relation of gender to Buddhism, which had not been adequately discussed in conventional Buddhism.

Also, while Ellen Key sought for a way of being a "new woman" in

Christian society, the young Raichō, who was also aware of Christianity, awoke to her true self by Zen practice. Raichō then developed a conception of motherhood which integrated Zen. Ultimately, Raichō conceptualized religion in an expansive way that does not entirely fit into a Buddhist framework, as her ideological background also included Shinto based new religions. We can also see here, in Raichō's willingness to adopt a plurality of both Eastern and Western ideologies, the flexibility of the Japanese, who accept diverse ideas and cultures and create something unique from them. I have focused in this essay on the Buddhist aspects of Raichō's thought, but I hope this will be a foundation for more multifaceted research.

References

- Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう. *Genshi josei wa taiyō de atta: Hiratsuka Raicho jiden* 元始女性は太陽であった: 平塚らいてう自伝. 3 vols. Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 1971.
- Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう. *Hiratsuka Raichō chosakushū* 平塚らいてう著作集. 8 vols. Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 1983-1984.
- Ide Fumiko 井出文子. *Hiratsuka Raichō: kindai to shinpi* 平塚らいてう: 近代と神秘. Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1987.
- Imakita Kōsen 今北洪川. *Kankyo Zenkai ichiran* 官許禅海一瀾. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Yamaguchi Prefecture: Abe Junsuke, 1876.
- Inagaki Masami 稲垣真美. *Kindaika ni tomonau kyōgaku rongi* 近代化にともなう教学論義. in *Bukkyō shisōshi 5: Bukkyō naibu ni okeru tairon nihon* 仏教思想史5: 仏教内部における対論・日本, by Tamura Enchō 田村円澄 and Tamura Yoshirō 田村芳朗. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1983.
- Kawaguchi Satsuki 川口さつき. "Shiobara jiken ni okeru Hiratsuka Haru (Raichō) no Zen no eikyō saikō" 塩原事件における平塚明(らいてう)の禅の影響再考 (Reconsidering the Influence of Hiratsuka Haru- Raicho's Practice of Zen on the Shiobara Incident)." *Hikaku Bunka Kenkyū*, no. 102 (2012): 11-24.
- Kawaguchi Satsuki 川口さつき. "Hiratsuka Raichō no josei kaihō shisō to jiga shugi: Kindai-teki jiga no tsuikyū to Zen" 平塚らいてうの女性解放思想と

- 自我主義: 近代的自我の追究と禪 (Hiratsuka Raichō's Feminism and Her Individualistic Beliefs: Pursuit of the Modern Self and Zen). *Hikaku Bunka Kenkyū*, no. 130 (2018): 93-106.
- Kawaguchi Tae 川口妙慧. "Hiratsuka Raichō to Zen to shugyō" 平塚らいてうと禪の修行. *Zen*, no. 41 (2013): 91-103.
- Key, Ellen. *Love and Marriage*. Translated by Arthur G. Chater. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.
- , *Ren'ai to kekkon* 恋愛と結婚. Translated by Onadera Makoto 小野寺信 and Onadera Yuriko 小野寺百合子. Shinhyōron, 1997.
- Kobayashi Tomie 小林登美枝. *Hiratsuka Raichō* 平塚らいてう. Tokyo: Shimizu Shoin, 1984.
- Mizuta Tamae 水田珠枝. "Hiratsuka Raichō no shinpishugi" 平塚らいてうの神秘主義. *Shisō* parts 1-2, no. 996-997 (2007).
- Mizutani Kana 水谷香奈. "Hiratsuka Raichō to Bukkyō: Jōdo mondai e no taiō to sono shisōteki haikai" 平塚らいてうと仏教: 浄土問題への対応とその思想的背景. *Indogaku Bukkyō gaku kenkyū* 67, no. 2 (2019): 633-639.
- Mohr, Michel. "Hiratsuka Raichō ga mita kindai no shūkyō to sono hyōka" 平塚らいてうが見た近代の宗教とその評価 (Modern Religions as Hiratsuka Raichō Saw and Evaluated Them). *Kindai Bukkyō* 近代仏教, no. 12 (2006): 20-38.
- Murakami Senshō 村上専精. *Bukkyō tōitsu ron* 佛教統一論. Edited by 太田善磨 Ōta Yoshimaro. Tokyo: Gunsho, 1997.
- Omi Toshihiro 碧海寿広. "Kindai Shinshū to Kirisutokyō: Chikazumi Jōkan no fukyō senryaku" 近代真宗とキリスト教: 近角常観の布教戦略 (Modern Shinshū and Christianity: The Missionary Strategy of Chikazumi Jōkan). *Shūkyō to Shakai*, no. 17 (2011): 17-30.
- Shaku Sōkatsu 釈宗活. *Rinzairoku kōwa* 臨濟録講話. Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1941.
- Shimada Akiko 島田燁子. *Hiratsuka Raichō no shisō to Bukkyō* 平塚らいてうの思想と仏教. Vol. 3, in *Gendai Nihon to Bukkyō* 現代日本と仏教, edited by Kobayashi Takasuke 小林孝輔 and Ikeda Eishun 池田英俊 et al., 225-241. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2000.
- Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士. "Josei no mezame to Zen: Hiratsuka Raichō" 女性の目覚めと禪: 平塚らいてう. *Fukujin*, no. 11 (2006).

Wakimoto Tsuneya 脇本平也. *Kiyosawa Manshi: Seishin shugi no Bukkyō kakushin*. Vol. 14, in *Jōdo Bukkyō no shisō: Kiyozawa Manshi, Yamazaki Ben'ei* 浄土仏教の思想: 清沢満之・山崎弁栄, edited by Yūichi Kajiyama 梶山雄一. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1992.

Wang Xue 王雪. "Shoki Hiratsuka Raichō no jōsei kaihō no shisō to Zen." In *Higashi Ajia no jōsei to Bukkyō to bungaku* 東アジアの女性と仏教と文学, by Zhang Longmei 張龍妹 and Komine Kazuaki 小峯和明. Tokyo: Bensei shuppan, 2017.

Zhenzhou Linji Huizhao chanshi yulu 鎮州臨濟慧照禪師語錄 (Jp. Chinshū Rinzai Eshō zenji goroku). T 1985.47.496b-506c.

Notes

- 1 Studies of Raichō's Zen include: (Inagaki Masami 稲垣眞美 1983); (Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 2006); (Kawaguchi Satsuki 川口さつき 2012); (Kawaguchi Tae 川口妙慧 2013); and (Wang Xue 王雪 2017). For studies which consider both the Buddhist and other philosophical and religious aspects of Raichō's thinking, I recommend: (Ide Fumiko 井手文子 1987); (Mohr 2006); and (Mizuta Tamae 水田珠枝 2007).
- 2 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1971, 96–100, 118–120)
- 3 (Mizuta Tamae 水田珠枝 2007, 6)
- 4 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1971, 128)
- 5 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1971, 130–131). Bracketed ellipses throughout this paper indicate omitted text.—Trans.
- 6 I did not locate a corresponding advertisement for the year 1902 in the databases of the *Asahi Shimbun*, *Mainichi Shimbun*, and *Yomiuri Shimbun* newspapers. However, I located 1889 advertisement in the *Yomiuri Shimbun* newspaper database for the eighth commemoration of the birthday of Shakyamuni Buddha sponsored by the Great Japan Buddhist Youth Association, to be held at the Kinkikan Hall. The program of the event gives the title of a lecture to be delivered by Murakami Senshō, so I think it is quite possible that Raichō had learned of Senshō's lecture from another advertisement; “'Kōkoku' Dai 8-kai Shakuson Gōtan'e Dai Enzetsu Kinkikan Dai Nihon Bukkyō Seinenkai” [広告] 第8

- 回釈尊降誕会大演説錦輝館大日本仏教青年会, *Yomidas rekishikan* ヨミダス歴史館, 1899.4.7, <https://database.yomiuri.co.jp>.
- 7 Shinshū Ōtani-ha no kōkotsu, dōshū Tōkyō Chūgaku kōchō, Murakami Senshō-shi ga Kinkikan no enzetsu ni tsuite kataru” 真宗大谷派の硬骨、同宗東京中学校長・村上專精師が錦輝館の演説について語る, *Yomidas rekishikan* ヨミダス歴史館, 1899.4.14, <https://database.yomiuri.co.jp>. The bracketed ellipsis indicates an omission; the italics were emphatic white side dots in original.
- 8 On the relationship between Shin Buddhism and Christianity at that time, including opposition to the Religions Bill, see: (Omi Toshihiro 碧海寿広 2011).
- 9 For more details on the reform movement of the Kiyozawa Manshi faction, see: (Wakimoto Tsuneya 脇本平也 1992, 103–117)
- 10 (Murakami Senshō 村上專精 1997, 174a)
- 11 Tsunashima had a background in literature, and was an apprentice of Tsubouchi Shōyō in his youth. He was also a Christian, but his mystical view of religion was strengthened after a bout of tuberculosis. *Yo ga kenshin no jikken* is a published essay of that experience.
- 12 大道求于心。勿求于外。我心躡之妙用。直我大道也。(Imakita Kōsen 今北洪川 1876)
- 13 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1971, 171–172)
- 14 (Wang Xue 王雪 2017, 295–297)
- 15 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1971, 186)
- 16 *Zhenzhou Linji Huizhao chanshi yulu* 鎮州臨濟慧照禪師語録, p. 496c.
- 17 *Zhenzhou Linji Huizhao chanshi yulu* 鎮州臨濟慧照禪師語録, p. 497b. Text is omitted between the two parts of section ②. English translation according to Sōkatsu’s interpretation.—Trans.
- 18 (Shaku Sōkatsu 釈宗活 1941, 124–125)
- 19 (Shaku Sōkatsu 釈宗活 1941, 171–176)
- 20 In addition to the Scripturalist sect, and the Dhyana sect, is the Vinaya sect based on the Vinaya Pitaka. This is a type of classification system of Chinese Buddhism.
- 21 This explanation is based on the *Jin’gang bore shu* 金剛般若疏 (Annotated

Dia mond Prajna Sutra), by the perfecter of the Sanlun structuralist teachings Jizang 吉藏 (549–623), which states: “The first are the dharmakaya buddhas. These are the bodies of the correct dharma. The second are the rewarded bodies of buddhas. These are cultivation of causes already completed in their fruition. The recompense to these causes which arise are called the rewarded bodies of buddhas. The third are the metamorphosed bodies of buddhas. This now is said to be that without actual proof and without actual explanation. Shakyamuni was a metamorphosed-bodied buddha, not a paragon of a buddha (rewarded body).

一者法身佛。即以正法爲身。二者報身佛。即是脩因已滿果起酬因名爲報佛。

三者化身佛。今言無有實證無有實說者。釋迦即是化身佛。非是真佛。 See *Jin'gang bore shu* 金剛般若疏 p. 107b.

- 22 For the relationship between Zen and the Shiobara Incident, see (Kawaguchi Satsuki 川口さつき 2012)
- 23 (Kawaguchi Tae 川口妙慧 2013, 97)
- 24 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 5, 245)
- 25 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 5, 274–276)
- 26 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 5, 346–348)
- 27 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 6, 18–34)
- 28 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 6, 273–274)
- 29 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 5, 274–276)
- 30 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 18–22)
- 31 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 20–21)
- 32 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 21)
- 33 For Raichō's relationship to the Oomoto religion, see (Ide Fumiko 井手文子 1987). We can see Raichō's interest in the Seicho-No-Ie religion and its idea of all religions uniting into one in her writings: (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 6, 118, 274)
- 34 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 6, 118)
- 35 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 6, 13)
- 36 (Mizutani Kana 水谷香奈 2019)
- 37 (Sueki Fumihiko 末本文美士 2006, 159–)

- 38 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 5, 24)
- 39 (Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 2006, 161)
- 40 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 5, 257-258). This English translation borrows from that of Sharon Sievers, *Flowers in Salt: The Beginnings of Feminist Consciousness in Modern Japan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983), p. 176—Trans.
- 41 (Ide Fumiko 井手文子 1987, 110)
- 42 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 5, 258)
- 43 (Key, Love and Marriage 1911, 168) (Key, Ren'ai to kekkon 恋愛と結婚 1997, 177).
- 44 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 6, 212)
- 45 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 5, 224-225, emphasis added)
- 46 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 6, 100)
- 47 (Key, Love and Marriage 1911, 262) (Key, Ren'ai to kekkon 恋愛と結婚 1997, 269)
- 48 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 212)
- 49 (Shimada Akiko 島田燐子 2000, 42-43)
- 50 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 42-43, emphasis added)
- 51 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 68-74)
- 52 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 71)
- 53 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 72)
- 54 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 72-73)
- 55 (Key, Love and Marriage 1911, 261-262) (Key, Ren'ai to kekkon 恋愛と結婚 1997, 268)
- 56 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 73)
- 57 (Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう 1983-1984, Vol. 7, 73-74)
- 58 (Mizuta Tamae 水田珠枝 2007, 143-144)