



## Book Reviews

Nakanishi Naoki 中西直樹

*Shokuminchi chōsen to nihon bukkō* 植民地朝鮮と日本仏教 (Colonial Korea and Japanese Buddhism).

Kyoto: San'insha, 2013. 308 pp.

The idea that Japanese Buddhist missionaries failed miserably in advancing their religion in colonial Korea because they were seen as wholesale collaborators with the Japanese government has been the accepted view of the history of Japanese Buddhism in colonial Korea. Along with their sectarian institutions, missionaries served as a faithful mouthpiece of the state's imperial ideology, and their missionary goals were primarily aimed at justifying Japan's colonial rule and Japanizing Korean Buddhism. The missionary work of modern Japanese Buddhists was not rooted in a Buddhist ideal that embraced Koreans and Korean Buddhists on an equal footing, and they failed to convince Koreans and even Korean Buddhists to join their tradition. As such, their religious activities in Korea, as in other Asian countries, stopped at merely chasing after Japanese expatriates.

While holding true in a general sense, this linear, top-down, and nation-centered narrative occludes more complex and even contradictory versions of the period. The works of NAKANO Kyōtoku (1976) and HAN Sokki (1988), two authorities on this subject, shaped and perpetuated the depiction of Japanese Buddhism as predatory and political, which leads to the conclusion that the institutions' missions in colonial Korea were fruitless and pointless. But since the early 1990s, Japanese scholars, led by KIBA Akeshi and KOJIMA Masaru (1992), FUJII Takeshi (1999), and SUEKI Fumihiko (2002), began questioning the guilt/hatred-based presentation of the history. They are joined by Korean scholars, represented by CHO Sōngt'aek (2002) and KIM Sanghyōn (2008), who likewise express the need to go beyond the pro-/anti-Japanese binary in describing Korean Buddhists' relationships with Japanese Buddhists. Scholars from both countries agree that a multi-dimensional approach elicits a distinctive Buddhist discourse. A number of influential articles and chapter-length works have since introduced alternative perspectives; Nakanishi Naoki's publication is the first book-length work on this topic.

In the preface, Nakanishi explains how this book is a natural product of a larger, collaborative research project. Since 2007, he has been involved in a project entitled "Studies of the History of Buddhist Foreign Missions," that collects and reprints archives on Japanese Buddhist foreign missions. This rigorous undertaking resulted

in publishing a collection of primary sources on Japanese Buddhist missions to Hawai'i (Nakanishi 2009) as well as a separate monograph a few years later (Idem 2012). Simultaneously, he and his team gathered and printed archives on Japanese Buddhist missions to Korea, culminating in the publication of seven volumes in 2013, which contain major articles, books, travelogues, and journals (Idem 2013). *Colonial Korea and Japanese Buddhism* is a result of his research on these materials.

The book comprises six chapters, in addition to an introduction and postscript. The first five chapters are chronologically structured and trace seven decades of Japanese Buddhist work in Korea from 1877 to 1945. Chapter Six, the core of the book, is a case study of the missionary Iwa Jōen (1874-1948) who, unlike other Buddhist missionaries, worked amicably with Koreans and Korean Buddhists. In the introduction, Nakanishi criticizes earlier scholarship for limiting its research to certain sects and sectarian-specific sources. He writes that his book seeks to provide a complete picture of Japanese Buddhist missionary history in Korea (9). In his careful analysis of this history, Nakanishi makes two major contributions: first, fleshing out inter-/intra-sectarian competition, tension, and interests (Chapters One through Five) and, second, introducing an exemplary Buddhist missionary, Iwa, who was "respectful to the traditional spiritual culture of Koreans" (14) (chapter six).

Chapter One discusses the background to the foreign missions of the Jōdo Shinshū's Ōtani branch, which set the standards for later Japanese Buddhist missionaries to Korea. In the early years of the Meiji period (1868-1912), this denomination was an underdog because it had stood against the military forces that toppled the bakufu regime and established the Meiji government. Thus when the Meiji government ordered the Ōtani branch to undertake the mission to Hokkaidō in 1873 so as to develop and civilize the land, the Ōtani willingly complied, pouring a tremendous amount of human and material resources into the enterprise despite their limited finances. The Meiji government also harnessed the denomination's institutional resources by asking it to send missionaries to China and Korea, which materialized in 1871 and 1877, respectively. In addition, the government expected the missionaries to serve as spies. Other Buddhist sects that had also experienced short-lived oppression in the early Meiji were likewise eager to restore their good graces by fulfilling the state's requests.

However, the Ōtani branch's cooperation with the government stood out especially in Korea, where it was assigned to turn reform-minded Koreans into pro-Japanese. This task carried risk in that when the political situation in Korea turned against Japan, the Ōtani missions were directly affected. When a leading Korean reform group that the Ōtani branch supported failed in a coup in 1884, the denomination had to withdraw its mission posts. Nakanishi adds an additional layer of complexity to this narrative by detailing the infighting between two factions in the Ōtani, each led by Ishikawa Shuntai (1842-1931) and Atsumi Kaien (1840-

1906). Ishikawa believed that foreign missions would expand the denomination's influence abroad, while Atsumi wished to prioritize sectarian projects domestically. The differing visions and other discrepancies between the two leaders threw the sect into chaos, hindering its missionary enterprise in Korea and China.

Chapter Two details similar intra-sectarian tension in the missions of the Nichiren sect, which had succeeded the Ōtani as the dominant sect in Korea in the mid-1890s. While the Nichiren sect commenced sending missions to Korea, the sect was undertaking a painful centralization process. Reform-minded priests designated the Kūonji temple as the great head temple, tried to remove the head temple status of more than forty other temples, and attempted to re-designate them as branch temples of Kūonji. This move backfired, and tension brewed between those for and against the Great Head Temple system (*daihonzan seido* 大本山制度). Meanwhile, the Nichiren priest Sano Zenrei (1864-1917), who supported this system, went to Korea as a missionary. There, he successfully convinced the Korean court and officials to lift a centuries'-old anti-Buddhist policy that prohibited Korean monastics from entering the gates to the capital city of Seoul. Emboldened, he attempted to bring Korean Buddhism in its entirety under the umbrella of his sect. However, the opposing camp in his own sect, composed mostly of those against the Great Head Temple system, quickly censured him of misrepresenting the sect and obstructed his efforts. Even though Nakanishi draws out how such intra-sectarian tension impacted the Nichiren sect's aspirations in Korea, he nonetheless reemphasizes the political dimension in his analysis, concluding that the Nichiren sect failed in its mission because it primarily acted as an advance guard for Japanizing Korean Buddhism, as had the Ōtani branch before it (98). Like the Ōtani branch, the Nichiren sect's influence in Korea waned once Japan's political clout weakened as Russia advanced in the late 1890s.

Chapter Three covers the missionary efforts of other major sects, including the Jōdo sect, the Honganji branch of Jōdo Shinshū, and the Sōtō sect, from the Sino-Japanese War in 1894-5 to Japan's annexation of Korea in 1910. In this chapter, Nakanishi points to divergent intentions and expectations between colonial authorities and Japanese sects. As before, the sects entered Korea in tandem with Japanese colonial expansion. When more Japanese expatriates settled in Korea's cities after Japan's victory, Buddhist missionaries established preaching halls and temples throughout the country. The rate of temple-building increased after Japan made Korea a protectorate in 1905 and annexed it in 1910. These fifteen years contain the most fascinating events between Japanese and Korean Buddhists. Japanese Buddhist missionaries competed among each other to take over Korean Buddhism, while Korean Buddhists, desperate to ensure their temple properties and personal safety in the face of attacks and extortion from various parties (including even Koreans), turned to Japanese Buddhist sects for protection. Koreans who

became disadvantaged as a result of disintegration of the Chosŏn state also allied themselves with Japanese Buddhist sects, in particular the Jōdo sect. As Nakanishi points out, the Jōdo sect often acted on its own regarding its interactions with Koreans, thereby causing headaches for the Japanese and Korean authorities. Other Japanese sects' aggressive moves to bring Korean temples under their control climaxed in the Sōtō sect's alliance with the Korean Buddhism's primary institution, the Wŏnjong. This strategic alliance outraged other sects and irritated the colonial government. This dynamic relationship between Korean and Japanese Buddhists ended when the colonial government promulgated the Temple Ordinance of 1911, which allowed Korean Buddhism to govern itself autonomously under the auspices of the colonial government directly. As a result, Koreans and Korean Buddhists left Japanese sects in droves, as quickly as they had joined. Japanese Buddhist sects acquiesced to the colonial government's orders and over the next ten years, Japanese and Korean Buddhism coexisted without much institutional contact, until the 1919 March First Independence Movement shattered the colonial authority's confidence that it could rule Korea effectively on its own.

In the wake of the Independence Movement, the colonial government turned to Japanese Buddhism again for help. This time, however, they circumvented the priests and engaged the efforts of Japanese lay Buddhists. In Chapter Four, Nakanishi turns his attention to how Japanese lay Buddhists operated in colonial Korea. A number of Japanese lay Buddhists, with support of the Governor-General Saitō Makoto (1858-1936), founded the Association of Korean Buddhism (*Chōsen Bukkyōdan*) to build a bridge between Japanese and Korean Buddhism. Under the banner "Harmony of Japanese and Koreans (*naisen yūwa*)," the Association developed programs, publications, street propagation, and lecture series. The Association encouraged Buddhist leaders of both countries to work together to bring peace to the country and to deter Christianity's spreading influence. This effort peaked in an international conference in 1929 that brought together Buddhist leaders from Japan and Korea in the space of a colonial government building. Yet, this lay organization and the conference organizers, politically motivated from the start, continued to exhibit a supercessionistic attitude towards Korean Buddhists. Korean Buddhist monastics, for their part, were ambivalent about the lay organization in general and the conference in particular. The conference was unproductive.

A series of interconnected events, including Japan's invasion of Manchuria in 1931, the establishment of Manchukuo in 1932, a global recession in early 1930s, and the Second Sino-Japanese war in 1937, prompted the colonial authorities to turn to Japanese and Korean Buddhist communities to support the government's economic, spiritual, and military mobilization drives. The Ōtani branch returned to the scene leading the way on these movements. This time, the colonial government

awarded the Ōtani a gift. For tighter control over the populace, the colonial government cracked down on pseudo-religions: it forced the 5,000 member Mit'agyo religion (originally Suun'gyo) to merge with the Ōtani branch in 1936. The denomination was jubilant and bragged that the takeover was the largest success of Japanese Buddhist missions in Korea. Nakanishi details the mobilization drives of the 1930s in chapter five of this book. He considers this case as further evidence that Japanese Buddhist missions failed due to their dependence on the state and lack of an authentic missionary spirit, as seen in Christian mission of the time.

In the following chapter Nakanishi introduces the Honganji branch missionary Iwa Jōen, whom he views as the kind of Buddhist missionary that could have found success in missionizing Japanese Buddhism to Korea, and had others follow his example. Iwa was critical of the ways in which Japan used Buddhism as a political tool and believed that Japanese sects' condescension led to their ineffectual missionary efforts. At the start of his career, Iwa moved into a Korean monastery and learned Korean Buddhism, culture, and language, wore Korean clothes and lived among Koreans. More importantly, he became a disciple of the prominent Korean master Pak Manha, and traveled with him around the country, befriending Korean monks. Recognizing Iwa's accomplishments, the Honganji administration assigned him to direct the Great Saint Church (Daijō Kyōkai), the Honganji branch's missionary establishment in Seoul. Iwa endeavored to run the church independent of his denomination, and he accomplished this by appointing Koreans to leadership positions and offering talks to Japanese and Korean Buddhists in both languages. At its peak in 1909, the church had seven thousand members, of which a significant number were Korean. However, after Japan's colonization of Korea, many members left, and Iwa stepped down from his position in 1912. Nakanishi attributes Iwa's resignation to his frustrations with the Japanese colonial government's interference and his sect's policies that towed the line of the colonial government. For example, to ingratiate itself with authorities, the Honganji branch used the church as a forum to spread the justifications for Japan's colonial rule over Korea. In this milieu, there was no space for Iwa who, as Nakanishi argues, "had neither any sense of superiority about the current status of Japanese Buddhism nor any intention to impose it [on Koreans]" (276). Nakanishi lionizes Iwa as a rare but convincing case that, "Among the Japanese Buddhists who were engaged in missions in Korea, there existed one who strove to form a true kinship with Koreans and exerted to put it into practice" (296). In contrast to his admiration for Iwa, Nakanishi concludes that Japanese Buddhist missionaries did not meet their own expectations in their missions to Korea due to their "un-Buddhistic" thought, words, and behaviors (*ibid.*).

Throughout the book, Nakanishi uses untapped primary sources to provide anecdotes that successfully bring more dimensions into the highly politicized narratives about the history of Japanese Buddhist missions. Revealing the

inter-/intra-sectarian dynamics and the case of Iwa significantly advances the understanding of this period and compels scholars to give equal attention to the Buddhist discourse operating in parallel to the political discourse. That being said, I would like to provide three observations that can further future writing on this period.

First is the usage of primary sources, which has been problematic in most other works and remains an issue for Nakanishi's book. As the book is primarily based on Japanese-language materials, it excludes the perspective of Koreans who wrote predominantly in their mother language. The lopsided usage of archives inevitably mutes the responses of Koreans and Korean Buddhists, thereby diminishing their agency. When both Korean and Japanese sources are integrated into the narratives of the dual history, then a fuller picture emerges. Modern Japanese Buddhism cannot be adequately understood without including the responses and initiatives of Korean Buddhism; likewise, Korean Buddhism cannot be understood without including Japanese Buddhism.

Second, Nakanishi's conclusions as to the reasons why Japanese Buddhist missions to Korea failed can be further complicated. He ascribes this failure mainly to the sects' supercessionistic, colonial, sectarian, and ethnocentric approach. His somewhat idealized characterization of Japanese Buddhist missionaries as colonialists and, by contrast, of Iwa as a bona fide Buddhist missionary might cause one to overlook considering where Japanese figures were placed on the spectrum between these opposites. Even Iwa himself falls in between. No matter how pure Iwa's intentions may have been, he was not free from the colonial context, and could not avoid, in his interactions with Koreans, unequal power dynamics. Although not discussed in this book, Iwa persuaded his Korean master Pak Manha and other Korean monks to be re-ordained in the Honganji temple in 1911. As such, Iwa was also sectarian and colonialist; but at the same time, he was a well-intended Buddhist missionary in his own right. Many other Japanese Buddhist missionaries and leaders fell into this "both/and" category. For examples, Shaku Unshō (1827-1909) from the Shingon sect was disillusioned with new Japanese Buddhists in Japan and envisioned the establishment of an ideal monastic community in Korea; the Sōtō sect missionary Takeda Hanshi (1863-1911) worked with Korean Buddhist leaders to create a semi-independent Korean Buddhist institution; the Rinzai sect's lay Buddhist leader Abe Mitsuie (1862-1936) helped many Koreans, including Korean Buddhists; the Rinzai sect missionary Gotō Zuigan (1879-1965) opened his Rinzai branch temple to Koreans; and finally, the Sōtō priest Sōma Shōei (1904-1971) practiced at Korean monasteries under the guidance of Korean masters for several years in the late 1920s to early 1930s. These figures worked directly and indirectly with and were sponsored by the colonial authorities even as they formed amicable friendships with Korean Buddhists.

Lastly, the modern concept of Buddhist foreign missions bears examination. In the late nineteenth century, traditional Buddhist nomenclature, such as *fukyō*, *kaikyō*, *senkyō*, and *dendō*, adapted new ideological connotations in response to internal and external forces. Faced with the encroachment of Christianity in Japan and other Asian countries, Japanese Buddhists developed the belief that their religion had always been a missionary religion (an interpretation created by European Orientalist scholarship), as well as the confidence that they could be as successful as Christian missionaries in foreign missions. However, as Nakanishi corroborates, as much as Japanese Buddhist missionary work to Korea and other Asian countries was unsuccessful, it was also unsuccessful in America, where Japanese Buddhists, as in Korea, mainly pursued Japanese immigrants. Thus, whether the setting was colonial and non-colonial does not seem to be a decisive factor in the failure of Japanese Buddhist missions. This is further evidence that one needs to go beyond employing a political discourse in interpreting the history of the mission.

Nakanishi's book is the most up-to-date work on the topic in Japanese-language scholarship. It makes a significant contribution to existing scholarship by further illuminating the complex history of Japanese Buddhist foreign missions. An essential resource, scholars will continue to draw on Nakanishi's research as they revise the history of this fascinating time.

### References

- Cho Sōngt'aek 조성택. 2006. "Kūndae Pulgyohak kwa Han'guk kūndae Pulgyo 근대 불교학과 한국근대불교." *Minjok munhwa yōn'gu* 민족문화연구 45: 77-108.
- Han Sokki 韓哲曦. 1988. *Nihon no Chōsen shihai to shūkyō seisaku* 日本の朝鮮支配と宗教政策. Tokyo: Miraisha.
- Fujii Takeshi 藤井健志. 1999. "Senzen ni okeru bukkyō no higashi ajia fukyō: Kenkyūshi no sai kentō 戦前における仏教の東アジア布教—研究史の再検討." *Kindai bukkyō* 近代仏教 6: 8-22.
- Kiba Akeshi 木場明志 and Kojima Masaru 小島勝. 1991. *Ajia no kaikyō to kyōiku* アジアの開教と教育. Kyoto: Ryūkoku Daigaku Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyūjō.
- Kim Sanghyōn 김상현. 2008. "Han'guk kūndaesa ūi chōn'gae wa Pulgyo 한국근대사의 전개와 불교." In: *Han-Chung-Il samguk ūi kūndaehwa wa Pulgyo* 한중일 삼국의 근대화와 불교. Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo.
- Nakanishi Naoki 中西直樹. 2009. "Kaisetsu 解説." *Bukkyō kaigai kaikyōshi shiryō shūsei: Hokubei hen* 仏教海外開教史資料集成・北米編, vol. 6. Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan.
- . 2012. *Bukkyō kaigai kaikyōshi no kenkyū* 仏教海外開教史の研究. Tōkyō: Fuji Shuppan.
- . (ed.). 2013. *Bukkyō shokuminchi fukyōshi shiryō shūsei: Chōsen hen* 仏教植

- 民地布教史資料集成・朝鮮編. Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan.  
 Nakano Kyōtoku 中濃教篤. 1976. *Tennōsei kokka to shokuminchi dendō* 天皇制国家と植民地伝道. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.  
 Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 (ed.). 2002. “Bukkyō/Kindai/Ajia 仏教／近代／アジア” *Shisō* 思想, n.943.

Hwansoo I. Kim  
 Duke University

Shinbori Kanno 新堀歆乃  
*Kindai Bukkyō kyōdan to goeika* 近代仏教教団とご詠歌 (Modern Buddhist institutions and *Goeika*).  
 Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2013, 272 pp.

For some time now, scholars active in the Japanese-language academic community have been proclaiming that research on modern Buddhism is thriving (Klautau 2014; Ōmi 2014: 3-4). The considerable number of edited volumes, conferences, and government-funded research projects on the topic that have appeared in recent years speak to the veracity of this claim. However, beneath the surface, one can detect a growing sense of unease that this momentum has begun to slow: new young researchers – who appeared on the scene like “shooting stars” (Hayashi 2014: 19) in the past – have not grabbed the reins to lead research on modern Buddhism to new heights, leading some to wonder whether the past decade will go down in the annals of history as the heyday of the field.

One of the central reasons for the field’s flourishing has been what could be described as a “methodological self-awareness and willingness to critically scrutinize previous scholarship” (Auerback 2014: 23). The feeling of possibility and broader vantage points that arise from a meta-approach that historicizes previously-taken-for-granted understandings has attracted to the modern Buddhism party senior scholars from fields spanning from ancient Japanese Buddhist history to text-based research on Indian Buddhism. Yet, as Ōmi Toshihirō notes, this approach has not necessarily entailed an expansion of research topics (2014: 8). Put negatively, the field is spinning its wheels in traditional modern Buddhism themes, and scholarship that moves beyond the intellectual Buddhist endeavors of cosmopolitan elites is sorely needed if the field is to reach a new level that ensures its strength and continuity.

This brings us to the book at hand, Shinbori Kanno’s *Kindai Bukkyō kyōdan to goeika*. Covering a religious musical practice that is located at the intersection of Buddhist institutions, elites, and various levels of the laity, it offers an interdisciplinary path forward for scholars in the field of modern Buddhism. Below, I will provide a summary of its content, focusing on topics of interest to scholars of

religion in Japan, and then offer some brief concluding remarks.

*Goeika* is “a type of religious music in Japan that has Buddhism-related lyrics with melodies added that are similar to *minyō* [folk songs] and so on. *Goeika* singers, who are primarily common lay Buddhist believers, sing them during pilgrimages such as the Shikoku Pilgrimage and Buddhist ceremonies such as funerals” (9). The objective of Shinbōri’s monograph, which focuses on the Yamato, Kongō, and Mitsugon *goeika* schools, is to, “focusing on the circumstances surrounding the splitting-off from the Yamato school...of the various schools transmitted by Buddhist religious institutions and their subsequent formation, make clear the process through which the religious music *goeika* was passed down as part of religious institutions’ proselytization activities as well as the transformations in the form of transmission in this process” (10). To do so, the author draws from her own participant-observation fieldwork in the three aforementioned *goeika* schools, interviews with people involved in teaching and learning *goeika*, and collected texts, recordings, and so on held by these people as well as *goeika* organizations.

Chapter 1, “The Formation Process of *Goeika* Schools,” details how the Yamato, Kongō, and Mitsugon schools came into existence. The Yamato-kō (*kō* means “religious organization,” see below for details) was founded by Yamasaki Chikumatsu (1885-1926) in 1921, the Kongō-kō in 1926 by the Mt. Kōya Shingon sect institution after the Yamato school spread inside the sect, and the Mitsugon school’s Henjō-kō in 1931 by Asahi Jun’ei, the superintendent priest of the Shingon sect’s Chizan branch. After their formation, all schools created and published standard repertoires, crafted their own styles of musical notation, developed level systems that involve examinations on lyrics, melody, rhythm, and so on, and held performance competitions. Unlike the Yamato school, the Kongō and Mitsugon schools released recordings of their songs, and created books explaining their music. Of the three schools, the Kongō was and still is the strongest; in 1931 it had 160 branches and 165,616 members compared to the mere 10,000 members the Yamato school could lay claim to. The Mitsugon school, on the other hand, rapidly grew after its founding to include approximately 25,000 members by 1936; however it lost strength during the war and it only has 8,000 members today. Chapter 1 concludes by drawing from the work of Nishimura Matsunosuke on the Edo period *natori seido* to argue that the level systems were one of the primary causes of the rapid growth of the *goeika* organizations.

Chapter 2, “Buddhist Organizations and *Goeika*: The Process of Becoming Proselytizing Music,” is divided into two sections. The first discusses the relationship of Buddhist institutions and *goeika* transmission by focusing on *goeika kō* (usually defined as “organizations comprised of [religious] companions that worship gods and buddhas” [87]). While unlike the Kongō-kō and Henjō-kō, the Yamato-kō was not formed under the leadership of established Buddhist organizations, it did aim to convert people to Buddhism, and its activities were

supported by the various Buddhist sects. Shinbōri argues that such relationships were cultivated so the head of the Yamato-kō (*kōshū*) could have a dharma name and thereby be recognized as a person leading an organization that was religious in nature, and that these connections enabled it to establish itself in local communities and develop as a Buddhist organization by receiving resources and fostering connections with the headquarters of sects. The Kongō-kō, on the other hand, was created by the Mt. Kōya Shingon sect, which incorporated *goeika* into proselytizing activities. This meant its branches were located in temples across the country and therefore closely connected to the sect's headquarters, enabling it to spread rapidly. The Mitsugon school's Henjō-kō had a similar relationship with the Shingon sect Chizan branch headquarters; however, unlike the Kongō school, all instructors were Chizan priests, leading to strong control over it by branch headquarters.

The second part of Chapter 2 explores the relationship of *goeika* and proselytizing, focusing on the differences in the proselytizing activities of the Mt. Kōya Shingon sect and the Jōdo Shin sect. According to Shinbōri, during the Edo period (1600-1867), unlike the latter which had worked to establish an economic basis by acquiring parishioner households through proselytization, the former had largely ignored the populace due to its strength and stability, and therefore it was at a disadvantage after the challenges to Buddhist organizations that accompanied the Meiji Restoration in 1868. This meant that its proselytization activities often mimicked those of the Shin sect, and it did not find its own method until the advent of the *daishi-shugi* (return to Kūkai) movement in the 1920s. Shinbōri details how Mt. Kōya Shingon incorporated *goeika* into the *daishi-shugi*-influenced 1934 Kūkai *goonki* (memorial) event because they thought as a "traditional" form of music connected to Kūkai, familiar to the populace, and – unlike *shōmyō* (Buddhist chants) – easy to understand, it would be an effective way to spark people's interest in Buddhism. Their efforts were successful, with the *goonki goeika* performances receiving coverage throughout the media.

In Chapter 3, "The Reconstruction of *Goeika* by Buddhist Organizations: From Folk to Buddhist Music," Shinbōri details in three sections how Buddhist organizations constructed *goeika* as religious music. The first section discusses how, up until the 1920s, *goeika* had a negative image that stemmed from its singing by marginalized people engaging in both religious and non-religious begging on the Shikoku Pilgrimage. In response, *goeika* leaders asserted that *goeika* actually formed part of a scripturally-based practice of religious begging. Furthermore, secular music such as *minyō* and jazz was popular and frequently broadcast on the radio during this time, and the sectarian institutions associated with the Kongō and Mitsugon schools worked to differentiate *goeika* from them by asserting that it was Buddhist music sung out of faith. The second portion of the chapter presents detailed treatment of the re-organization of the level systems in the *goeika* organizations, which in the Kongō and Mitsugon schools provided opportunities for high-ranking

individuals to play a role in proselytization as well as lay people to engage in what came to be seen as religious practice. Shinbōri argues that this restructuring “was an important step to establish *goeika* as religious practice” (137). Finally, the third part of the chapter explores the invention of *goeika* tradition and the formation of the concept of *seichō* (a school’s norms for orthodox or “correct” singing) through an analysis of musical notation and music theory. The former was “improved” by drawing from *shōmyō* notation, and the latter was similarly developed while drawing from not Western music but *shōmyō* and Japanese folk music theory, partially out of a desire to present it as “traditional Japanese” music. Notation and theory provided a written basis for and thereby influenced the emergence of the concept of *seichō*, which was further shaped by exclusions and purifications aimed at making *goeika* a modern type of music equal to that found in the West. Shinbōri concludes the chapter by noting that another reason that Western musical notation was not adopted in *goeika* was that it posed difficulties for communicating some of *goeika*’s musical characteristics.

Chapter 4, “Transmitting *Seichō*: Sheet Music and Oral Transmission,” begins by posing the following questions: “How can changing sheet music and oral transmission be seen as transmitting *seichō*? How can the transmission of *seichō* and individual self-expression co-exist?” (170). To answer these questions, Shinbōri details how those transmitting *goeika* in the Mitsugon school demonstrate individuality and are aware of it in the transmission process by exploring changes in sheet music and oral transmission, as well as the relationship of these changes to *seichō*. After providing an overview of the various positions and types of people involved in transmitting – a concept in which she includes both teaching and learning – *goeika*, Shinbōri focuses on transformations in the sheet music of the *Tsuichō wasan* (Mourning Hymn), focusing on how they related to increases and decreases in the amount of information provided during oral transmission. Based on a case study of a *shihan* instructor council meeting regarding which pentatonic scale should be used for the melody in the *Tsuichō wasan*, she argues that amidst discussions over “correctness” in *goeika*, “in each *shihan*’s awareness the ‘proper’ way of singing *goeika* – in other words ‘*seichō*’ – is reconstructed,” and based on this “new ‘*seichō*’ the old sheet music and oral transmission are changed.” Shinbōri then shifts to a methodologically self-aware transcription-based analysis of variations in personal expression – specifically microtonal ornamentations – seen in recordings of *shihan* instructors’ *goeika* performances, seeking to understand how those involved in the transmission of *goeika* are aware of individual expression in musical performance. She shows how *shihan* instructors redefined vis-à-vis *seichō* the orthodoxy of types of microtonal ornamentation, thereby revising rules of individual expression, and argues that “in the *seichō* of *goeika*, it is not the case that a single performance always based on a digital interpretation emerges; for every performer or every performance diverse interpretations are born, thus individuality can also

be expressed in standard performances that sing *seichō*" (228). Chapter 4 ends with a two-part conclusion. The first uses the work of Walter Ong to argue that while *goeika* may at first glance appear to be a written culture due to its use of sheet music, it also contains strong oral component as evidenced by the emphasis on the voices of *goeika* transmitters in the creation of sheet music. The second part discusses the concept of *arigatasa* that is used to express the aesthetic value of *goeika* and evaluate individual expression – including not only voice quality and musical content but also the religious feeling – in performance.

As Shinbōri notes herself, this book is valuable in that it differs from previous research in two ways. Unlike previous scholarship on *goeika*, she focuses its musical side and form of transmission. Furthermore, her move beyond the Shin sect – a favorite recurring topic in modern Buddhism research – to include the Shingon sect and focus on "culture" is markedly different from most research in modern Buddhism. In this way, this monograph serves as an important departure from the field's status quo, and offers a certainly fruitful path forward for the field of modern Buddhism.

### References

- Auerback, Micah. 2014. "Politics and Scholarship in the Modern Reinvention of Japanese Buddhism." Review of Ōtani Eiichi, *Kindai bukkō to iu shiza: Sensō, ajia, shakaishugi* and Orion Klautau, *Kindai nihon shisō to shite no bukkō shigaku*. *Religious Studies in Japan* 2: 23-36.
- Hayashi Makoto 林淳. 2014. "Sōron: Kindai bukkō to gakuchi 総論 近代仏教と学知." In: *Budda no henbō* ブッダの変貌, edited by Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 et al. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 5-28.
- Klautau, Orion. 2014. "Modern Buddhism as a Perspective." Review of Ōtani Eiichi, *Kindai bukkō to iu shiza: Sensō, ajia, shakaishugi*. <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=38987>. Accessed August 30, 2014.
- Ōmi Toshihiro 碧海寿広. 2014. *Kindai bukkō no naka no shinshū: Chikazumi Jōkan to kyudōsha tachi* 近代仏教のなかの真宗—近角常観と求道者たち. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Dylan Luers Toda  
Independent Scholar

Klautau, Orion オリオン・クラウタウ  
*Kindai nihon shisō to shite no bukkyō shigaku* 近代日本思想としての仏教史学  
(The Study of Buddhist History as Modern Japanese Thought).  
Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2012. 340 pp.

Orion Klautau is the leading scholar who has focused attention on the way narratives of Japanese Buddhist history were invented in the twentieth century. This text, some of the results of which were previously published in articles, is the culmination of his work over a number of years.

The book is organized systematically into nine major sections. The first of these is a preface which includes a survey of recent academic trends in the notion of “Buddhism” – where any purported unity of the concept itself has come under sharp skeptical scrutiny – as well as an examination of some relevant points about the historiography of religion. The author notes how a long history of European encounters in the past once generated a certain type of European conceptual construction, especially over-unified images of “Buddhism” (and “religion”), but recently this is being corrected through recognition of Eurocentrism in the practice of world history. In Japanese academia in the twentieth century questions about definitions, narratives, and conceptualizations had long produced fragmented disputes, but the recent influence of works by Donald Lopez, Bernard Faure and Sueki Fumihiko have produced a much more adequately self-conscious era in contemporary Buddhist studies in Japan. On the basis of those shifts it can now be understood how on the Japanese side the conceptual constructions around Buddhism which started with *kindai* (modern) and *Meiji bukkyō* (Meiji Buddhism) have been set within the larger theoretical problem of Japan’s transition to modernity as mixed with a large set of further questions about the construction of “religious studies.” In other words “Buddhism” (a modern neologism) as an object of study has been invented by some specific conditions involving Meiji period (1868-1912) politics, modern academicism, and Western influences including the orientalism posited by Edward Said.

With that theoretical perspective in mind, sections two through five of the book deal with narratives of nationalism. Japan’s quest for modern identity in the nation-state demanded the modern question whether there exists a “Japanese” Buddhism distinct in quality from Buddhism in general. Section two first takes up the situation just before (fully modern) “Japanese Buddhism” was concocted by examining the scholar Hara Tanzan (1819-1892). Straddling the gap between *kinsei* (early modern) and *kindai* versions of study, Hara’s era at the very beginning of the Meiji period marked the birth of modern academic Buddhist studies in Japan. The birth was accompanied at the outset by the emergence of an unprecedented sense of the universalization of Buddhism. Indeed, Hara’s response, focused on restructuring Buddhism around Western and scientific ideas, was not based merely on Western

knowledge but also on Confucian input. Thus while this era was marked by the characteristically unstable categorizations of early Meiji circling around *shūkyō* (“religion”), at that initial stage the flavor of nationalism was relatively weak.

However, a more substantial birth of nationalism, at first of low intensity, is elaborated in the third section which focuses on the activity of the pivotal scholar Murakami Senshō (1851-1929). Murakami is known for certain “universal” claims about Buddhism, but his early work in framing the subject as “Japanese Buddhist history” also pioneered the idea that Buddhism in Japan had certain special characteristics: Murakami identified such special features as its handling of precepts, its lay rather than monastic leadership, its close relationship with the imperial house, its adoption of modern historical consciousness rather than the traditional premodern Buddhist chronologism, and its mode of relationship of Buddhism and the state. After the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) Murakami became much more heatedly nationalistic as well as more sectarian (in favor of Jōdo Shinshū, or True Pure Land Buddhism), and began to promote ideas such as a continuing Japanese spirit (*seishin*) running from Shōtoku Taishi (574-622) through Shinran (1173-1262). This move initiated a pattern of bimodal interpretation which for decades successfully satisfied demands on both Buddhist and nationalist sides.

The fourth section continues with how the discourse of “Japanese Buddhism” further evolved in the Taishō period (1912-1926). The Russo-Japanese War’s atmosphere of both victory and colonial crisis was the turning point in Buddhist intellectuals’ commitment to an emphasis on nationalism and a discourse of harmony or coordination with the state: the enhanced discourse presented the Buddhist *ie* (household or family) as the symbol for a Japanese nationhood which could resist destabilization. Here the key figure was Takakusu Junjirō (1866-1945), who enunciated a concept of “the Buddhist [Japanese] people” (*bukkyō kokumin*), which provided a kind of idealized modern reenvisioning of the tradition. Like many others of his era, Takakusu was centrally concerned with the competitive relationship of Japan and the West and wanted to coordinate “Japanese spirit” with “Western material culture” while perceiving that unique *seishin* continuous through Japanese history. His thought stressed a polarized dichotomy of the “individual” versus the “family” and offering a warning against such pernicious individualism theorized relationships among Amidist orientation (*shinkō*, “faith” – a broad term, like “Buddhism” itself a conceptual innovation or quasi-neologism in early twentieth-century Japan), ancestralism, “familialism” (*kazokushugi*) and Japanese spirit. Such elements were seen as linked together as an immemorial manifestation of the *seishin* – albeit shaped by selective appropriation of foreign resources – and were particularly assimilated to the notion of Shinran’s teachings as the high point of all Buddhist tradition. Indeed, on that account Takakusu even spoke of the

Japanese as the “chosen people” (*senmin*) of Buddhism. As Klautau explains, such ideas were not really strictly derived from Buddhism but were expressions of a pervasive ideological climate after 1905.

The fifth section completes this dimension of the story by showing how the earlier nationalist discourses were modified during the Pacific War era. After Takakusu’s time, scholars gave up earlier “scientific” claims for the continuity of Mahāyāna with primitive Buddhist teaching but not their nationalist celebration of Japanese Buddhism. These passages of the book concentrate on the figures of Hanayama Shinshō (1898-1995) and Ienaga Saburō (1913-2002), whose era saw Buddhism promoted in the context of the Shintōesque manifesto *Kokutai no hongi* (The Cardinal Principles of National Polity) via the technique of assimilation to the figure of Shōtoku Taishi. Hanayama restated an essentialist ideology of Japanese Buddhism which reflected a strongly right-wing vision unifying nationalism, Kamakura Buddhism and Shin Buddhism. Ienaga in some contrast in a more philosophical vein formulated a notion of a “logic of negation” (*hitei no ronri*) for Japanese Buddhism (notably introduced in the English literature by Robert Bellah). Yet while the messages differed somewhat – Hanayama located a nationalistic particularism whereas Ienaga sought a Japanocentric universalism – both expressed a sense of “grand narrative” and their bows towards Shōtoku Taishi and Shinran reflected a structure of discourse which continued earlier trends. Scholars in the postwar period would soon begin to discard such attitudes, but the notion of some kind of supremacism via Kamakura Buddhism was long preserved.

With the above nationalism in the background, sections six through nine<sup>1</sup> deal with the coeval emergence of narratives of “decadence” pertaining to *kinsei* Buddhism. The sixth section sets the stage by beginning to explore how the theme of “clerical reform” (*sōfū sasshin*) accompanied the post-Meiji historical description of “Buddhism.” Buddhist institutions themselves were no strangers to traditional forms of discourse about the failings of the clerical membership – as Klautau explains, issues of reform already had a *kinsei* history expressing various meanings and emphases – but after the early Meiji episodes of anti-Buddhist violence, they struggled anew with questions of political religious policy and clerical behavior. (Precept revival [irrelevant, of course, to Jōdo Shinshū, which was actually the largest of the sects] was important but was only one of a heterogeneity of issues.) Relatively little-known today, a specialized Meiji organization called the “Pan-Sectarian Moral Association” (*Shoshū Dōtoku Kaimei*) grew out of this awareness, maintained a close relationship with the governing regime, and produced significant self-reflection.

---

1. See Klautau 2008 for an abridged English version of the material presented in these sections.

The seventh section details how despite such activity of conscience among the Buddhist leadership, the popularly narrativized image of early modern Buddhism came to be deeply imbued with a one-sided emphasis on the “decadence” of the *kinsei* clerisy. Internal scrutiny about self-reform and self-criticism was widespread among the Buddhist leadership but when picked up by unfriendly critics especially on the outside could be twisted to a kind of evaluative hierarchization of the historical phases of Japanese Buddhism. In this innovative characterization, *kinsei* Buddhism was assigned a low ranking, while – in sharp contrast – Kamakura-period Buddhism was depicted as flourishing.

The eighth section examines how this “decadence” narrative, which had already grown in the prewar period, was understood to be highlighted within the voluminous postwar writing of the historian Tsuji Zennosuke (1877-1955) in a way which came to supply the dominant image of *kinsei* in the latter half of the twentieth century. Tsuji’s work was both extensively documented (before his time the performance of actual documentary history had been relatively weak, and his work became regarded as the exemplar of evidence-based historiography (*jissō shigaku*) and yet distinctly slanted. Readers may be surprised to learn that Tsuji was at a personal level clearly engaged with religious issues: he was raised in a Jōdo Shinshū household, but it was one skeptical of the official priesthood, which seems to have provided Tsuji a distinctive critical orientation. Taking the *haibutsu kishaku* episode as central to the predicament of modern Buddhism, Tsuji thus played up the weaknesses of Buddhism as it existed under the official *bakuhatsu* system. The nature of this criticism can, nevertheless, be easily mistaken. The most publicized pejorative words in Japanese used to describe the alleged state of *kinsei* Buddhism have included *daraku* (typically rendered as English as “depraved”) and *suibi* (“ebbing, declining”). However, as noted, Tsuji – along with the majority of the other figures in this book – was personally associated with Shin Buddhism and was thus both unconcerned with any maintenance of monastic precepts and well aware that late Tokugawa Shin Buddhism was a highly successful and indeed growing institution. The core of Tsuji’s truly dominant criticism seems to have been reflected in a third, less lurid term, which instead was “formalization” (*keishikika*, i.e. routinization, ritualization, loss of inner inspiration, cooption to authority).

The ninth section completes the survey of the twentieth century by examining both the continuing legacy of the decadence thesis and the reevaluation that finally began to emerge by the end of the century. On the exterior, foreign scholarship such as that of George Sansom (1883-1965) tended to pick up and recycle simplistic versions of Tsuji’s negative judgments. In Japan itself postwar attitudes came to reflect a new environment (often leftist and anti-authoritarian) for the scholarly community, and consequently the decadence thesis was carried on in modified form by scholars such as the hereditary Zen priest Tamamuro Taijō

(1902-1966), whose coined term “funeral Buddhism” became a standard phrase in Japanese. His son Tamamuro Fumio (1935- ) in a cynical marxian-influenced vein pursued research in the *jissō shigaku* style of Tsuji, undertaking enormous (if selective) efforts at collection of documentation from local institutions. The younger Tamamuro’s reductionist fundamental theme was that *kinsei* Buddhism involved either funerals centered in bakufu-registered temples or thaumaturgy (*kitō*, which in the author’s later writings was reoriented towards the activity of fringe priests), and given this structure ordinary Japanese citizens either chose between the temple registration system, which was coercive, formalized and spiritually empty (and essentially exploitive, as seen in the economic interests of Buddhist priests in maintaining the funeral business) or they sought religious relief outside its boundaries. Those two options were presented as the whole picture.

However, initially signaled by the appearance of the academic journal *Kinsei Bukkyō*, efforts gradually emerged at reframing the subject in a manner transcending Tsuji’s paradigm. Specifically, attention turned to revisionist questions about how *kinsei* Buddhism may have embodied some spirit of modernity and to the importance of regional concentrations and variations. Still, for a long time post-Tsuji scholars tended to accept his position as “historical fact” rather than as a selectively biased narrative or discourse and thus their capacity to challenge it remained limited. It is only at the very conclusion of this long tale that Klautau can introduce later twentieth century scholars whose research has more fully transcended the decadence thesis, most prominently Ōkuwa Hitoshi (1937-) and Takano Toshihiko (1947-). Yet despite such fundamental reorientations among Buddhist history specialists themselves, throughout other kinds of fields of Japanese studies a simplistic negative view of early modern Buddhism doggedly persists (290).

This is a groundbreaking piece of scholarship. The historiographical story and some of its main figures have been researched in relatively piecemeal fashion before, but Klautau in a freshly powerful way presents a chronological survey covering the whole course of the twentieth century. This produces a clarification of how the narratives and thus perceptions have been shaped by two dissimilar but heavy pressures deriving from modern Japanese cultural politics, namely the requirement to cope with Japanese nationalism and the craving to find reformed modalities of Buddhism better adapted to the twentieth century. Readers should note this is not a book about any empirical description of either *kinsei* or *kindai* Buddhism, but rather it is a conceptual archaeology aiming to explain how historical conditions gave rise to certain narratives. As displayed in his very extensive bibliography (pp. 311-332) the author consolidated his perspective by examining not only primary sources but also a multiplicity of kinds of previous literature, citing works not only in Japanese but also in English, French, Spanish, German and Portuguese; the references deal variously and wide-rangingly with religious studies theory, the history of

Western encounters with Buddhism, Japanese religions, modernization and nationalism in Japan, the general history of Buddhism, orientalism, and the question of “objectivity” in historical studies. The book also includes an effective index. It is striking how Klautau draws out the underemphasized nationalist ideological records of figures such as Murakami, Takakusu and Hanayama, whose complex activities as educators have presented different faces to different audiences. Of course in a book of this scope it is impossible to cover everything, and this reviewer looks forward in Klautau’s future research to possible expansion of discussions concerning the role of Marxist historiography, possible relationships with the Kyoto School, the seemingly paradoxical interaction between the nationalist and decadence perspectives, and more explanation of why the Jōdo Shinshū sect is so conspicuously important to the story.

Regarding the decadence thesis – which was, as Klautau notes, never more than one of the several possible narratives about Buddhist historiography – the outstanding contribution of this research is to clarify how easy it is to misunderstand – perhaps especially as a foreigner – what motivated the rhetoric. *Daraku* was above all a rhetorical device used by Buddhist reformists themselves in taking aim at the *twentieth century*. Already at the earliest stages of the Meiji period Inoue Enryō (1858-1919) – soon followed by Kiyozawa Manshi (1863-1903) and others – introduced an “anachronistic” critique according to which Edo Buddhism was “decadent” (more accurately glossable as “attached to tradition but maladaptive today”) because its inheritors were not responding fast enough to *contemporary* needs. In parallel, the overemphasis on pure and heroic Kamakura Buddhism versus corrupt *kinsei* Buddhism was designed to stimulate *current* reform.

From what a foreign scholar might regard as a more “objective” standpoint, the politicized, reductionist Japanese narratives described in this book have produced remarkably problematic results both inside and outside Japan. One of the enduring temptations in Japanese studies among foreigners is to follow – because the intellectual work involves a complex, literate society with a difficult language – too uncritically the lead of Japanese scholars themselves and treat them as authoritative. What is sharply evident in Klautau’s survey is the overwhelmingly inward-directed hermeneutical quality of the historiography. Aimed at a Japanese audience, it was actually packed with unspoken presuppositions about the continuing seriousness of the Buddhist tradition in Japan which only that internal audience could understand. Similarly this study underlines the existence of major differences between modern Western and modern Japanese contexts and motivations entailed in the construction of their two respective fields of conceptualization of “Buddhism.” The persistence of Japanese inwardness (and stubborn barriers in Japanese academia) also means that certain interdisciplinary intellectual avenues tended to remain underexploited: for example, there is has been an absence of comparative reference

to practices of local documentary history as done in Christian Europe, no suggestive comparisons with how Christianity was institutionally structured into various European countries in the early modern period, no sense of sociological evolution in comparative context (the elevation of Kamakura Buddhism in the twentieth century was largely fueled by local nationalism and thus Hara Katsurō's early notion of some kind of world-linking relation to European historical evolution was long abandoned), or no sense of comparative anthropological consciousness. Until very recently, Japanese Buddhist historians as depicted here have a record of startling narrowness and one-dimensionality in their views, neglecting interests in ambiguity, plurality, and polysemy. One apparent paradox then in the intellectual history of twentieth century Japanese Buddhism – considering the tremendous productivity of paper by its scholars – is the limited interaction of its resources with what we might think of as a “global” intellectual society. Klautau's work provides a splendid stepping stone for potentially reaching out in richer and more stimulating ways to new phases of narrating Japanese Buddhist history and perhaps encouraging it to talk to the world more productively.

### References

Klautau, Orion. 2008. “Against the Ghosts of Recent Past: Meiji Scholarship and the Discourse on Edo-Period Buddhist Decadence.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 35(2): 263-303.

Galen Amstutz  
Institute of Buddhist Studies/  
Graduate Theological Union

Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一

*Kindai bukkyō to iu shiza: Sensō, ajia, shakaishugi* 近代仏教という視座—戦争・アジア・社会主義 (The Perspective of Modern Buddhism: War, Asia, Socialism).

Tokyo: Perikansha, 2012. 294 pp.

In Japan, the study of “modern Buddhism” (*kindai bukkyō*) – which originally meant primarily if not solely Meiji Buddhism – has witnessed several waves in the seven decades since the end of the Asia Pacific War (1941-1945). The undisputed pioneer of the field is Yoshida Kyūichi (1915-2005), whose *Nihon kindai bukkyōshi kenkyū* (Studies in the History of Buddhism in Modern Japan) was the first scholarly work to focus on the “modernistic” – including social and political – aspects of Meiji-era Buddhism (Yoshida 1959). Yoshida was followed in the next several decades

by Kashiwahara Yūsen (1916-2002) and Ikeda Eishun (1925-2004), who together comprise what is known in scholarly circles as the “Big Three” of modern Buddhist studies in Japan (see also Kashiwahara 1969 and Ikeda 1976). After a slight lull, a new generation of scholars from both Japan and the West began to emerge in the late 1990s and early 2000s, many of whom working under or alongside Sueki Fumihiko, whose own scholarship had moved from medieval to modern thought. The author of the present volume, Ōtani Eiichi, is unquestionably on the forefront of this recent *kindai bukkyō* boom, and in many respects *Kindai bukkyō to iu shiza* presents a summary of his work over the past decade – and as such provides a fine introduction to the key components of modern Buddhism in the Japanese context.

The book is divided into three sections: 1) “Revisiting Modern Buddhism,” 2) “Modern Buddhism and the Nation-State,” and 3) “Modern Buddhism Beyond Borders,” each of which is divided in turn into three separate chapters.

In the first section, Ōtani begins by providing a critical re-examination of the standard narrative of the “making of modern Buddhism” while elucidating some new perspectives emerging from recent research. In particular, he is critical of the fact that previous scholarship had assumed an *a priori* “Buddhism” that was then subject to “modernization” from the Meiji period. In contrast, Ōtani follows the more recent trend towards focusing on the emergence of categories such as “religion” and “Buddhism” in the modern period. This is followed by a chapter on the emergence and development of “new Buddhism,” including but not limited to the New Buddhist Fellowship (*Shin Bukkyō Dōshikai*), which Ōtani helpfully characterizes as a manifestation of a “youth culture” movement in late Meiji Japan. This initial section of the book is rounded off with a brief examination of a later experiment in “new Buddhism” – the Youth League for Revitalizing Buddhism (*Shinkō Bukkyō Seinen Dōmei*), a Buddhist socialist movement founded by Nichiren lay-Buddhist Seno’o Girō (1889-1961). Here Ōtani sets the Youth League into the context of the maelstrom of early Showa, including the growing anti-religious (*han-shukyō*) movements of the day.

The second section of the book is dedicated to exploring the links between modern Buddhism and the nation state. This is a topic that is fundamental, of course, to any study of modern Buddhism in Japan or elsewhere, and it is one that Ōtani has dealt with in other publications. After critically examining the public role of Buddhists by way of the work of José Casanova, he turns his attention to the case of Tanaka Chigaku’s Kokuchūkai, a socially active lay Nichiren movement that flourished in the 1920s. In the final chapter of this section Ōtani flips to the other side of the political coin by describing the pacifist and anti-war arguments of a few twentieth-century Buddhists like Takenaka Shōgen (1867-1945) and Inoue Shūten (1880-1945).

In the third and final section on the “transnational” aspects of modern Japanese Buddhism, Ōtani first discusses the theoretical and practical missionary work of Nichiren priest Takanabe Nittō (1879-1953) before moving into a discussion of the “ultranationalist” Buddhism of Inoue Nisshō (1887-1967), whose Ketsumeidan (Blood Pledge Corps) carried out a number of assassinations of political and business leaders in the early 1930s. The book concludes by returning to the life and work of Seno’o Girō and the Youth League for Revitalizing Buddhism as an instance of a Buddhist anti-war and anti-fascist perspective.

As noted above, the book works well as a primer to modern Buddhism in Japan, particularly when it comes to understand the various ways in which Buddhists in the early decades of the twentieth-century understood themselves in relation to society and the state. Although repetitive in places – it reads as a series of separate papers rather than a single narrative, such that several of the figures, including Seno’o, are re-introduced with virtually identical language on three or four separate occasions – Ōtani covers a wide-range of interlocking “problems” faced by modern Buddhists from late Meiji through early Shōwa (1926-1989).

Although Ōtani asserts early on that modern Buddhism is best approached from a “broad” rather than “narrow” perspective – by which he means a view that takes into account forms of practice and ritual in addition to belief – the rest of the book sticks fairly close to the standard narrative of Buddhist “beliefs” about society, the state, and the world. In the estimation of this reviewer, the author opens up but deigns to fully pursue some important issues of the meaning of belief in relation to practice (or *praxis*) among the various forms of “new Buddhism” that emerged in modern Japan – for instance, the possibility (pursued by a number of socialists) that these categories may collapse into one. The book might also be criticized for sectarian bias, since more than half of the figures dealt with come from the Nichiren tradition, but as someone who has studied the social and political manifestations of modern Buddhism during these tumultuous decades I can attest that Tanaka Chigaku’s Nichirenism, in particular, stands out as a dominant force in Japanese Buddhist modernism, producing figures as diverse as Seno’o Girō, Inoue Nisshō, Kita Ikki (1883-1937) and Miyazawa Kenji (1896-1933). Having said that, and while realizing that the book does not intend to be comprehensive, it would have been nice to see more attention paid to some of the “alternative” forms of modernism emerging from the Shin Ōtani and Honganji sects during this same period. And finally, as at least one other reviewer has noted, the book would have greatly benefitted from a concluding chapter in which the author might have reflected more deeply upon the implications of his work.

On the whole, the book is highly recommended, especially for those with some background in Japanese Buddhism or modern Japanese history but little familiarity with modern Japanese Buddhism.

### References

- Ikeda Eishun 池田英俊. 1976. *Meiji no shinbukkyō undō* 明治の新仏教運動. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- Kashiwahara Yūsen 柏原祐泉. 1969. *Nihon kinsei kindai bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 日本近世近代仏教史の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.
- Yoshida Kyūichi 吉田久一. 1959. *Nihon kindai bukkyōshi kenkyū* 日本近代仏教史研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

James Mark Shields  
Bucknell University

Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士, Hayashi Makoto 林淳, Yoshinaga Shin'ichi 吉永進一, and Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一, eds.

*Budda no henbō: Kōsaku suru kindai bukkyō* ブッダの変貌—交錯する近代仏教 (Transformations of the Buddha: Crisscrossing Streams of Modern Buddhism).

Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2014. iv+415 pp.

In recent years, the study of modern Japanese Buddhism has burgeoned. Publications in this area since the turn of the twenty-first century outnumber those of several decades preceding, and the number of researchers, younger ones especially, has increased. Methodologically self-aware, this new wave of scholarship has moved beyond the modernist commitments of postwar models to acknowledge the constructed nature of its own categories (“Buddhism,” “modernity,” etc.), embracing and refining the insights of colonial and post-colonial studies and other relevant disciplines and theoretical frameworks. Modern Japanese Buddhism is no longer considered solely from a perspective confined to Japan but in global context.

One impetus behind these gains has been a collaborative research association based at the International Research Center for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken) and headed by Sueki Fumihiko. Outcomes of the group’s activities include *Kindai to bukkyō*, or *Modernity and Buddhism* (Sueki 2011); an English version published as a special issue of *The Eastern Buddhist* (vol. 43, nos. 1-2 [2012]); and the present volume, which raises the field to a new standard.

*Budda no henbō* makes several contributions. First, it establishes a transnational perspective, attentive to multilateral flows of people, practices, and ideas across national boundaries (the “crisscrossing streams” of the book’s subtitle). The volume brings scholarship on Buddhism in Japan’s modern period (roughly 1868-1945), including interactions with Chinese and Korean Buddhism, into dialogue with work on Buddhist modernism from a chiefly Western perspective, such as that of

Donald Lopez, Thomas Tweed, and David McMahan. It demonstrates the value of Buddhist Studies to the study of modernity and illuminates from that perspective recent work on the formation in Japan of Religious Studies and the modern categories of “religion” and “the secular” (e.g., Isomae 2003, Josephson 2012). The essays showcase newly tapped sources, such as early Buddhist periodicals, and also introduce the reader to the historiography of modern Buddhism and the approaches that have informed it.

*Budda no henbō* contains fifteen chapters: nine written expressly for this volume and another six excerpted from seminal works originally published in English and here ably translated for a Japanese readership. The chapters are grouped into four parts, for each of which one of the co-editors has written a substantial overview. These four *sōron* elevate the book above the general run of essay collections, in that they not only introduce the work of the individual contributors but also situate it with respect to prior scholarship and supply detailed historical context. Also included are a foreword by Sueki, an afterword by Hayashi, and a brief biographical dictionary of figures discussed in the chapters.

Part I, “Ways of Speaking about Buddhism,” deals with the formation of Buddhist Studies as a modern academic discipline in the latter nineteenth and early twentieth century. Hayashi Makoto’s introductory article relates how European Buddhologists grounded in Enlightenment values sought to construct the “historical Buddha” as a rationalist human teacher; valorizing the Pāli canon as normative, they dismissed the Mahāyāna as a later, debased form that was “not the Buddha’s teaching” (*daijō hibussetsu*). Hayashi details how Japanese Buddhist scholars struggled to overcome this threat to the legitimacy of their own, Mahāyāna tradition. One powerful mode of counter-argument, often associated with Murakami Senshō (1851-1929), entailed a two-tiered response: viewed historically, the Mahāyāna must indeed be acknowledged as a later form, but from the perspective of doctrine or principle, it represented a higher development of the Buddha’s truth that had culminated in Japan. This move not only inverted the European privileging of Buddhist origins but positioned the nascent field of “Japanese Buddhism” as uniquely able to mediate between the universalistic, “rational” Buddhism of the Western academy and traditional Buddhist sectarian studies.

The next chapter, by Donald Lopez – originally, his entry on “Buddha” in his *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism* (2005) – underscores the incommensurable gap between Western humanistic images of the Buddha and traditional Asian representations, using the *uṣṇīṣa*, the fleshy protuberance atop the Buddha’s head, as a metonym. This mark of a superior man, which in Asia had set the Buddha apart as a transcendent being, proved embarrassing to European Buddhologists and art historians, and had to be explained away as a turban or topknot.

Orion Klautau's chapter examines how "Buddhism" (*bukkyō*) took shape as an academic field in Meiji Japan and how differences over its proper method and social role – was it to be science, philosophy, or religion? – were negotiated. Klautau is the author of *Kindai Nihon shisō toshite no bukkyō shigaku* (The study of Buddhist history as modern Japanese thought, 2012), a masterful analysis of how the grand narratives of Japanese Buddhist history (Kamakura-period flowering, Edo-period decline, and modern reformation) were first produced. His essay in this volume expands on an early part of that story, focusing on the role of Yoshitani Kakuju (1843-1914) and Murakami Senshō, both Shinshū priests who each taught for a time at Tokyo Imperial University. In contrast to Yoshitani's colleague Hara Tanzan (1819-1892), who embraced a scientific approach to Buddhism and rejected its classification as "religion" (which he identified with Christianity), Yoshitani and Murakami valued the aspect of faith and argued for Buddhism as "religion," albeit with a strong philosophical component, shaping an approach that soon prevailed within the academic world. Deeply invested in sectarian reform, they also framed the task of academic Buddhist scholarship as the delineation of a unified Buddhism in which the doctrines and practices of the various sects were equally encompassed as differing approaches to a single truth.

As James Ketelaar noted early on, efforts to define a unified "bukkyō" led Meiji Buddhist intellectuals to assert that Japan's "thirteen sects" together represented, not factionalism, but the completeness of Japanese Buddhism (Ketelaar 1990, 177-91). Eric Schicketanz examines how Chinese Buddhists appropriated this discourse, even calling, at least at a rhetorical level, for the restoration of sects that had been "lost" in China. Some late Qing and early republican figures, beginning with the historian Liang Qichao (1873-1929), inverted the discourse: China was where the plurality of sects had arisen; Korea and Japan had merely imported them. In Schicketanz's analysis, even while the discourse of "sects" thus served to exalt Chinese Buddhism and relativize that of Japan, given the power differential between the two countries, it also subsumed Chinese Buddhists within a discursive space defined by their Japanese counterparts.

Part II, "The Transnational History of Modern Buddhism," shows that modern Buddhism did not spread unidirectionally but emerged as a global phenomenon shaped by both Asian and Western actors. In his rich overview, Yoshinaga Shin'ichi introduces the trans-Pacific networks, avenues, and "contact zones" through which modern Buddhism took form. He highlights the surprisingly influential role of the Theosophical Society; the activities of so-called "blue-eyed monks," young men from Europe and America who received ordination in Asia and established international monastic networks; the work of sectarian missionaries sent abroad from Japan; and the role of Buddhist English-language journals published in Japan and the United States and distributed worldwide, providing platforms for such influential advocates as D.T. Suzuki, Paul Carus, Henry Steel Olcott, T. W. Rhys Davids, and others.

Two other chapters in this section examine the contributions to modern Buddhism of actors on either side of the Pacific. Judith Snodgrass's essay, a key chapter from her *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West* (2003), considers the 1892 Chicago World Parliament of Religions against the backdrop of Japan's struggle for revision of unequal treaties imposed by Western powers. She examines how Japanese delegates, notably the lay Buddhist Hirai Kinza (1859-1916), drew strategically on Western and specifically Christian concepts such as God as ineffable truth and the ideal of human brotherhood to argue that these were exemplified by Mahāyāna Buddhism and to critique Western aggression and racial prejudice. Yoshinaga locates Snodgrass's work within a genealogy of scholars who, refining the insights of Edward Said, have argued that, far from being passive objects of an Orientalizing Western gaze, Asian Buddhists were assertive agents in representing their tradition to the West. Thomas Tweed's essay, the third chapter of his *American Encounter with Buddhism, 1844-1912* (2000) presents his famous heuristic typology of early Western Buddhist sympathizers: "esoterics," such Theosophists, who turned to Buddhism in their quest for occult mysteries; "rationalists," who saw Buddhist as a humanistic, ethical tradition compatible with science; and "romantics," who were drawn to the artistic and literary dimensions of Buddhist cultures.

In his introduction to Part III, "The Development of Modern Buddhism in Asia," Ōtani Eiichi argues that to date the onset of Asian modernity to the "Western impact" is neither to promote a form of neo-Orientalism nor to embrace Western models of the modern: Modern Buddhism was shaped in the crucible of colonialism and imperialism, and its study offers unique perspectives for their critique. (Ōtani has himself pioneered the idea of Buddhism as a perspective for studying modernity; see Ōtani 2012). He begins by tracing relevant scholarly antecedents, including Charles Taylor's call for the study of multiple modernities; Robert Bellah's notion of "reformism"; Gananath Obeyesekere's "Protestant Buddhism"; and the groundbreaking work by Sallie King and Christopher Queen on Buddhist liberation movements seeking to redress specific social inequities and environmental ills. This part of his essay serves to introduce King's chapter, an expanded version of her conclusion to *Engaged Buddhism* (1996), which she co-edited with Queen. King finds that, while sharing a common stance that legitimates social activism as inseparable from the pursuit of enlightenment, engaged Buddhist movements nonetheless diverge markedly on such issues as their means of reform, their degree of political involvement, and particularistic versus universalizing understandings of Buddhist identity.

Ōtani also addresses conflicts in modern Asian Buddhism arising from the ambivalent position of Japan, which resisted Western hegemony but also became an imperial power in its own right. Here he urges a transnational approach as essential to illuminating the tangled threads of conflict, resistance, collaboration, appropriation, and assimilation that accompanied Buddhism as part of the "history

of empire.” The remaining two essays in this section offer compelling illustrations. Liang Minxia relates how initial admiration on the part of reform-minded Chinese monks for modern Japanese Buddhist modes of scholarship and priestly education gave way to disillusionment in the late 1920s when Japan began armed incursions on the mainland. The reformer Taixu (1890-1947) called repeatedly on the mass of Japanese Buddhists to oppose their government’s aggression, eventually denouncing them as traitors to the Dharma. During the Anti-Japanese War (1937-45), while honoring *vinaya* prohibitions against bearing arms, Chinese monks wholeheartedly supported the national defense, donating material resources and forming rescue squads at the front to assist the wounded and displaced (these efforts are detailed in Xue 2005, which also notes instances of compromise with *vinaya* restrictions). Monastic support for the war against Japan, Liang argues, represents a form of “socially engaged Buddhism” unprecedented in Chinese history.

Kim Tae Hoon’s chapter complicates simplistic models of Korean Buddhism under Japanese colonization as neatly split between a complicit “pro-Japanese” faction and a “people’s Buddhism” (*minjung Pulgyo*) movement informed by ethnic nationalism – a dichotomy also challenged in recent Anglophone scholarship (e.g., Park 2009; Kim 2013). Kim takes up the Korean Buddhist leader and reformer Heo Young-ho (1900-1952), who straddled this divide. Heo found in the thought of the scholar-monk Wonhyo (617-686) a Buddhism at once distinctively Korean and yet all-encompassing. However, under Japanese colonization, Heo spoke out in favor of the “Buddhism of empire.” Kim argues that Heo employed such language, not to promote the Buddhism of Japanese colonizers as presently constructed, but to appropriate its claims to universality and to express, within the harsh constraints of colonial rule, his vision of a Korean Buddhism that could someday open outward to the world. Kim’s essay illuminates some of the complex and troubled intersections of Buddhist and national identities under conditions of asymmetrical power relations.

Part IV, “Tradition and Modernity,” addresses tensions between modern and premodern Buddhist forms. In a trenchant introduction, Sueki draws on Meiji-era examples to argue that tradition is not a pristine past untouched by modernizing processes but is perpetually being constructed together with the modern. The much maligned “funeral Buddhism” of Japan’s modern period, he says, was not a premodern holdover but a modern reconstruction that supported the patriarchal family system underlying both Meiji social organization and imperial ideology. Similarly, the valorization of “Kamakura new Buddhism,” along with calls for a “return” to the message of its founders, was not a revival of Buddhist tradition but a refiguring of it in ways according with both modern constructions of “religion” as a private, inner realm and the secularizing efforts of the Meiji state. Sueki forcefully reminds us that the modern and the traditional are mutually constitutive, and that interpretations of the past are shaped by the needs of the present.

Nishimura Ryō's essay in this section surveys shifts in Buddhist anti-Christian polemics over some three centuries. Chan and Zen monks in the late Ming and early Tokugawa periods mounted a straightforward ontological critique of the Christian God based on Buddhist notions of emptiness and *tathāgata-garbha* thought. Later in the Tokugawa era, and especially under the perceived threat of Western domination in its closing years, Buddhist critics stressed the dimension of social ethics and the dangers Christianity posed to Japan. The ontological argument resurfaced in Meiji, for example, with Inoue Enryō (1858-1919), but was now refracted through the modern categorical divisions of science, religion, and philosophy. Nishimura underscores the ongoing significance of Christianity as a foil against which modern Buddhism has defined itself.

Also included here is the last chapter of Richard Jaffe's *Neither Monk nor Layman* (2001), which analyzes the decriminalization of clerical marriage in the context of emergent notions of the secular and official policies isolating religion from public affairs. Jaffe argues that legal redefinitions of priests as ordinary citizens and the loss of celibacy as a marker of their access to the transcendent neither undermined the traditional hierarchy of priests and laity nor displaced renunciation as a normative ideal: to this day, Buddhist priests, and their families, live with the tensions between the monastic ideal and the realities of temple family life.

Last, David McMahan's chapter, from his edited university textbook *Buddhism in the Modern World* (2012), sketches the complex and locally varied phenomenon of "Buddhist modernism," whose formation he astutely analyzed in his *Making of Buddhist Modernism* (2008). McMahan sees Buddhist modernism as a "hybrid religious and cultural form" arising initially from resistance to Western imperial powers and Christian missionizing. Shared traits that he examines include demythologizing of traditional cosmology; de-emphasis on ritual and priesthood; ideals of social egalitarianism; a this-worldly orientation that may include social or political activism; and a linking of meditation, broadly reformulated for lay people, to modern psychology and neuroscience.

*Budda no henbō* is on the whole a most superior volume. One could raise a few quibbles: Given the contributors' research specializations, its essays tend to cluster around the two foci of East Asia, especially Japan, and global Buddhist modernism; an additional essay or two devoted to specific aspects of modern Buddhism in Sri Lanka, the Himalayan region, and/or Southeast Asia could have strengthened the volume's transnational perspective. Personally I would have liked to see a final chapter by one or more of the co-editors, drawing out and explicitly thematizing some of the many suggestive connections among the individual chapters. And, without denying in any way that modernity has entailed profound ruptures with the past, one might also ask for increased attention to continuities with earlier periods that may have informed particular Buddhist modernist responses. Of course, no

single volume can do everything, and *Budda no henbō* is already much more than the sum of its parts. Those wishing to orient themselves to the current state of research on modern Buddhism, especially with respect to Japan, could hardly do better than to peruse this volume.

### References

- Isomae Jun'ichi 磯前順一. 2003. *Kindai nihon no shūkyō gensetsu to sono keifu* 近代日本の宗教言説とその系譜. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Josephson, Jason Ānanda. 2012. *The Invention of Religion in Japan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ketelaar, James E. 1990. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kim, Hwansoo Ilmee. 2013. *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877-1912*. Boston: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Klautau, Orion. 2012. *Kindai nihon shisō toshite no bukkō shigaku* 近代日本思想としての仏教史学. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一. 2012. *Kindai bukkō to iu shiza: Sensō, ajia, shakaishugi* 近代仏教という視座—戦争・アジア・社会主義. Tokyo: Perikansha.
- Park, Pori. 2009. *Trial and Error in Modernist Reforms: Korean Buddhism under Colonial Rule*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies.
- Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 (ed.). 2011. *Kindai to bukkō* 近代と仏教. Kyoto: Kokusai Nihon Bunka Kenkyū Sentā.
- Yu, Xue. 2005. *Buddhism, War, and Nationalism: Chinese Monks in the Struggles against Japanese Aggressions, 1931-1945*. New York: Routledge.

Jacqueline I. Stone  
Princeton University