

REVIEWS

Religious Studies in Japan (2)

*Edited by the
Japanese Association for Religious Studies and the
Japanese Organizing Committee of the
Ninth International Congress for the History of Religions.
Tokyo: Maruzen Company, Ltd., 1959, pp. 507, ¥2,500.*

Having already considered those articles which deal with particular religions, we turn now to the articles which may be described generally as having a methodological motif.

Professor Teruji Ishizu,^a who has served as chairman of the board of editors for the entire volume, shows in the opening article that valid communication of truth in Buddhism is done only in the teacher-disciple relationship. We are prone to ask what this means for the researcher, interested in Buddhism, who cannot or does not choose to be involved in such a relationship. In other words, is Buddhism understandable only to the devotee?

Professor Hideo Kishimoto^b has contributed a helpful paper in general terms on the meaning of religion to the Japanese people. Professor Nobukiyo Nomura's report on the results of psychological tests given to Protestant pastors, Shinto priests, and people with no religious affiliation, is a fascinating survey of varying attitudes. Professor Ichirō Hori's^d study of "the phenomenological development of the Pure Land School" is remarkable for its clarity and its insightful presentation in brief compass of the major trends of Nara and Heian Buddhism. Professor Hiromasa Ikegami's^e study of the role of mountains in Japanese religions, and Professor Sojun

a. 石津照彌 b. 岸本英夫 c. 野村穉清 d. 堀一郎 e. 池上広正

REVIEWS

Moroto's^a analysis of the origins of ancestor worship in China, round out a group of essays which the reviewer would group together (although they are not grouped together in the book), as clear systematic studies on religious phenomena which unquestionably extend the bounds of our knowledge.

In two of the above-mentioned papers, however, there are the most curious statements regarding Christianity. Professor Kishimoto says: "The spread of Christianity is like an overwhelming flood. It wipes out everything." One wonders if the Christian movement in Japan has been so insensitive to culture? At another point he speaks of introspection in order to change one's attitude toward the world and its problems as a Buddhist manner of life which is in contrast to Western religious tradition. Has Christianity in Japan been so activist that its great mystical tradition, its historic insistence on the rigorous searching of one's soul, its pattern of quiet expectancy before the Lord, have gone unnoticed? Although an affirmative answer is possible to both

questions, it is also quite likely that observers have seen only one side of a many-sided movement.

In referring to the failure of Christianity to be synthesized with the culture of Japan, Professor Ikegami says that "no new sects of Christianity have been established by the Japanese." Is not the Non-church (*Mukyōkai*) movement in actuality such a sect, in spite of that group's distrust of any form of organization?

Messrs. Katayama,^b Kusunoki,^c Nishitsuoi,^d and Niyeda^e write a series of papers dealing with the philosophy of religion. Professor Masahiro Kusunoki, in dealing with Scheler and Mensching on the problem of man in religions, makes some very keen observations on misery and deliverance as conceived in Buddhism. Professor Masayoshi Nishitsuoi's brilliant discussion of science and myth as the major problem of our time ends with a proposal of *śūnyatā* as a possible perspective. He unfortunately gives only a few lines of his last paragraph to his proposal, so we hardly know what he has in mind. And

a. 諸戸素純 b. 片山正直 c. 楠正弘 d. 西角井正慶 e. 仁戸田六三郎

Professor Rokusaburō Niyeda, who hopes to conceive a philosophy which will reconcile all the “contraries and contradictions” between East and West, admits: “This thesis is only a dream-like blueprint.”

Perhaps this is the point at which to deal with Professor Fumio Masutani's^a article on two types of faith in Buddhism, the thesis of which has already been presented in his comparative study of Buddhism and Christianity. The designation of Jōdo Shin faith as devotion to a person is demonstrable, but to depict faith in early Buddhism as “understanding through reason” is to subsume the vast panorama of early Buddhism under one rubric. *Dharma* is more than rational doctrine, and if one admits, as Professor Masutani does, that faith as devotion is a necessary prerequisite to faith as understanding, then how can faith as understanding, or reason, be descriptive of early Buddhism?

Perhaps it is a problem of translating very loaded terms. For example, Professor Yoshinori Moroi^b has a lot to say about faith in his

article on “believing”, but never mentions the word “trust” as one meaning of the word faith, and suggests “adventure” only in a footnote. And if Professor Ichi Oguchi^c would go on to spell out his methodological principle—“scientific understanding based on sympathy”—our studies of the faith of another might be more adequate.

We must mention a series of very competent papers in various fields: Messrs Shigeo Abe^d and Jōji Tanase^e discuss the problems of functional anthropology in reference to the work of Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski. Professor Yoshinori Takeuchi^f delves into the subject of sacred time and space, Professor Kiyoto Furuno^g surveys the progress of French Roman Catholic sociology, and Professor Shōkō Odawara^h presents Kant's theory of symbols carefully and systematically. Professor Shinjō Takenakaⁱ provides us with an excellent survey of developments in the Psychology of Religion, and Professor Hitoo Marukawa^j does the same with the views of philosophers of

a. 増谷文雄 b. 諸井慶徳 c. 小口偉一 d. 阿部重夫 e. 棚瀬襄爾
f. 武内義範 g. 古野清人 h. 小田原尚興 i. 竹中信常 j. 丸川仁夫

REVIEWS

the Enlightenment on the Origin of Religion.

This reviewer has mentioned each of the articles in this symposium because each article has some merit, and all have been read with interest and profit. Those papers which have provoked critical comment are in some measure the best, and it is hoped that such comment will in turn encourage further effort to think and write about problems that are basic to our common task as students and interpreters of the world's religions.

We are completely overwhelmed by the breadth and detail of scholarship which is to be found in Japan. The competence in the use of numerous languages is nothing short of remarkable. The grasp of key figures and movements in Western thought by Japanese scholars leaves a Western student a bit ashamed as he thinks of the few Western scholars who have a similar grasp of Eastern thought. The concern by the men whose papers appear in this volume to understand and interpret their own religious traditions should be received by all

people with openness and receptivity, for such a concern in East and West will ultimately lead to the understanding we seek so desperately.

Interest in Japan and the East is increasing in America and in the West generally. Such volumes as *Religious Studies in Japan* help immeasurably to further this interest. Since so few people in the West have any knowledge of any Oriental language, we must plead (unfairly) for more translation and publication of Japanese works in English. For Japanese to write in English, or to arrange for translation, is difficult and tedious, and the financial reward is undoubtedly small, but works by Japanese scholars in English have made a tremendous contribution to scholarship throughout the world in the past, just as this volume and various others will make today. We say "*arigatō gozaimasu*," ("Thank you") with deep respect and appreciation for this volume, and with eager anticipation for other which shall follow.

Hong Kong Richard Bush