

JAPAN'S MODERNIZATION AND BUDDHISM

By Saburō Ienaga*

The question as to the role of traditional Japanese culture, as it developed during ancient and feudal times, in modern society, or as to its historical significance, is a question of extreme importance and, at the same time, a question which is not easily answered. Also the question of the relationship between Japan's modernization and Buddhism is, in fact, a part of the larger subject, namely, of the influence of traditional culture today. In the field of art, much basic research on the so-called modern period since the Meiji era has been undertaken; in contrast to this, the study of Buddhism in modern Japan lags far behind. Works of genuine academic achievement are few. Although there is the *Nihon kindai bukkyō-shi kenkyū* (A Study of the History of Buddhism in Modern Japan) by Kyūichi Yoshida, it may be that the time for a scholarly and documented survey of the connection between Japan's modernization and Buddhism has not yet arrived. I am really not a specialist in the history of modern Buddhism and thus totally unqualified to write on such a subject. However, as I am interested in both the history of Japanese Buddhism and the history of modern thought, and have some impressions — though perhaps academically unsound — about the connection between Japan's modernization and Buddhism, I have decided

* The following is an edited translation of the author's paper, "Nihon no kindaika to bukkyō" in *Kōza kindai bukkyō*, Vol. II, Kyoto 1961, pp. 1-35.

to discuss these impressions in this paper, and ask my readers to make the necessary corrections.

1. Buddhism in Feudal Society

Opinion may be divided about Japan's modernization depending upon the kind of definition to be given to the concept of "modern". Here I wish to follow common-sense usage and define it as a process, beginning about the time of the Meiji Restoration, of Japan's achieving maturity as a capitalistic society under the influence of the advanced Western capitalistic nations. Modernization, thus, may be accepted as the dominant tendency of Japanese history in the century which has passed since the opening of the country and the time when she began to receive directly "external pressure" from advanced capitalistic societies. However, it is now generally accepted, that the drive toward modernization had already begun, spontaneously, within Japanese society before there was any contact with advanced capitalistic nations, and that, because this condition already existed within the country, it was possible for Japan to accept the influence of the "external pressure" and accomplish modernization in a regular way. It may be said, therefore, that the phenomenon of modernization was already in evidence in an embryonic form in the Edo era, which can be regarded as a classical feudal society, long before the Meiji Restoration.

To be sure, the Edo era showed, in social structure, the classical form of feudal society characterized by the economic exploitation of the farmers by virtue of the order based on social status. Correspondingly, there prevailed, in the world

of thought, a feudal ideology which made this social status order absolute and the farmers unconditionally subservient to the ruling class of warriors. Nevertheless, the development of a money economy accompanying the development of productive power, gave rise to serious inconsistencies in the feudal system, so that the classical feudal system gradually underwent a qualitative change. At the same time there emerged more than one "heretical" idea, totally or partly opposed to the feudal ideology, which were rich in the first gleam of the modern way of thinking. Even within the Confucianism that formed the main current of orthodox feudal morality, there appeared reformist schools such as *kogaku-ha* (School of Classical Studies) which successively gave birth, as their "impish children" (*kishi*), to schools as was that of Nakamoto Tominaga whose thought was nourished by Confucian theories but who transcended them and established his own logic, or of Shōeki Andō, to the school of national literature (*kokugaku*), the statecraft school (*keiseigaku*) of Gennai Hiraga, Baien Miura, Toshiaki Honda, Seiryō Kaibo and others. Although it cannot be said that these became the direct fountainhead of modern thought after the Meiji Restoration, it cannot be denied that the existence of such thoughts and tendencies worked as a powerful historical factor making it possible for Japan to accept modern Western thought in the years following the opening of the country and to develop it further. From the viewpoint of modernization, the new ideological trends in the Edo era thus have noteworthy antecedents. What, then, was the role of Buddhism? In order to discuss the connection between the modernization of the country after the Meiji era and Buddhism,

it will be necessary to understand what Buddhism was at that time.

Buddhism, in this period, had become little more than an ideology for feudal control, and this background has been decisive for the destiny of Buddhism since then. Buddhism, in its original form, was not designed to become the servant of political power but was a teaching that denied, in principle, social status, and strongly advocated the equality of all men. Even in Japanese Buddhism, which generally was subservient to the ruling class, there undeniably existed a tradition of its being an anti-authoritarian faith that shuns power and preaches encouraging messages for the underprivileged masses. Such persons as Gyōki, the holy men of the Heian era and Shimran exemplified this characteristic of Buddhism. With the establishment of the feudal organization, however, Buddhist circles capitulated to secular power and willingly fulfilled the task of safeguarding the status quo and gave up all of their noteworthy social functions.

That the Edo Government established a system of examining the sectarian affiliation of individuals in order to strengthen the ban on *kirishitan* (early Christianity) and compelled all people to become adherents of specific temples, may be regarded, in one sense, as having made Buddhism the state religion. (The promotion of the Buddhist faith as an official state affair by the Emperor's Government in the 7th and 8th centuries was one type of state religious policy, but it was not possible at the time to tie the entire people to Buddhism. So it can be said that Buddhism was established as a state religion for the first time by the Edo Government.) As a result, the

social position of Buddhism was stabilized, which stabilization, however, became an invitation to indolence and degeneration among the priesthood. In addition, the policy of the Shogunate which banned the discussion and advocacy of new ideas in all things, made it possible for the priests, already living in idleness and bound by tradition, to slip into a state of stagnation. Not only was the development of new thought and new faith inhibited, even the enthusiastic, though ritualistic, religious faith of the past vanished. It seemed that the Buddhist temples performed their only social function in holding ceremonies for funerals, commemorations of the dead, *urabon* (the Buddhist All Souls' Day), etc. As the Buddhist sects were, on the one hand, subordinate to and protected by the feudal ruler, and on the other hand, justified their existence by holding the traditional ceremonies for the village communities, the feudal social structure had to be perpetuated by all means for the maintenance of the sects themselves. It is only natural, then, that Buddhism in the Edo era willingly cooperated in the preservation of the feudal order.

A glance at what several famous contemporary Buddhist thinkers preached will suffice to teach us the social role of Buddhism at that time. A writing of Tetsugen titled *Kana-hōgo* (Sermons in the *Kana* Alphabet) gives a stern warning against opposing the ruling system by preaching, " Foolish ones in society commit theft and receive official punishment ; they are put to shame in this life, and fall to hell for ever in the other world — this derives from a delusion of greed. And there are also people who plot such a thing as revolt and try to upset the Government ; they get punished severely, and

make even their wives, children and brothers and relatives suffer unbearably — this derives also from a delusion. It is very easy, when the idea comes up first, to perceive that it is a delusion and to dispel it from the mind.” Hakuin, another priest-thinker, upheld feudal morality by saying, “Pay homage to the Three Treasures [Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha], revere the ancestors, be filially devoted to parents and grandparents, maintain love and respect between husband and wife, live modestly according to your means, be diligent in your family profession, be obedient to the regulations of the emperor and the feudal lord” (in a song entitled *Otafuku jorō konahiki uta*) and, “The prudence of the subordinate lies in refraining from rumoring about the government, in always remembering the debts of gratitude, and in being diligent in one’s business as warrior, farmer, artisan and merchant respectively. This is loyalty to the government” (in a song entitled *Zen-aku tanemaki kagami wasan*). These may be called striking examples.

When we read about the acts of *myōkōnin* (devout Shin-shū believers), who were believed to have reached the ultimate in the Shin-shū faith, we learn that there were those who held the class distinctions to be absolutes, like Jirōzaemon Sesshū who said, “As poverty or wealth, suffering or pleasure derive from the *karma*-cause of the previous life, your being rich is due to the previous *karma*, and my being poor is also due to the accumulated *karma*; even saints cannot escape the power of *karma*” (*Myōkōnin-den* [The Lives of Myōkōnin] Vol. 1). Then there were those who positively defended the feudal exploitation of the poor and took the side of those who suppressed the resistance of the people, like Chōzō Sekishū who,

“hearing in a year of bad harvest, the villagers agreeing among themselves to ask the feudal lord to reduce the land tax in kind,” said, “Up to now we have been able to bring up our many children with the remainder after offering the land tax year after year, so it is presumptuous to ask for reduction on the ground of the rice being insufficient; this year must be said to be the very year when we should repay our debt of gratitude” (*Ibid.*, Vol. 2, Book 5). Finally, there were those who willingly accepted the feudal order and served it faithfully like Uemon Banshū who is said “to have seen the feudal lord off on the occasion of the latter’s going up to Edo for an alternate-year residence (*sankin*) by accompanying the latter’s procession for a distance of some 12 km, and returned home saying, ‘the lord makes the trip for my sake,’ and, on the lord’s return from Edo, welcomed him back saying, ‘my august guardian has come back’” (*Ibid.*, Vol. 2, Book 2). Does not the fact that a large number of people willingly accepted the feudal order and faithfully served it show clearly the social function of Buddhism in this period? I believe that, because Buddhism had changed into such an existence, the Tokugawa Government made Buddhism the state religion in order to check the *kirishitan* which endangered the feudal order, and that the Buddhist side was also able to live up to that expectation. At least, as long as Buddhism accepted the basic attitudes as stated above, there was no possibility at all of any movement emerging from it to seek things modern by conquering feudal society or feudal thought.

However, we must not forget that the Buddhism of feudal society had not only the official task of following the political

demands of the feudal ruler but also the task of satisfying the private supplications of the masses for affairs such as prosperity in business. But it goes without saying that such ritualistic functions and things modern are poles apart.

The fact that Buddhism of the Edo era had to face the Meiji Restoration while maintaining such a premodern form has an important significance. While Confucianism — which, though it occupied the orthodox position of feudal doctrine, gave birth to various anti-feudal thoughts, its “impish children” — could during the Meiji Restoration become a stump on which to graft Western thought such as modern enlightened ideas, Christianity, etc., Buddhism was obliged to take a stand almost completely opposed to the modern thought introduced from abroad. Does this not show that the difference in their roles in the world of thought of the Edo era had an almost decisive significance?

2. The Meiji Restoration and Buddhism

The Meiji Restoration was to become the beginning of a deliberate execution of orderly modernization by positively adopting the advanced Western capitalistic civilization. But the Meiji Restoration itself was not a democratic reform carried out with the clear aim of modernization. While it was supported internally by a strong aspiration for reform, it was led by the low class warriors hailing from some large clans who ostensibly advocated a perverse ideology called *sonnō-jōi* (Reverence for the Emperor and Expulsion of the Foreigners), and was also actually realized in the form of “restoration of the Imperial rule” (*ōsei fukko*) aimed at recovering the power

of the Emperor who was the ruler of the ancient state. Therefore, the Restoration government carried out, on the one hand, reforms aimed at the extinction of the feudal order, but made, on the other hand, not a few anachronistic attempts such as the revival of the ceremonies of the ancient state.

A large number of classical scholars of the school of Atsutane Hirata embraced Revival Shintō and participated in the Restoration government which upheld the "restoration of the Imperial rule", and the revival of the ceremonies of the ancient state was carried out exclusively on the basis of their advice. As one of such measures, the Buddhist ceremonies which had penetrated deeply into the religious service of Shintō shrines in the form of a syncretism of Shintō and Buddhism or had been adopted singly in the official function of the central government were severed from Shintō shrines by virtue of a policy of separation of Shintō from Buddhism (*shinbutsu bunri*), and were totally banned from the official sphere. This in itself was a great blow to Buddhism that had been living upon government authority, but the revivalist group made a further attack called "abolishment and demolition of Buddhism" (*haibutsu kishaku*), so that the injury inflicted on Buddhist circles became extremely severe.

Historically, Japanese Buddhism had never suffered such a severe blow. I am of the opinion that the so-called "abolishment of Buddhism" (*haibutsu*) immediately after the introduction of Buddhism in the 6th century was not an objective fact, so that a total persecution of Buddhism may be said to have been launched for the first time by the *haibutsu kishaku* mentioned in the preceding paragraph. There are many in-

stances of the persecution of a single individual or a sect, such as Gyōki and the *Senjū Nembutsu*, *Ikkō* or *Fuju-fuse* Schools because of acts deemed undesirable by the authorities, but these were minorities in the Buddhist world. Its main current was always in line with the authorities and received official protection. It was through the Meiji Restoration that Japanese Buddhism as a whole faced the experience of being consciously deserted by the state authority.

If Buddhism had tried on that occasion to reflect seriously on the relationship between state and religion and had sought an independent way for religion detached from the protection of civil authority, the Buddhist circles, which had fallen into the depths of indolence and degeneration under the protection of the Shogunate Government of Edo, might have found a turning point for resuscitation. However, Buddhism did not try to stand on its own feet with the help of this unprecedented "irony of fate" (*gyakuen*).

At one time the followers of the *Senjū Nembutsu* School (which exclusively practiced recitation of the *nembutsu* [*Namu Amida Butsu*]) strengthened their faith by undergoing persecution. They voluntarily severed relations with the state authority and consciously sought a meaningful religious realm of their own. But this time *haibutsu kishaku* came not because there was any anti-state tendency on the Buddhist side, rather it was an expected attack from the Revival Shintoists; so the reaction of the Buddhist priests, facing it in a completely defensive way, could hardly be anything but passive. As will be described later on, the demand for separation of church and state that appeared from the Buddhist side as a protest against

the policy of the Restoration Government of establishing Shintō as the state religion, was perhaps the only reasonable reaction. But it did not become a big movement and gave the impression of being a desperate measure of Buddhism, which had been officially recognized as the state religion by the Shogunate of Edo but whose position had been usurped by Shintō. How far this movement was based on consideration of the principle of separation of church and state among the Buddhists is open to questioning. If such consideration had been taken seriously among the Buddhist, Buddhists since would not have compromised with the authorities as easily as they actually did.

It is a fact that the blow dealt by *haibutsu kishaku* gave an opportunity of awakening to a Buddhism sunk in indolence and idle slumber for many years. It is also a fact that various kinds of self-awakening have appeared in the Buddhist world. At the same time, however, it will be difficult to deny that the Buddhist world did not try to reflect seriously on what it should be in the future, and to venture such a drastic ecdysis as would enable it to revive and develop in modern Japan with a new vitality.

3. Effort for Recovery of Influence through Ingratiation with State Authority

The basic trend of the Buddhist world seeking survival in the new age may be said to have consisted, in a word, in recovery from the blow dealt by *haibutsu ki.haku* through actively ingratiating itself with the new state authority and the ruling class supporting it.

To begin with, Buddhism took the lead in agitating against

Christianity. Catholicism, which had been banned for many years as an “evil faith” (*jashūmon*), continued to be persecuted in the beginning of the Restoration, as can be seen from the persecution of its followers in the village of Urakami. Even Protestantism, which had come later, was compelled to engage in mission work while being regarded with suspicion by high and low as a part of the same Christianity. The situation was, therefore, totally different from that of Buddhism which, though hurt by the storm of *haibutsu kishaku*, had permeated the entire population from the ruling class down to the lowest villager. Moreover, unlike Buddhism which could offer nothing positive to promote the new historical trend of “civilization and enlightenment” (*bunmei kaika*), Christianity, the religion of the advanced Western nations, was regarded as the model of this trend. Although its spiritual core was not identical with that of modern civilization, it had, more or less, a function to promote it. The spearheading of the agitation against Christianity by Buddhism thus could only result in placing Buddhism on the side of those who impeded the process of modernization.

When the initial period in which the “civilization and enlightenment” policy was powerfully promoted by the government had passed, and when the period began in which the split between government and private circles regarding the direction of modernization slowly emerged with the rise of the movement for democratic rights (*Jiyū minken undō*), the governmental side began to urge the people to return to traditional Oriental ethics, such as Confucianism, for the sake of the establishment of an absolutistic Emperor system. Those

private circles dedicated to realizing democracy and opposing the system of absolutism, counted a large number of people who did not hesitate to join hands with Christianity, if not to embrace it. The Buddhism that attacked Christianity had naturally to join the governmental camp and oppose the private democratic forces. From the end of the second decade of Meiji (1877-1886) up to the beginning of the 20th year of Meiji (1887), there took place a fierce controversy all over the country between the Buddhists and the Christians. We must not overlook the fact that this was not confined to religious issues between the two faiths, but had also considerable political significance. When a group of people, primarily Christians, made a representation concerning the practice of monogamy in 1889, the Buddhists attacked it. This is a plain example of the Buddhist reaction against the modernization movement from below.

It goes without saying that Christianity, which preaches "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's," was not always a dangerous religion to the state authority. However, to the system based on the Meiji Constitution and the Rescript on Education, which emphasized the sacred authority of the Emperor as ideologically based on the legendary stories of the age of the gods and tried to make it the spiritual prop for absolutistic authority, a Christianity that preached God as a spiritual authority above any earthly lord, must have seemed a threat in many respects. In 1891, the famous *lèse majesté* case of Kanzō Uchimura, a Christian who refused to pay homage to the Rescript on Education signed personally by the Emperor, became an occasion of fierce attacks against Christianity. In this

case the Buddhist mass communications media such as *Mitsugon shimpō*, *Meikyō shinshi*, and *Jōdo kyōhō* played a big role in condemning Uchimura by successively publishing inflammatory articles under headlines such as “The Hateful Disloyal Man”. When Tetsujirō Inoue published his article titled “Conflict between Education and Religion” on this occasion and accused Christianity of being a religion inconsistent with Japan’s educational policy, which gave rise to a dispute between him and the Christians including Gorō Takahashi, all Buddhist circles supported Inoue and drove Christianity into a very disadvantageous position by launching a unanimous attack on it. It was not necessarily a “production” planned by the absolutistic authority itself, but the fact that the Rescript on Education was functioning not only as a moral injunction but also as a symbol of absolute authority before which one had to bow one’s head just as in the case of the Imperial portrait (*go-shin’ei*), can be regarded as one result of Uchimura’s lèse-majesté case. Buddhism happened, by compromising with absolutism, to achieve unintentionally not a little merit for collaboration with the establishment of the state structure based on the Meiji Constitution and the Rescript on Education.

The attitude of the Buddhist circles that opposed the democratic trend from below and supported the move to establish a sovereign national structure from above, remained fundamentally unchanged, and the Buddhists were unable to develop a new path beyond always following the basic policy of the state authority. The state authority that had solved its internal problems by crushing the democratic rights movement gradually came to concentrate its entire energies on foreign military ex-

pansion with the development of capitalistic economy and engaged in the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars for the control of the neighboring country of Korea. Buddhism willingly supported militarism and cooperated in driving the people to war. Though, for that matter, the spirit of freedom and independence which characterized Christianity in the beginning had weakened by this time, and there appeared scenes of Buddhism and Christianity joining hands in preaching and providing consoling activities for the soldiers. A plain evidence of the Buddhist cooperation for war can be seen in an Imperial writing given subsequently to Kōzui Ōtani of Nishi-Honganji, saying, "On the occasion of the war of 1904-5, you have encouraged the public service of your adherents by enlarging upon the will of your ancestors, and have also endeavored to buttress the military morale by extensively dispatching your priests to the expeditionary forces. The effort you made was considerable. We deeply appreciate it." In May 1904, shortly after the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war, two Buddhist priests, Shindō Kuroda and Eun Maeda, joined hands with Yōichi Honda and Hiromichi Kōzaki, both Christians, and Reiichi Shibata of Shintō, and sponsored a Religionists Meeting in Tokyo. On this occasion, they tried to justify the war from the standpoint of religionists by adopting a resolution that said, among other things, "The hostilities between Japan and Russia have broken out for securing the safety of the Japanese Empire and the eternal peace of the East, and for the sake of civilization and humanity of the world." Cooperation for war with foreign countries was maintained consistently up to the Pacific War.

The period in which Japan developed as a strong militaristic country capable of making military advances into the neighboring countries of East Asia was, at the same time, the period in which inconsistencies in the capitalistic structure at home gradually became aggravated. Shortly before the Russo-Japanese war, new anti-regime movements with proletarian support furnished by the labor movement and the socialist movement began to develop. The state authority, accustomed to suppressing anti-regime movements with strong measures, not only adopted a policy of thoroughgoing suppression against these new movements but continued to encourage ideological attacks against anti-regime movements and obedience to the regime in power through education and other means of communication. That Buddhism had an important role to play in this "ideological guidance" may be evident when we look at the example of the president of the Ōmi Kenshi Company who continued, even after the end of the war, to impose employment conditions in disregard of human rights by forcing factory hands to worship before a Buddhist altar. There are numerous cases of similar nature, but I confine myself to adding an interesting example of the priests of the Hōryūji who, at a time when the conflict between landlords and tenants over the question of reducing or abolishing farm rent worsened in the years after 1912, endeavored to suppress the tenants' complaint against the landlords by emphasizing the words of Prince Shōtoku, "Priceless is the virtue of concord," in sermons addressed to the inhabitants of Hōryūji village.

Of course, such a trend as mentioned above does not apply to the Buddhist world in its entirety after the Meiji era,

as we shall see later, but the fact that it was at least the basic attitude of the Buddhist sects cannot be denied. It may perhaps be said that the historical characteristic of Japanese Buddhism, after the middle of the 7th century, in accepting the safeguarding of the regime in power as a mission for a religion that "appeases and safeguards the state" (*chingo kokka*) underwent no great change, except for some of the sects that appeared in the Kamakura era, and that this general trend has persisted in the Buddhist world since the Meiji era. However, I cannot resist saying that, unlike the ancient and feudal ages wherein anti-regime thought had not developed clear ideological forms and movements, anti-regime movements such as the democratic rights movement, socialism, and the anti-war movement were building up their powerful traditions in modern society, and yet Buddhism deliberately adopted a pose of opposing these modernization movements from below, revealing thereby the strong reactionary nature of Buddhism in modern Japan.

The Buddhist world produced a number of scholar-priests after the Meiji era. Of them, aside from Tetsujirō Inoue, who cannot be said to have been a genuine Buddhist, there seems to have been no better ideologist than Enryō Inoue in representing the basic trend of Buddhism as mentioned before. *Shinri kinshin* (A Guide to Truth) in three volumes and *Bukkyō katuron* (On Vital Buddhism) in three volumes which Inoue published successively from 1885 to 1890 were important works in which he tried to demonstrate the qualification of Buddhism as a religion for modern Japanese society. They were aimed at promoting the superiority of Buddhism by

denouncing Christianity with the assertion that, while there is agreement between Buddhism and modern natural science, Christianity is, on the contrary, full of superstition that cannot withstand the truth of modern natural science. This was in line with the purpose of these books : to give a theoretical basis to the anti-Christian movement carried on by the Buddhists with an all-out effort as a means of recovering their lost territory. As Inoue was familiar with the philosophy and science of the West, his comparative discussions of Buddhist and Christian doctrines as seen through the medium of natural science raised many interesting problems from the standpoint of the history of philosophy. However, as their actual motive was polemical, they could not, after all, become more than Buddhist apologetics based on slanders of Christianity.

In these works, which were begun toward the latter part of the second decade of Meiji (1877 and after), when the system based on the Meiji Constitution and on the Rescript on Education had not yet been established and the remaining flame of the democratic rights movement had not yet disappeared completely, appeasement of the authorities was not too apparent, and where the author judged the superiority or inferiority of Christianity from the intellectual standard of agreement or disagreement with the truth of natural science, he gave the impression of standing on the tradition of the spirit of enlightenment of the early Meiji years. But as soon as the government shifted its policies toward a more conservative line, his theories concentrated exclusively on backing the ideology of the regime. *Nihon rinrigaku an* (A Draft of Japanese Ethics) and *Chūkō katsuron* (On Vital Loyalty and Filial Piety)

published in 1893 may be cited as examples that most eloquently express such a trend. In these, Inoue explains the reasons why "There is [first] the Imperial Family and the people, but not [first] the people and then the Imperial family," emphasizes the morality of absolute obedience to the monarch, and, at the same time, evolves the idea of "coincidence of loyalty and filial piety" in the following way: "A state may be said to be a big family. Therefore, the friendly feelings toward relatives, if extended a step further, would become morality toward society and the state." Thus he gives a theoretical basis for the preservation of the pre-modern family system, and exalts the master-servant morality of the feudal age. He concludes that "even today the whole family must cultivate the sentiment of faithfulness between master and servant and offer it, collectively, to the Imperial Family. Further, the relationship between landlord and tenants should also be understood according to this." He emphasized moral obedience to the absolutistic Emperor system and the parasitic landlord system constituting its foundation. As it was a work of a period when capitalistic economy had not yet matured properly, it did not go so far as to preach laborers' subservience to the capitalist, but the fact that he acted as an eloquent mouthpiece of the ruling class in regard to its social demands — as evidenced by his advice to the tenants to be submissive to the landlord — should not be overlooked.

Next, Inoue published *Sensō tetsugaku ippan* (An Outline of War Philosophy) in 1894, in which year the Sino-Japanese War broke out. After emphasizing that war, owing to "a natural character of society," is a phenomenon inescapable in

human history, he argued that “our people should pay more attention to the war than ever and must endeavor to exert themselves at the risk of their lives by making the martial spirit their own and national independence their objective,” and exclaimed, “Vigorously foster the spirit of the people by giving a genuine militaristic education to children at home based on the great path of the coincidence of loyalty and filial piety.”

Inoue as head of the *Tetsugakkan* (literally, “The House of Philosophy”), may be regarded as having become more of a philosopher than a Buddhist. In fact, the work introduced above contains almost nothing about Buddhist doctrine and exclusively preaches secular morality. Be that as it may, we cannot but recollect with deep interest that Inoue, who had the status of a Shin-shū priest and who had entered the world of thought through an apologetical movement, displayed such ideological activities as have clearly characterized the basic trend of the Buddhist world of the Meiji era.

4. Attempts at Modernization of Buddhism

As far as the reform from above by the Meiji Government could display the power to lead Japan from capitalism to the stage of imperialism, it may be said to have been an attempt at modernization, and it may be possible to call the movement of the Buddhist world that faithfully followed this attempt also a kind of modernization. However, as long as the “modernization” from above was conducted on the basis of the absolutistic Emperor system or the paternalistic family-state system, though aimed at an intensive capitalistic development on the one hand, it could not, on the other, refrain from maintaining

and reproducing the pre-modern social structure — for example the pre-modern petty businesses with low productivity such as small enterprises and minimal farms —, so that the “modernization” from above had the inconsistency of inherently harboring factors preventing a thoroughgoing modernization, and it was natural that Buddhism, which served it, could not go thoroughly in the direction of modernization. It would seem that Japanese Buddhism, which had planted its roots in the pre-modern social relations of the village community when it began to enjoy the status of a state religion under the Shogunate regime and thus had a firm footing in the rural areas that did not receive the blessings of modernization despite the progress of a capitalistic economy, was compelled to tie up with the pre-modern side more deeply than with the capitalistic side of the system under the Meiji Constitution, and that this made the modern ecdysis of Japanese Buddhism more difficult than ever.

Nevertheless, while Japanese society was involved in a whirlpool of world history and was undergoing a rapid qualitative change, Buddhism could not remain indifferent to the general trend. In fact, attempts at modernization from various angles were carried out to a considerable extent in the Buddhist world.

The first one of them was Mokurai Shimaji's movement for the separation of church and state. Shimaji drew up, in 1872, a representation in protest against the nation-wide enlightenment activities through Shintō and Buddhism called *taikyō sempu* (propagation of the great teaching) under the direction of the state authority, and made persistent efforts for several years for the separation of Buddhism from the state authority, and

succeeded in gradually securing the principle of religious freedom, the abolition of the Ministry of Religious Affairs (*Kyōbushō*) in 1878 down to the guaranteeing of freedom of faith by the Constitution of 1889. This was possible thanks to the special conditions prevailing at the period of enlightenment when there was no strong resistance against the importation of modern Western thought in a comparatively raw form, and when the absolutistic system was not yet firmly established. In the Buddhist world lacking in forward-looking activities, this may be said to have been almost the only modernization movement. However, it was, even if inspired by the idea of separation of state and church of the modern West, richly colored by an apologetic intention of getting rid of its subordination to Shintō, and Shimaji, who at that time seemed to have fairly liberal ideas, became, by the time the anti-Christian movement had spread, one who followed others blindly in persecuting, and the resolve to attain the independence of religion from the state authority disappeared from the main current of Buddhism. Under the Meiji Constitution, which, though it upheld the freedom of faith, actually and legally institutionalized the observance of Shrine Shintō as “a duty of the subjects” by adding a supplementary phrase, “in so far as it does not disturb peace and order and does not go against the duty as a subject,” there could not be in the Buddhist world such a thing as a demand for independence of religion and, in comparison with Christianity, which, though generally fallen into a condition more or less similar to Buddhism, had men like Gien Kashiwagi and others, albeit in small number, who persistently continued their resistance to the policy of making religion kneel at the feet

of authority, Buddhism clearly failed to produce achievements comparable to it.

The second in the series was an attempt at introverting the faith. To emphasize the non-superstitious character of Buddhism by taking modern science as a standard, as Enryō Inoue did in his *Shinri kinshin* mentioned above, may be said to be a kind of modernization, though very superficial. However, it is so only in so far as Buddhism is regarded as a "philosophy"; it had little to do with the essence of Buddhism as a practical religion. It should rather be said that the movement of Gyōkai Fukuda and Shaku Unshō, who completely ignored such a thing as relationship with modern Western civilization, advocated revivalism and emphasized the observance of the Buddhist precepts (*kairitsu*) in an earnest hope of purifying the life of the sectarian Buddhists who had become corrupt and degraded, was far more appropriate for revitalizing Buddhism itself. Any world religion, which, though originally a product of ancient society, succeeds in discovering what could become an ideological tradition that transcends age by overcoming specific historical and social conditions, harbors the possibility of its revival becoming an occasion for producing a new advance forward. However, when the revival lacks a momentum for advancing forward, it cannot escape the danger of degenerating into conservatism and reactionism. The revivalism of Fukuda and others, after all, ended in a revival of a Buddhism tied up with the old system, and did not succeed in producing a Buddhism of the new age freed from the pre-modern restrictions.

A rare example of success in achieving a new development

of the Buddhist faith was the idealism (*seishin-shugi*) advocated by Manshi Kiyozawa in the fourth decade of Meiji (1897-1906).

Kiyozawa, a priest belonging to Honganji, attempted to introvert the doctrine of Shin-shū in a form easily acceptable also to the new intellectuals of the Meiji era by reviving Founder Shinran's faith in *akunin shōki* (wicked men constitute the proper object of salvation) in a pure form after discarding the feudal ideological accretions attached to the Jōdo Shin-shū. As its individualistic and idealistic characteristics possessed what satisfied the inner requirement of the intelligentsia of the middle Meiji era who, though they had experienced the awakening of the individual ego, had lost the hope of its social realization through the defeat of the democratic rights movement, it held a great attraction for the intelligentsia for a time, and left an important footprint in the world of thought. Kiyozawa's having the dual character of being a reform-religionist belonging to the priesthood is supposed to have functioned as a restraint preventing him from being logically thoroughgoing as a modern thinker.

But, judging from the fact that he obtained clues to contemplation from the Western philosophy of Hegel and Epictetus, and the fact that he drew so near to the Christian view of man as to make one wonder whether he did not renovate the *akunin shōki* theory on the basis of the Christian idea of original sin, there is no doubt that his idealism had a new age characteristic that drew a clear line between it and the Shin-shū doctrine of the past. Though it cannot be denied that, where it sharply stands apart from modern democracy, there is a passive aspect as a thought of the defeated qualitatively similar to Tōkoku Kitamura's demand for spiritual freedom, Kiyozawa's

idealism was the very thing in the realm of religion that followed the standpoint of Tōkoku and others who considered deepened inner spiritual independence and freedom a substitute for defeat in the political world. It should be regarded as a fleeting but splendid experiment for the modernization of Buddhism in so far as it pioneered a world independent of the course of absolutism by purifying the standpoint of Buddhism proper.

The movement of the "New Buddhism" group was an attempt at the modernization of Buddhism that must not be overlooked. In contrast to the idealism diving into the depths of the spiritual realm and succeeding in parting from pre-modern things to some extent, their attitude was to draw nearer to the popular course of Japan's modernization by squarely facing the moves of actual society (and yet without taking advantage of the policy of the absolutistic authority as was done typically by Enryō Inoue); by plainly admitting the contradictions of capitalistic imperialistic Japan; and, by showing abundant sympathy for the modernization movement from below. It was started when Kōyō Sakaino, Kaikyoku Watanabe Beihō Takashima and others formed an association of Buddhists (*Bukkyō seito dōshikai*) in 1899 and began to publish the magazine *Shin-bukkyō* (New Buddhism) in the following year. Their intention to denounce the institutional stiffening and the superstitious degeneration of the established sects, to become independent from the interference by the Government and the Buddhist sects in studying Buddhism, to investigate the principles of Buddhism from a free standpoint, and to accomplish the reform of society as stated in the program of the associa-

tion, may be said to show a further advance as modern thought than Kiyozawa's idealism, even if not equal in the inner depth of faith. The fact that, unlike Kiyozawa's idealism, the "New Buddhism" people showed a critical attitude in respect to the Russo-Japanese war, that they were opposed to socialism and yet showed sympathy to it and maintained an intimate relationship with such socialists as Shūsui Kōtoku and Toshihiko Sakai, proves, when compared with the general desire of the Buddhist world to conform to the will of the authorities, how rich the "New Buddhism" was in uniqueness.

However, like the idealism which preceded it, the reform activities of the "New Buddhism" did not last long either, and the leaders successively fell from the first line of the thinking world while the pre-modern ecclesiastical authority of the Buddhist sects they wanted to reform remained intact. This was a result of the fact that, while the Buddhist sects were deeply entrenched amid the backward farmers occupying the base of society, support for the idealism and the "New Buddhism" came only from a small number of urban intellectuals. In the intellectual circles, new thoughts responding directly to the concern of the times to a greater degree than Buddhism were emerging one after another. If Buddhism wanted to occupy a firm seat in it, an irreplaceable and uniquely attractive thought had to be offered, but neither the idealism nor the "New Buddhism" seems to have possessed such ideological strength. As far as modern Japanese Buddhism is concerned Kiyozawa's idealism may have been most profound, but Christianity, which was its model, was perhaps more pertinent for the modern people, and, as socialism decidedly opposed war and denied

capitalism, it was far more thoroughgoing than the halfway social ideas and criticism of war of the "New Buddhists". It was inevitable that they were defeated in the competition.

In this way, the three attempts at modernizing Buddhism all came to disappear without leaving any results of modernization until today. The only thing that somehow established an indisputable course of modernization and survives till today is the scientific modernization of Buddhist studies.

Unlike folklore beliefs whose original form lacked scriptures, Buddhism was brought to Japan after a huge system of doctrine had been formed in India, China and Korea, so that it was, of course, necessary for the Buddhist sects to make an academic effort to understand its doctrine. But, this effort was subordinate to the sectarian objectives such as ceremonies, propagation, the establishment of sectarian doctrine, etc., so that there was lack of autonomy as a science of a creative attitude of seeking the objective truth. The only occasion on which comparatively creative philosophical thinking appeared was when a founder expressed it in his doctrinal writing on the occasion of the founding of a new sect. Even when it is compared with Confucianism, which, though having a common character as a theology subordinated to religious authority, as it touches territories related to the actual world, has achieved considerable results in the pursuit of objective truth, the unscientific nature of the Buddhist studies could not be disguised. What became a motive for breaking down the Buddhist lack of interest in studies in the Shogunate period was the influence of modern Western science. Japan, which depended on the Chinese translations of the sutras even though a thousand years

had passed since the introduction of Buddhism, and which had almost no direct contact with Indian Buddhism, was totally ignorant about Indian Buddhism except for some researches in Siddham. Meanwhile, the academic world of the European countries that actually ruled India had ample facilities for the study of Indian thought at first hand and had made far-reaching progress in the study of Indian Buddhism. The Buddhist world of Japan of the first years of Meiji could not ignore this fact and conceived the idea of sending scholars to Europe for the pursuit of Indian studies. Starting with Bunyū Nanjō and Kenji Kasahara, who went to England in 1876 and studied Sanscrit under Max Müller, many scholars went abroad for study one after another. Indian philosophy came to occupy a new academic status in the learned circles of Japan.

It must not be overlooked that the view of Buddhism held by the Japanese, who knew only that Buddhism originated in India and used to discuss Buddhism without knowing anything about India in the past, now came to be exploded radically. The Japanese scholars who succeeded in directly learning about Indian Buddhism by pursuing Indian studies not only revolutionized the Japanese people's knowledge of Buddhism, but also made great contributions to the academic circles of the world in a positive way. As representative examples may be cited the introduction and publication of the English translations of the *Amida-sutra* in Sanscrit, the palm-leaf *Kongō-hannya-kyō* (*Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*), the *Butchō-sonshō-dharani*, etc., the publication of an English translation of the index of the Ming *Tripitaka*, etc. by Nanjō; the publication of the English translations of the *Kan-muryōju-kyō* and the

Nankai-kiki-den, the introduction of the original text of *Zenken-ritsu-bibasha*, etc. by Junjirō Takakusu; and a comparative study of the "Five-part" *Nikāya* in Pali and the *Agama* in Chinese translation by Masaharu Anesaki. The development of Indian philosophy in Japan has achieved remarkable progress since then, and following Anezaki and Takakusu, great scholars such as Taiken Kimura, Hakuju Ui, Hajime Nakamura have been successively produced to date.

What should be noticed along with the development of Indian studies is the development of the historical study of Buddhism. Since in the Buddhist world, which attaches a paramount importance to religious authority, the fact of historical changes in Buddhist doctrine had not been recognized and the people concerned had been content to explain the ideological changes between various sutras by replacing it with an historical evaluation called *kyōso hanjaku*, it was difficult to think of anything more than an enumeration of facts even when one spoke of the history of Buddhism. Nakamoto Tominaga, a Confucian scholar of the late 18th century, can be said to have started a historical study of Buddhism in Japan, but the Buddhists regarded it as a kind of anti-Buddhist thought and did not try to digest its historical way of thinking. In the Meiji era, as research in Indian studies progressed, recognition of the historical development became inevitable first of all in regard to Indian Buddhism. The Buddhist world, which refused to agree when Tominaga expressed the idea for the first time, was now unable to deny the proposition that Mahayana Buddhism was a product of historical development since Shakyamuni. Further, historical researches were extended to include the Buddhism of China

and Japan. The year 1894 saw the publication of the magazine *Bukkyō-shirin* (The History of Buddhism) by Kōyō Sakaino, Junkei Washio and others. A scientific history of Japanese Buddhism began to develop and to replace the sectarian bias which had been unable to think of an objective history outside of the sectarian tradition. This should not be attributed solely to the spread of the historical sense in the Buddhist world. Rather, it may be said to have been a result of the scholars of history having pushed intensive researches on Buddhism. Whether it can be called a modernization of the Buddhist world is doubtful, but when we consider that a large number of scholars in the history of Buddhism emerged from the Buddhist circles and that, to some extent, outspoken historical interpretations were advanced even in regard to the history of the Buddhist sects and the biographies of the founder that had been filled with mythology, the progress of modernization cannot be denied after all.

That the scientific study of Buddhism progressed in this manner is a characteristic that clearly distinguishes Japanese Buddhism of olden days when there was almost no scientific coloring from Buddhism after the Meiji era. Nevertheless, it cannot be overlooked that the fact that most Buddhist scholars are priests of the Buddhist sects and that the free progress of research is difficult without the cooperation of the sects considerably hampers the growth of Buddhist studies as a modern science. As a hindrance to positive research there stands solidly the super-academic religious (actually, sectarian) authority which lays down, consciously or unconsciously, a big limitation to the search after truth for the sake of truth. Is this not plainly

shown in the fact that, as mentioned above, remarkable results of academic development are exclusively concentrated in the two fields of Indian studies and Buddhist history, and that there are few unique achievements in the field of philosophical studies pregnant with the danger of swaying the sectarian teachings of the Buddhist sects? We must realize that the stagnation of the Buddhist sects definitely constitutes the obstacle to the modernization of Buddhism also in this respect.

5. Modern Culture and Buddhism

I believe the attitude taken by the Buddhists toward Japan's historical trend of modernization has been clarified by what I have stated in the foregoing. Then, what attitude did society in general — which was treading the path of modernization — take toward Buddhism? This is the question to be tackled next.

As stated already, the main current of the Buddhist sects succeeded in making the position of Buddhism secure under the capitalistic setup subjected to the Emperor system by strenuously ingratiating themselves with the ruling authority. Thus it was inevitable that they should stand in a relationship of enmity against the modern renovation movement that tried to oppose the spread of absolutism and capitalism from above and promote modernization from below. Among the leaders of the democratic rights movement there were many who took up religious thoughts antagonistic to Buddhism, as can be seen from the examples of Kenkichi Kataoka who was baptized and Chōmin Nakae who advocated atheism. Even after the birth of the socialist movement, there were Christians such as Isoo

Abe and Sanshirō Ishikawa but very few Buddhists among the socialists of the first period. When Marxism came to occupy a central position in the socialist movement there was, of course, no room for producing a positive rapport with Buddhism as all religions, including Buddhism were denounced as opium for the people. Besides, the compromise of the Buddhist sects with the ruling class resulted in the endorsement, as it were, of the proposition that religion is opium for the people so that the gap between Buddhism and the renovation ideology became increasingly bigger.

However, we cannot simply conclude that Buddhism and the modern renovation ideology from below were in a state of complete antagonism. It is worthy of note that, though the general trend was as stated above, even among the promoters of the democratic rights movement there was such a person as Emori Ueki who was first a devout Protestant Christian, but later came to ascertain the ideological superiority of Buddhism through a comparison of the doctrines of Buddhism and Christianity. In the socialist camp there was also a man [like Gudō Uchiyama, a Buddhist priest, who plunged into a most radical revolutionary movement. These examples are not a phenomenon that could sway the general trend of the world of thought, but they can serve to prove that the modernization movement from below harbored abundant conditions of being able to join hands positively with Buddhism.

It may be very questionable whether Yukichi Fukuzawa can be included among the renovators who attempted modernization from below, but in so far as he consistently advocated an all-round absorption of modern Western civilization and a thorough-

going breakdown of feudalistic customs, he is qualified to be called Japan's number one advocate of modern thought in the Meiji era. It is important that this very Fukuzawa entertained a very Buddhistic concept as the basis of his advocacy of modernization, namely, that "human life is like a poor maggot; it is only playing and passing a span of 50 years or 70 years that scarcely allows even the morning dew to dry up." Though there may be room for debating whether this is a Buddhist idea or not, it may well be admitted that it has received some suggestion from Buddhist thought when we consider that Fukuzawa associated, in his later years, with Buddhist priests like Jummyō Shinohara and Gōjun Shichiri. Moreover, it is important that such an idea, unlike the usual case in which it leads to a passive retreat, has played a role of supporting a positivism of "being able to be active" because of "belittling of the mundane world," and it is not impossible to regard it as expressing the acme of the spirit of Mahayana Buddhism. In any case, was it not beautifully proven in the case of Fukuzawa that Buddhism and modern renovationism could tie up with each other without any contradiction?

Generally speaking, however, it seems that a positive connection between renovationism and Buddhism as in the case of Fukuzawa was evident in comparatively few cases, and the influence of Buddhism on renovationism was mostly of a nature that dampened the renovative character. As Naoe Kinoshita is thought never to have lost his intention toward revolution until his death, it may be too hasty to judge the influence of Buddhism on Kinoshita on the ground of the external phenomenon that he believed in Christianity at the time when he was active

in the front lines of the social movement, but began to show interest in Buddhism toward the time he retired and gave up practical activities. The fact that the replacing of Christianity by Buddhism in the spiritual life of Kinoshita has such a chronological sequence would seem to have some meaning. But, as the concrete relationship between Buddhism and modern renovationism harbors many delicate problems, it may be difficult to reach a definite conclusion before the matter is studied further in the future.

Turning our eyes from political renovationism to the cultural world in general, there are, among the artists and other men of culture since the Meiji era, not a few persons who positively took their spiritual food from Buddhism. Though the state of "To conform to Heaven and get rid of self" (*sokuten kyoshi*) which Sōseki Natsume reached in his later years may have been induced from his own experience, at the same time it cannot be denied that it was a state formed at the suggestion of the state of enlightenment of Zen in which he had been showing a deep interest for a long time. It is well known that Kitarō Nishida, who built up the system of his original "Nishida philosophy", had contacts with Zen since his youth and in due time carved out a path of his own by creating an Oriental — it may also be called a Buddhistic — philosophy called the logic of "place" (*basho*), which is qualitatively quite different from the objective logic of the West. Both Natsume and Nishida were modern intellectuals specializing in Western learning who, in the course of developing their thinking, found in the Buddhist view of the world a separate significance which could not be sought after in modern Western civilization, and tried

to break therewith the deadlock of thought based exclusively on Western culture. Whether the influence of Buddhism in them worked as a plus or as a minus has to be considered as another problem, but it is very noteworthy that persons as these, who are to be called the leading figures of the modern cultural world, have accomplished their achievements by studying Buddhism.

When Buddhism is considered as a cultural heritage it is necessary to consider not only its invisible spiritual aspects such as faith and doctrine, but also its concrete aspects. In this connection it must not be overlooked that Buddhist art, which has an especially great weight in Buddhist culture, began to be highly appreciated after the Meiji era. Due to the fact that there were no noteworthy new developments in Buddhist art in the Edo era and that there was a strong tendency to deny ancient art owing to the *haibutsu kishaku* and the atmosphere of breaking down the things of old, in the early Meiji years there was almost no one who paid attention to Buddhist art. But since the third decade of Meiji (1887-1896), with the rise of ultra-nationalism, traditional art was subjected to reevaluation, and interest in Buddhist art deepened when the artistic value of the temple architecture and the Buddhist images of the Asuka, Hakuho, and Tempyo eras were valued highly by Fenollosa and Tenshin Okakura. The cultural-historical position of Horyuji, Yakushiji, Todaiji Hokkedo, etc. was established for the first time by such attempts at reevaluation.*

* A small number of amateurs, such as Tadatomo Hoida, were engaged in research from an archeological point of view, so that the significance of Buddhist culture was not generally understood.

In the feudal society, only such a revaluation gave a new impetus also to the creative world, and led to giving new standard models to Japanese art as can be seen in the "Birth of Buddha" (*Buttan*) painted by Kanzan Shimomura after he had studied the style of the murals at the *Kondō* of Hōryūji. However, this revaluation of Buddhist art, which was exclusively conducted as a re-perception of artistic value, resulted in leading people to understand Buddhist art as mere works of art instead of grasping it religiously as objects of faith, and totally failed to promote the revival of Buddhism in modern society as a religion. Therefore, although academic study of Buddhist art was intensive, new creations of Buddhist art were at a low ebb. Even when something related to Buddhism was used as material, fascinating works were scarce in the fields of Buddhist painting and sculpture. That the huge statues of Kannon (*Avalokiteśvara*) built at Ōfuna and Maebashi are artistically extremely clumsy is not unrelated to the fact that there is a lack of religious fervor such as was prominent in the ages when superb Buddhist art was produced. In this respect, a similar historical circumstance may be noted in the fact that, while the study of the history of Buddhism made great progress, creative Buddhist ideas did not emerge at all.

Thus, though there exist many problems, it is a fact that the ideological world and the cultural world of modern Japan maintained certain types of relations with Buddhism. This, it may be said, was quite natural when we think of the long tradition of Buddhism throughout Japanese history. However, is it not important for us to observe that the ties with Buddhism as described above were a phenomenon observable only

among a small number of cultured people who had a deep understanding of the past cultural tradition, and that, when we turn our eyes to Japanese society as a whole, we find that there had developed a completely different phenomenon?

Despite the blow dealt by the *haibutsu kishaku*, Buddhism survived tenaciously at the base of Japanese society. In the modernized society of Japan, the function of the Buddhist sects as a cult of the community since the Edo era is still in existence. Not only in the farming villages but also in the urban areas, the annual functions for *higan* (the equinoctial week) and *urabon* (the Buddhist All Souls' Day) are being repeated at the hands of the Buddhist priests, and the funeral rites are still mostly conducted in Buddhist style. Leaving the old people aside, it is doubtful how much the younger generation of Japanese people believe in Buddhism. Most of them probably do not believe in religion, but even if they are unbelievers at heart, there are many who feel no inconsistency in inviting a priest to chant sutras in the traditional way on the occasion of a funeral. It is probably for this reason that the Buddhist sects can maintain their existence by force of habit. In Japan, where a ceremony for purifying the building site according to the Shintō faith is conducted on the occasion of the construction of an Atomic Power Research Institute, the intensive utilization of the products of modern scientific civilization — television, jet planes, electronic computers — and the conducting of ritualistic ceremonies (essentially not of Buddhist origin) — are co-existing without arousing any suspicion of being very strange. We must understand that the background of social psychology made the survival of the Buddhist sects

possible after the Meiji era, and not any achievement of modernization adapted to modern society.

I believe that Japan since the Meiji era always tolerated, even while treading the path of modernization, the existence and perpetuation of an extensive pre-modern social structure and living mode at the base of society. This was due primarily to the fact that almost no modernization of farming villages had been conducted, but the situation was the same in small and medium commercial and industrial enterprises. The pre-modern way of thinking and feudal customs persisted in these spheres as they had in the past. Buddhist sects maintained their influence as they had in the past by repeating the social functions they had performed in feudal society, and this was possible because many traditional ways were preserved in modern Japan.

Does this not constitute an important premise in forecasting the destiny of Japanese Buddhism in the future? Specifically, if the modernization of Japanese society is pushed forward thoroughly in the future, and if pre-modern conditions disappear in due time, it is bound to become difficult for the Buddhist sects to retain their influence in its present form by force of habit. In today's Japan the number of households that do not have Buddhist altars has increased, and we shall not consider the record of visits to the Buddhist temple, but we may wonder how many people would have the patience to meekly listen to the unintelligible sutra chanting even after modernization has gone very far. Attempts to choose materials for creating new culture from Buddhist thought or related culture as a cultural heritage may become more lively than today, but this concerns Buddhism as a cultural asset preserved in libraries and museums,

and not the Buddhist sects as a social influence.

Then, is Buddhism as a living religion fated to go against the progress of Japan's modernization, and to head for a downfall with the completion of modernization? Such a conclusion does not necessarily emerge from the considerations I have given above. What is diagnosed as being difficult to maintain with the progress of modernization is the way of the Buddhist sects whose only social function is holding ritualistic funeral rites. If Buddhism gives up such pre-modern forms and finds a way out of its difficulties, the progress of modernization will never endanger the future life of Buddhism.

As I do not have a detailed knowledge of the Nipponzan Myōhōji, neither as to its history nor as to its present condition, I am not qualified to give an accurate evaluation of the Myōhōji sect. But was not a way to be followed by the Buddhist sects of Japan shown by the attitude of the Myōhōji priests who, worrying about the serious results to be brought about by the expansion of the American air base at Sunakawa, and wishing to safeguard the peace and security of Japan, willingly joined hands with a large number of citizens, laborers and students in lining up for a scrimmage against the expansion work, and did not flinch even when their white robes were stained with blood by the truncheons used by the police. In it was revived the most noble tradition of Japanese Buddhism that produced Shinran who did not cease to preach his message for the sake of the masses even while he put up with unjust persecution and spent an exile's life in the eastern provinces. If Japanese Buddhism is not contented with surviving only as a past cultural asset similar in nature to stone and earthen

ware exhibited in museums, does not the way it should follow become evident in itself?

Kanji Glossary

Abe, Isoo 安部磯雄
akunin shōki 悪人正機
 Andō, Shōeki 安藤昌益
 Anezaki, Masaharu 姉崎正治
 Asuka 飛鳥
basho 場所
 Banshū, Uemon 播州卯右衛門
Bukkyō katsuron 仏教活論
Bukkyō seito dōshikai 仏教清徒同志会
Bukkyō-shirin 仏教史林
bunmei kaika 文明開化
Butchō-sonshō-darani 仏頂尊勝陀羅尼
Buttan 仏誕
chingo kokka 鎮護国家
Chūkō katsuron 忠孝活論
 Edo 江戸
Fuju-fuse 不受不施
 Fukuda, Gyōkai 福田行誠
 Fukuzawa, Yukichi 福沢諭吉
go-shin'ei 御真影
gyakuen 逆縁
 Gyōki 行基
haibutsu 廃仏
haibutsu kishaku 廃仏毀釈
 Hakuho 白鳳
 Hakuin 白隠
 Heian 平安
higan 彼岸
 Hiraga, Gennai 平賀源内
 Hirata, Atsutane 平田篤胤
 Hōida, Tadatomo 穂井田忠友
 Honda, Toshiaki 本多利明
 Honda, Yōichi 本多庸一
 Hōryūji 法隆寺

Ienaga, Saburō 家永三郎
Ikkō 一向
 Inoue, Enryō 井上円了
 Inoue, Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎
 Ishikawa, Sanshirō 石川三四郎
jashūmon 邪宗門
Jiyū minken undō 自由民権運動
Jōdo kyōhō 浄土教報
Jōdo Shin-shū 浄土真宗
 Kaibo, Seiryō 海保青陵
kairitsu 戒律
 Kamakura 鎌倉
Kana-hōgo 仮名法語
Kan-muryōju-kyō 觀無量寿經
 Kannon 觀音
 Kashiwagi, Gien 柏木義円
 Kasahara, Kenju 笠原研寿
 Kataoka, Kenkichi 片岡健吉
keisei-gaku 経世学
 Kimura, Taiken 木村泰賢
 Kinoshita, Naoe 木下尚江
kirishitan キリシタン
kishi 鬼子
 Kitamura, Tōkoku 北村透谷
 Kiyozawa, Manshi 清沢満之
kogaku-ha 古学派
kokugaku 国学
Kondō 金堂
Kongō-hannya kyō 金剛般若經
 Kōtoku, Shūsui 幸徳秋水
 Kozaki, Hiromichi 小崎弘道
Kōza kindai bukkyō 講座 近代仏教
 Kuroda, Shindō 黒田真洞
Kyōbushō 教部省
kyōso hanjaku 教相判釈
 Kyoto 京都

- Maebashi 前橋
 Maeda, Eun 前田慧雲
 Meiji 明治
Meikyō shinshi 明教新誌
Mitsugon shimpō 密藏新報
 Miura, Baien 三浦梅園
 Myōhōji 妙法寺
myōkōnin 妙好人
Myōkōnin-den 妙好人伝
- Nakae, Chōmin 中江兆民
 Nakamura, Hajime 中村元
Namu Amida Butsu 南無阿彌陀仏
Nankai-kiki-den 南海寄帰伝
 Nanjō, Bunyū 南条文雄
 Natsume, Sōseki 夏目漱石
nembutsu 念仏
Nihon kindai bukkuyō-shi kenkyū
 日本近代仏教史研究
Nihon no kindaika to bukkuyō
 日本の近代と仏教
Nihon rinrigaku an 日本倫理学案
 Nipponzan Myōhōji 日本山妙法寺
 Nishida, Kitarō 西田幾多郎
 Nishi-Honganji 西本願寺
- Ōfuna 大船
 Okakura, Tenshin 岡倉天心
 Ōmi Kenshi 近江絹糸
ōsei fukko 王政復古
Otafuku jorō konahiki uta
 おたふく女郎粉引歌
 Ōtani, Kōzui 大谷光瑞
- Sakai, Toshihiko 堺 利彦
 Sakaino, Kōyō 境野黄洋
sankin 参観
seishin-shugi 精神主義
 Sekishū, Chōzō 石州長藏
Senjā Nembutsu 専修念仏
Sensō tetsugaku ippan 戦争哲学一斑
 Sesshū, Jirōzaemon 撰州治郎左衛門
- Shaku, Unshō 釈雲照
 Shibata, Reiichi 柴田礼一
 Shichiri, Gōjun 七里恒順
 Shimaji, Mokurai 島地黙雷
 Shimomura, Kanzan 下村観山
Shin-bukkyō 新仏教
shinbutsu bunri 神仏分離
 Shinohara, Jummyō 篠原順明
 Shinran 親鸞
Shinri kinshin 真理金針
Shin-shū 真宗
 Shintō 神道
 Shōtoku (Prinz) 聖徳太子
sokuten kyoshi 則天去私
sonnō-jōi 尊皇攘夷
 Sunakawa 砂川
- taikyō sempu* 大教宣布
 Takahashi, Gorō 高橋五郎
 Takakusu, Junjirō 高橋順次郎
 Takashima, Beihō 高島米峰
 Tempyō 天平
Tetsugakkan 哲学館
 Tetsugen 鉄眼
 Tōdaiji Hokkedō 東大寺法華堂
 Tōkoku See Kitamura
 Tominaga, Nakamoto 富永仲基
- Uchimura, Kanzō 内村鑑三
 Uchiyama, Gudō 内山愚童
 Ueki, Emori 植木枝盛
 Ui, Hakuju 宇井伯寿
urabon 盂蘭盆
 Urakami 浦上
- Washio, Junkei 鷲尾順敬
 Watanabe, Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭
 Yakushiji 薬師寺
 Yoshida, Kyūichi 吉田久一
Zekenritsu-bibasha 善見律毘婆沙
Zen 禪
Zen-aku tanemaki kagami wasan
 善悪種蒔鏡和讃