



Tanigawa Yutaka 谷川 穰, *Meiji zenki no kyōiku, kyōka, Bukkyō* 明治前期の教育・教化・仏教 [Education, proselytization and Buddhism in the early Meiji period]

Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 2008. vi + 347 pp. + index. Cloth, ¥5,800.
ISBN 978-4-7842-1386-3.

THE author, an associate professor of Japanese history at Kyoto University, provides us with a work on a much understudied aspect of early Meiji Japan: the role of Buddhism in the construction of a modern public educational system. While the separation between “religion” and “education” is held to be one of the basic tenets of this system in Japan, Tanigawa focuses exactly on the period before such dichotomization became the norm. In fact, this is perhaps one of the most important contributions of this work: a detailed portrait of the diversification process of *kyō* 教 (teaching). Therefore, “without adhering merely to the ‘modern’ perspective premised on the splintering of *kyō* into ‘education’ [*kyōiku* 教育], ‘proselytization’ [*kyōka* 教化], and ‘religion’ [*shūkyō* 宗教]” (23), the author reevaluates the development of public schools in the early Meiji period, contributing to such diverse fields as educational, religious, and even political history.

The book is divided into two parts (each of them subdivided into three chapters) and a concluding chapter. The first part, “Doctrinal Instructors and Education: The First Years of the Meiji Period,” analyzes some of the “pre-splintering” features of *kyō* through an assessment of “local” cases. Based on historical documentation from the short-lived Chikuma Prefecture 筑摩県,¹ Tanigawa shows us the “gap” between the ideals of the central government and the local reality. While the tendency among Meiji ideologues—especially after 1872, with the demise of the Jingishō 神祇省 (Ministry of Shinto Affairs) and subsequent promulgation of the Gakusei 学制 (Education System Order)—was to separate religion and education, in Chikuma Prefecture things were not as yet so clear: temples used as school buildings and monks serving simultaneously as instructors were far from exceptional.

In the first chapter, the author reveals aspects of the tension between the Kyōbushō 教部省 (Ministry of Doctrine) and the Monbushō 文部省 (Ministry of Education). In 1872, Kyōbushō official Mishima Michitsune 三島通庸 (1835–1888) managed to add, in the above-mentioned Gakusei, regulations on schools run by

1. Created in December 1871 with the amalgamation of several prefectures established immediately following the *Haihan-chiken* 廃藩置県 act of August of that same year, Chikuma prefecture comprised parts of present-day Nagano and Gifu prefectures. The prefectural office was set up in Matsumoto, but after this literally went down in flames in 1876, the Meiji government decided to dismember Chikuma and divide its area among some of the neighboring prefectures.

Shinto Priests and Buddhist Monks (*Jinkan sōryo gakkō no koto* 神官僧侶学校ノ事). Mishima's intention was to incorporate the teachings of Shinto into the public educational system, but things did not go as expected. Monbushō officials Kido Takayoshi 木戸孝允 (1833–1877) and Tanaka Fujimaro 田中不二麿 (1845–1909), who had just returned from Europe as part of the Iwakura Mission and were now supporters of the “separation between education and religion,” strove to abolish these “Shinto-Buddhist schools.” Mishima was forced to resign, and especially after the withdrawal of Jōdo Shin priests from the Daikyōin 大教院 (Great Teaching Institute) in 1875, the principle of separation between education and religion became, at least as an ideal, the norm.

In both the second and third chapters, the author analyzes the reception of the above-mentioned principle by local society. The second chapter focuses on conflicts between doctrinal instructors (*kyōdōshoku* 教導職) sent from the central government in 1873, and regional bureaucrats from Chikuma prefecture. When the Shōkyōin 小教院 (a local branch of the Daikyōin) established by these instructors came into conflict with the public school run by the prefectural office, it was the former which received the most popular support, showing that the principle endorsed by the central government was, in general terms, still not clearly established. In the third chapter, Tanigawa focuses specifically on the “proselytization” strategies put forward by doctrinal instructors, both Buddhist monks and Shinto priests. As the author shows, these men followed their own different “religious” agendas while performing their preaching activities as Kyōbushō employees, but they all emphasized the contents of government decrees (154), which also obviously matched the prefectural office's requirements. In the same chapter, the author describes the reception of political measures for the separation of “proselytism” and “education” in terms of place (*ba* 場) and personnel (*hito* 人).

In part two, “Buddhism and Education: The Second and Third Decades of Meiji,” the author focuses on the period between the end of the 1870s to the 1890s, after the dismantling of the Kyōbushō. Chapter 4 analyzes the debate on Buddhist priests working as school instructors (*Sōryo kyōin kenmu ron* 僧侶教員兼務論), which took place around 1880. Monks had been forbidden to perform this activity since 1873, but this enterprise was condoned in reality due to a lack of teachers. When such legal impediments were removed in 1879, controversy arose among both Buddhists and non-Buddhists as to whether or not this was a good opportunity. While priests now came to understand working in public schools as no more than a diversion from their main obligation, some educators saw it as an opportunity to further develop the teaching of “moral education” (*tokuiku* 德育). In chapter 5, the author analyzes the development of schools for the training of Buddhist priests in the 1880s by focusing on the case of the Futsū Kyōkō 普通教校 (Normal School). Established by the Honganji branch of the Jōdo Shin sect in April 1885 amidst a debate on the prospects and limitations of contemporary seminary-style Buddhist schools, the Futsū Kyōkō was—*a priori*, at least—open to priests and laypeople alike. Therefore,

through a consideration of the tensions and accommodations involved in the creation and operation of the Futsū Kyōkō, the author contributes further to our understanding of the meaning of both “lay” and “religious” education in this period. The sixth chapter considers the unfolding (and fading), throughout the late 1880s, of the previously mentioned debate on Buddhist priests serving concurrently as school instructors. Focusing on discourses put forward in both Buddhist and pedagogical periodicals, Tanigawa shows how the polemics intensified within the larger context of the “moral education debate” boosted by Katō Hiroyuki’s 加藤弘之 November 1887 lecture on the subject. Furthermore, the author describes how the establishment of sect-run schools for lay people took a new turn in the 1880s, especially after Buddhist institutions began stressing the idea of *jizen* 慈善 (charitable benevolence) towards pauper children. He interestingly hints at a correlation between a later fading in such emphasis and the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education (*Kyōiku chokugo* 教育勅語; 1890) and the subsequent “collision between education and religion” dispute (1892–1893).

The final chapter consists of general remarks connecting the findings presented in parts one and two. The overall contribution of this work is, according to the author, an understanding of the actual ways in which “school ‘education’ [*kyōiku*] in modern Japan was established through the utilization of both ‘proselytization’ [*kyōka*]... and ‘Buddhism’ [*Bukkyō*] as a *basis* [*fumidai*]” (337). Therefore, in light of several new documents and grounded in an interdisciplinary approach, Tanigawa describes how Buddhism—despite it being regarded as “anti-enlightenment” (*hikai-kateki* 非開化的)—was used by the government in terms of place and personnel in order to build a “secularized” educational system. In fact, by concentrating not only on the central government’s decrees themselves but also on their actual application throughout local society, the author is able to show that, at least up until the 1880s, things were not so “black and white” regarding issues of what was “religious” and what was “secular.”

Despite the book’s many positive traits, there are also a few minor issues. These are mostly theoretical problems related to some of the key concepts used by Tanigawa. For instance, the term *bukkyōkai* 仏教界 (“Buddhist circles”) utilized throughout part two could benefit from further explanation, especially since many of the examples provided are from the Jōdo Shin sect. Still, this does not diminish the value of this volume. It will definitely remain as one of the most important works on the history of modern Japanese Buddhism published in the past decade.

Orion Klautau

Japan Society for the Promotion of Science