

Aihua ZHENG

## Buddhist Networks: The Japanese Preparation for the World's Parliament of Religions, 1892–1893

This article examines how the Japanese Buddhist delegates to the World's Parliament of Religions in 1893 prepared in Japan for their task of representing Japanese Buddhism to the West. From the late 1880s to the early 1890s, the Japanese Buddhist community was connected through the popular press, print media, and private organizations, which facilitated their resource sharing. The national network empowered the Japanese to collaborate with Buddhists in South Asia and with supporters in the West and participated in their pan-Asian networking. Through these networks, a group of internationally minded Japanese Buddhists helped the delegates gain information and resources to prepare a version of Japanese Buddhism acceptable to most domestic sects. Moreover, the delegates decided to portray their faith as a Japanese-style Mahāyāna tradition in line with the Western view of Buddhism. Their popularity in Chicago contributed to the globalization and revival of Japanese Buddhism.

KEYWORDS: Shaku Sōen—the World's Parliament of Religions—Meiji Buddhism—pan-Asian Buddhism—Bukkyō Kakushū Kyōkai

Aihua ZHENG is Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of Religious Studies and the Department of History at the University of Iowa.

ON 30 JULY 1893 a farewell party was held at Engakuji 円覚寺 in Kamakura. The entrance of the monastery was decorated with Japanese flags and lotus blossoms in antique celadon porcelain vases made in India. More than one hundred and fifty guests attended the party, and the majority were Engakuji clerics, dignitaries, and laypeople from the neighboring city of Yokohama (MS 2 August 1893). These guests came to send off Shaku Sōen 釈宗演 (1860–1919), the head abbot (*kanchō* 管長) of the Engakuji branch, for his journey to Chicago to present at the World's Parliament of Religions (11–27 September), which was part of the World's Columbian Exposition (1 May–30 October). The party illustrated Sōen's prestige and conviction that the future of Rinzai Zen and Engakuji rested on the international standing of Japanese Buddhism. The national flags presented telling evidence that institutional Buddhism, including the Rinzai sect, complied with the Meiji government's (1868–1919) policies of nationalism and loyalty to the state. The lotus flowers and the vases symbolized Rinzai Zen's connection with India, suggesting Sōen's deployment of the Western thinking that Śākyamuni Buddha was the scientifically proven historical founder of Buddhism, a world religion compatible with modern science and the philosophical ideal. The decoration meant that Japanese Buddhist nationalism relied on Buddhism's transnational and universal appeal to the West.

Sōen was one of the four Japanese monks and two laypeople to attend the Parliament. The other three monks were Ashitsu Jitsuzen 蘆津実全 (1850–1921) of the Tendai sect, Toki Hōryū 土宜法龍 (1854–1923) of the Shingon sect, and Yatsubuchi Banryū 八淵蟠竜 (1848–1926) of the Nishi Honganji branch of the Jōdo Shin sect. The two laypeople were Noguchi Zenshirō 野口善四郎 (1864–d.u., later known as Fukudō 復堂) and Hirai Kinzō 平井金三 (1859–1916). All six had been active in reviving Buddhism through publishing and community building. They had been playing an increasingly important role in their individual sects, although they were not recognized as prominent leaders or scholars in the Buddhist community at large. Sōen had been the head abbot of the Engakuji branch since 1 April 1892, but he had yet to build influence after being away in Ceylon (Sri Lanka) from March 1887 to the end of 1889. Ashitsu, Toki, and Yatsubuchi held no such prestigious title, as Toki admitted before their departure for Chi-

\* I would like to express my gratitude to the University of Iowa Center for Asian and Pacific Studies (CAPS) for providing financial support to visit the University of Chicago to conduct research for this article.

ago in August 1893 (MS 4 August 1893). Because Hirai had already left for the United States in April 1892 and did not return to Japan until 1894 (MS 16 August 1893; YOSHINAGA et al. 2004–2007, 8–16), this article focuses on the remaining five delegates. It concerns primarily these Japanese delegates' domestic preparation for the Parliament, especially their fundraising, selection of presentation topics, and the level to which they were supported by Buddhist organizations and the press.

While there is ample scholarship on how the delegation used the Parliament to successfully introduce Japanese Buddhism to the West to further their domestic revival, there has been less attention paid to the delegates' preparation in Japan and how Buddhist organizations and media entities supported them. Scholars such as James E. KETELAAR (1991; 1993; 2006), Judith SNODGRASS (1997; 1998; 2003; 2006; 2012), and John S. HARDING (2008) have agreed that the delegates had little support from the government and the sectarian institutions, but they nevertheless formed a private delegation to attend the Parliament in August (MCRAE 1991; SEAGER 1994). Ketelaar and other scholars have made various conjectures about the way Sōen financed his travel to Chicago, such as Engakuji's severe fiscal deficit since the early Meiji years. Snodgrass points out that in July 1892 a group of Buddhists published an article in *The Japan Weekly Mail* and other periodicals that introduced topics to frame the delegates' presentation. Yet surprisingly little is known about how the domestic support and Buddhist networks effectively prepared the delegates for the Parliament. This study fills this gap by using new primary sources, especially the writings of Shaku Sōen and Toki Hōryū, as well as Buddhist periodicals like the *Meikyō shinshi* 明教新誌 (The New Magazine of Bright Teachings).<sup>1</sup> It attempts to investigate why and how the Japanese relied on a complex network of the popular press, sectarian organizations, private societies, and monastic and laypeople to collect and share resources and prepare for the delegates' presentation at the Parliament.

The crisis of Buddhism in the early Meiji years complicated the delegates' preparation. Moreover, almost all of the five delegates were financially naïve. In 1890, Shaku Sōen wrote to Hasegawa Keitoku 長谷川惠徳 (d.u.) in a letter dated 25 July, expressing his shocking realization that Engakuji's annual income in the past several years had been reduced to about seventy yen, while its annual expenses amounted to more than four hundred yen (SHAKU SŌEN, SHAKU TAIBI, and NAGAO 1931, 81). This explains why he was not particularly excited about his promotion to head abbot two years later as he worried over the severe financial stress to sustain Engakuji. The bleak financial situation

1. As an influential trans-sectarian Buddhist newspaper issued every other day, it championed the freedom of religion and spreading Buddhism among laity until its last issue on 28 February 1901 (IKEDA 1976, 113, 154 note 3; TAKAOKA 2005, 514–16).

continued into 1893. The reasons for the crisis went back to 1868, when the separation of Shinto from Buddhism (*shinbutsu bunri* 神仏分離) resulted in an anti-Buddhist persecution (*haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈) that forcefully ended the millennium of syncretism between Buddhism and Shinto and damaged the Buddhist morale and reputation. Soon after, the government issued decrees to remove economic privileges from Buddhism. Among them, the land reclamation laws (*jōchi rei* 上知令) of 1871 and 1875 aimed to confiscate tax-free temple property, which included all lands granted by the Tokugawa shoguns (*shuinchi* 朱印地) and domain lords (*kokuinchi* 黒印地) as well as the lands, forests, and other properties from other benefactors outside the temple's central compound (SAKURAI 1977, 681–84; COLLICUTT 1988, 160; TAKENUKI 1989, 286–87; KITAGAWA 1987; 1990). The fiscal policies from 1869 to 1875 had various effects on temples: the Ji, Jōdo, Rinzai, Shingon, and Tendai sects bore the direct brunt, whereas the self-reliant two Honganji branches—the Nishi Honganji and the Higashi Honganji (or the Ōtani 大谷 branch), the Nichiren, and Sōtō sects suffered the least since they had relied less on tax-free lands for upkeep (TAMAMURO 1967, 306–309). Without the sustenance of land, most of the Ji, Jōdo, Rinzai, Shingon, and Tendai institutions struggled financially. To make matters worse, the government's urge to follow the Western path of modernization engendered public fascination with all things Western from 1882 to 1888 as evidenced by the contemporary witnesses that “people poured into Christian churches” and Christianity grew rapidly (WPR 2: 1013).

Beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, a transnational conversation about Buddhism circulated throughout East and South Asia, Europe, and North America. In the 1860s, when the Japanese were turning to all things Western, Ceylonese Theravādins had been organizing themselves to revive against the influence of Christianity. By 1875, scholars in Western Europe came to value Pali, instead of Sanskrit, as the original language used by the Buddha in his sermons, and to prioritize Buddhism in Ceylon and other Southeast Asian countries as historically closer to the Buddha's original teaching (UMEZAWA, TOKURA, et al. 2018, 153). In 1880, the American theosophist Henry Steel Olcott (1832–1907) arrived in Ceylon and converted to Theravāda Buddhism. To support the revival of Buddhism there, Olcott created branches of the Buddhist Theosophical Society and built Buddhist schools to engage clergy and laypeople (PROTHERO 1996, 96–106). From 1881 on, the Theravādins also intellectually and financially supported the Pali Text Society to spread their tradition in the West. The Japanese accepted the Western perspective that the Buddha was a historical figure from India, whose teachings were reflected in Hīnayāna (Japanese Buddhist intellectuals at the time considered Theravāda Buddhism in Ceylon, Siam, and Burma as Hīnayāna) (MS 4 September 1893; TWEED 2000, 122–23). Accepting this view meant that Japanese Buddhism, part of “Mahāyāna” or the northern branch of

Buddhism practiced in North Asia (Tibet, China, Korea, and Japan), was an offshoot of the earlier Hinayāna. Consequently, Japanese Buddhists reasoned that they could learn from exposure to this earlier Buddhism.

In the early 1890s, Japan turned its attention to the Parliament in Chicago. The Parliament was organized by Christian theologians (MS 4 August 1893). In spring 1891, John Henry Barrows (1847–1902) was named as chair to organize the Parliament (WPR 1: 8). A pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Chicago, Barrows was a successful evangelist, progressive social reformer, and fundraiser. The Parliament had to finance itself despite being a program of the exposition. The exposition consisted of the White City, the main site to celebrate America's industrial achievements, and the Midway Plaisance, which showcased the achievements of the “civilized” Europe and those of the “half-civilized and the savage” Asia, Africa, and America (BOAS 1893,; HAWTHORNE 1893). To align with the exposition's international agenda, Barrows introduced the principle of “Christian democracy” to turn the Parliament into a powerful opportunity to unite Christian denominations in the West and strengthen Christian missionary enterprise in the world (BONNEY 1900, 76–77; BARROWS 1904, 178–79, 247–61; ZIOLKOWSKI et al. 1993, 175). He hoped to invite international representatives of non-Christian faiths and make the Parliament an authoritative institution to represent global faiths. Encouraging an international spectacle would also attract people to buy tickets for the speeches and generate profits (WPR 1: 3–9, 183–86; RYDELL 1987, 55–65; SEAGER 1995, 25–27).

By examining Japanese Buddhist responses to Barrows's invitation in the context of pan-Asian Buddhist collaboration and the globalization of Buddhism, this article seeks to revise our understanding of Japanese Buddhist revival in the decades leading up to the Parliament in 1893. It highlights ordained and lay Buddhists' collaboration in Japan through a national network of sectarian and private organizations and the press from the late 1880s to 1893. This Japanese network intersected with a transnational network connecting Buddhists in South Asia and those in the West. Through these networks, internationally-minded Japanese Buddhists voluntarily diffused information and shared resources to help the delegates prepare for their journey to Chicago, which contributed to the national and global development of Japanese Buddhism.

### *The Buddhist Networks in Japan*

Following the promulgation of the Meiji Constitution on 11 February 1889, Japan had emerged as the first modern nation-state in Asia. On 30 October 1890, the Imperial Rescript on Education (Kyōiku Chokugo 教育勅語) legalized the conservative Confucian ethics and emperor-centered ideology to suppress excessive liberal ideals from the West. It gave rise to imperial nationalism, especially after

the Peace Preservation Law of 1887 had contained freedom of speech and public assembly. One month later, on 29 November, the Constitution was enacted to pave the way for Japan's capitalist development while reappraising the traditional Japanese values that had been rejected since the Charter Oath in 1868. The Constitution separated church (including Buddhism) and state but established emperor-centered Shinto myths and rites for the nation.

Institutional Buddhism was free from state intervention if it complied with governmental laws. Individual sects and branches managed their financial and religious matters according to their own sectarian regulations and bylaws (*shūsei shūki* 宗制宗紀) that had been approved by the government. In the decade after, "the signs of reactionary and anti-foreign spirit might be seen in everything—in customs, in sentiments, in public opinion.... A strong sense of national feeling has been aroused among all classes," as Kozaki Hiromichi 小崎弘道 (1856–1938), president of Doshisha University 同志社大学 from 1890 to 1897, recalled in November 1893. The Japanese, especially the younger generation who reached adulthood around the 1880s, were proud of Japan's modern achievements. Buddhism was now considered part of Japanese tradition, as Kozaki reminisced: "Buddhism, which has been regarded for years as a religion of the ignorant and inferior classes, is now praised as a superior religion, far above Christianity" (WPR 2: 1013).

Buddhists plunged into publishing and institution building to engage laypeople. Soon after the anti-Buddhist movement waned by the mid-1870s, Buddhism began to recover, especially between 1877 and 1882, "a period of reaction and of revival of the anti-foreign spirit" (WPR 2: 1013). The Buddhists built schools and organizations to influence the younger generation and developed associations and societies to consolidate and multiply resources. IKEDA Eishun (1976, 95, 113–15) estimates that over 220 Buddhist groups were founded between 1882 and 1887. For example, in December 1883, Yamaoka Tesshū 山岡鉄舟 (1836–1888) and Lieutenant General and Viscount Torio Koyata 鳥尾小弥太 (1848–1905, also known as Tokuan 得庵), two politically prominent laypeople, created Meidō Kyōkai 明道協会 (Society for Illuminating the Way), a transectarian society that grew nationally. This lay society mobilized priests from various denominations, including Sōen and Ashitsu, to teach traditional Japanese religion and moral values to monastic and lay audiences (*The Japan Weekly Mail*, 7 December 1889; MS 10 August 1893). In 1887, one year before the closing of Meidō Kyōkai, Ōuchi Seiran 大内青巒 (1845–1918), a lay Sōtō follower, founded the Sōtō Fusōkai 曹洞扶宗会 (the Sōtō Support Assembly) to spread Sōtō Zen to laity (IKEDA 1976, 13, 123–28). In 1890, one of the most important transectarian organizations, the Bukkyō Kakushū Kyōkai 仏教各宗協会 (Buddhist All Sects Council),<sup>2</sup> emerged

2. This article adopts Snodgrass's English translation (SNODGRASS 2003, 135, 173–74).

based on the agreement between major sectarian leaders. This private confederation of sects and branches consisted of head abbots and senior priests (at least sixty-six members in 1896) to represent the collective interests of twelve sects and thirty-seven independent branches at the national level (*Bukkyō kakushū kōyō*, 3–67). Engaged in reviving institutional Buddhism, this organization was the authoritative body to promote solidarity, utilize resources, and multiply influence.

To orchestrate the revival, Buddhists also tapped into the popular press and trained their own editors and publicists. From around April 1874 to April 1875, doctrinal instructors (*kyōdōshoku* 教導職) at Daikyōin 大教院 had managed *Kyōkai shinbun* 教会新聞, a government paper covering national and international religious news. In July 1875, seven years before the abolishment of doctrinal instructors, Ōuchi privatized it as *Meikyō shinshi* and served as its editor-in-chief. In 1884, the Meidō Kyōkai launched its periodical *Myōdō kyōkai zasshi* 明道協會雜誌. The introduction of railroads, telephones, telegraphs, and new technologies to reproduce photographs in a newspaper had also facilitated means of distribution and news collection. Soon, individual sects and temples had their own periodicals, especially since the ability to manage a paper with flashy ads and high readability would gain impressive circulation and profits (HUFFMAN 1997, 174, 197). In 1889, the Jōdo sect launched its periodical *Jōdo kyōhō* 浄土教報 (Jōdo Sect Gazette; 1889–1944), with Horiuchi Seiū 堀内静宇 (d.u.) as editor-in-chief. Like Ōuchi's status in the Sōtō sect, Horiuchi was an influential writer, social activist, and leader of the lay-oriented Jōdo sect. In 1890, Yatsubuchi Banryū together with Nakanishi Ushio 中西牛郎 (1859–1930), a cofounder of the Kyūshū Bukkyō Kurabu 九州仏教倶楽部 (Kyushu Buddhist Club) in 1892, launched the periodical *Kokkyō* 国教 (National Teaching) to represent Buddhist interests in Kumamoto Prefecture (*The Japan Weekly Mail*, 30 December 1893, MS 10 August 1893).<sup>3</sup> Similarly, Toki Hōryū had been the editor-in-chief of *Dendō* 傳燈 (Spreading the Way), a periodical of the Shingon sect (MS 10 August 1893). The subscribers of these periodicals helped finance and sustain the publications. By 1893, almost all the religious press had been reporting and organizing public events and engaging the public to share opinions.

The press, sectarian organizations, and voluntary societies brought people together across boundaries of class, gender, and sect. Ashitsu and Sōen participated in the activities organized by Myōdō Kyōkai. They also held membership in the Bukkyō Kakushū Kyōkai and other groups. In June 1890, the council held one of its first meetings in Tokyo, where Sōen attended as a deputy head abbot

3. The Kyūshū Bukkyō Kurabu aimed to promote solidarity between Honganji members in and from Kyushu, spread Buddhism to the younger generation, and arrange for Kyushu Buddhists to visit Kyoto, among other duties (NAKANISHI 2010, 28, 31).

of the Engakuji branch and was selected to compile the *Bukkyō kakushū kōyō* 仏教各宗綱要 (Synopsis of All the Buddhist Texts) on behalf of the Rinzai Zen sect. He was also a member of the editorial board along with Ashitsu, Toki, and Shimaji Mokurai 島地黙雷 (1838–1911) (IKEDA 1994, 14; Sōen’s letters on 25 July, 20 August, and 20 December 1890 [SHAKU SŌEN, SHAKU TAIBI, and NAGAO 1931, 80–86]),<sup>4</sup> a senior priest who was one of the first to visit Europe in 1872 and was at the forefront of protecting Buddhism. Shimaji, Sōen, and Ashitsu also published articles in Ōuchi’s engaging *Meikyō shinshi*, which had made headway in attracting readers across sectarian and monastic boundaries. In 1890 Horiuchi, Hirai, Ōuchi, Sōen, Nanjō Bun’yū 南條文雄 (1849–1927; Higashi Honganji) all wrote articles to congratulate Yatsubuchi when he launched the *Kokkyō* (NAKANISHI 2015, 24–25, 28). Shimaji, Ōuchi, and Nanjō’s examples demonstrate that senior monastic and lay members were collaborating with the younger generations to promote Buddhism. Their links to various organizations increased their frequency of interaction, and their open access to the press enabled a broader exchange of resources, all of which promoted transparency and fostered trust among members of different backgrounds. Moreover, editors and writers were resourceful collectors of information and upfront with their opinions. To increase a paper’s popularity, they engaged the readers and allowed the reading public “to have as much impact on the press as the papers did on the people” (HUFFMAN 1997, 198). The interaction and exchange between individuals, sectarian and voluntary organizations, and the press gave rise to a vibrant Buddhist community across Japan despite political censorship.

### *Japan and the Globalization of Buddhism*

During this time, Japanese Buddhists opened for interaction with other Asian Buddhist countries and the West, which helped transform Japanese thinking about Buddhism (JAFFE 2006, 269). The senior Shingon priest Shaku Unshō 釈雲照 (1827–1909), his nephew Shaku Kōnen 釈興然 (1849–1924), Sōen, and other Japanese considered the Theravāda as the surviving southern branch of Buddhism, whose Pali canon was the only extant, complete Buddhist canon in classical Indic language. In 1886, Unshō dispatched Kōnen to British India to study the Vinaya. That October, Kōnen reached Colombo, Ceylon, as the first Japanese monk to study Pali and Theravāda monasticism for nine years (Sōen’s letter to Imakita Kōsen on 4 April 1887 [SHAKU SŌEN, SHAKU TAIBI, and NAGAO 1931, 27]; SHAKU TAIBI 1942, 34; TSUNEMITSU 1968, vol. 1: 87, 372–75; TAMURA 2005, 189–90). Half a year later, on 31 March 1887, Sōen joined Kōnen in Galle to study until 1889 (SHAKU SŌEN et al. 2001, 44–81, 120).

4. The five volumes of the *Bukkyō kakushū kōyō* were completed in 1891.



The Japanese interest in Śākyamuni went beyond texts to include the recently discovered archaeological sites—Bodhi Gaya, Kapilavastu, the Deer Park, Kusināra—that were associated with the legends of the Buddha. From as early as 1883, three years before Kōnen reached Ceylon, Japanese Buddhists had already begun to make pilgrimages to these sites (JAFJE 2004, 70–80). In 1889, Japanese Buddhists established direct contact with Olcott, who reached Kobe from British India along with his acolyte Anagārika Dharmapāla (1864–1933) that February 9, upon the invitation from Hirai, Noguchi, and several Honganji priests. During his four-month tour in Japan, Olcott created a branch of the Theosophical Society and the Bukkyō Seinenkai 仏教青年会 (Young Man's Buddhist Association) as well as a nonsectarian committee, entitled General Committee of Buddhist Affairs (MS 10 August 1893; YAMAKAWA 2000, 46–49). The organizations facilitated Japanese Buddhists' collaboration with those in South Asia. To care for the historical sites, in 1891 Dharmapāla formed the Maha Bodhi Society in Ceylon with Olcott as the director. They recruited members from Japan, Ceylon, and other major Buddhist countries (MS 20 February 1893), and boasted representatives and branches in Great Britain, the United States, and other countries. Unshō and Horiuchi were the society's international board members. In September 1891, the Indo Busseki Kōfukukai 印度仏跡興復会 grew out of the General Committee of Buddhist Affairs; Horiuchi was the secretary (DHARMAPALA and GIR 1895, 16–18; SATŌ 2008, 284–85; KEMPER 2015, 138–40, 381, 449–50). The members in Japan were helping purchase the Mahabodhi Temple and arranging for Japanese pilgrims to India (BLACKBURN 2010, 120–25; WPR 1: 130–31; MS 28 September 1893).

Amid Japan's increasing engagement with the world, laypeople played an important role in facilitating Japanese participation in the globalization of Buddhism. The separation of church and state since 1890 drew Buddhist institutions closer to laypeople instead of to the state. Sectarian leaders and priests not only recognized laypeople's religious authority but also worked with them. Laypeople enjoyed greater social mobility than monastics. For example, in 1892, layman Hirai had left for the United States to lecture to members of the Theosophical Society on Japanese culture and religion (SNODGRASS 2003, 176; YOSHINAGA et al. 2004–2007, 8–18; MS 16 August 1893). Another layman, Horiuchi, having won the support of the Bukkyō Kakushū Kyōkai, set up lines of communication between clerics and members of the Maha Bodhi Society in British India and beyond through the Indo Busseki Kōfukukai. Monastics also participated in this globalizing process. Yatsubuchi's periodical *Kokkyō* was promoting the unity of “Northern” Mahāyāna and “Southern” Buddhism (*The Japan Weekly Mail* 30 December 1893; MS 10 August and 12 October 1893). As such, Japan's Buddhist networks intersected with those abroad including the Maha Bodhi Society, the Theosophical Society, and the Pali Text Society. This global networking fostered

an ecumenical dimension within the Japanese Buddhist community. As Japanese Buddhism became part of a transnational Buddhist community connecting Buddhist Asia with the West, sects became less prominent than the collective national interest.

Because of the international Buddhist network, the Japanese Buddhist public was also able to stay current on major world religious events, including the Parliament. From June 1891, *Meikyō shinshi*, *The Japan Weekly Mail*, *Kokkyō*, and other periodicals regularly updated the public on the Parliament and called for Japanese Buddhist participation (DAKE 2011, 256–58; NAKANISHI 2015, 28–29).

### *Bukkyō Kakushū Kyōkai*

Considering Buddhism as one of “the great historic faiths,” Barrows invited both the “northern and southern church” from China, Japan, Tibet, Ceylon, and Siam, identifying Japanese Buddhism as the leading representative of the northern branch. In 1892, he invited Horiuchi and head abbots of the Rinzai, Tendai, Shingon, Jōdo, and Nichiren sects, among others. Horiuchi reported the promised attendance of Shimaji Mokurai, Nanjō Bun’yū, Shibata Reiichi 柴田礼一 (1840–1920), and others in Tokyo. Barrows promised that the Parliament would reserve front seats for them (BARROWS 1904, 258–69; MS 28 February 1893).

Monastics and laypeople in Japan sought the endorsement of the Bukkyō Kakushū Kyōkai to compensate for the government’s lack of interest in the Parliament. In June 1892, Shimaji submitted a proposal to raise Japanese Buddhism’s international prestige, suggesting that the council either directly dispatch delegates or arrange for each sect to select delegates (MS 26 June). His proposal was rejected in July (MS 4 July 1893; NAKANISHI 2010, 34). Nevertheless, the council announced a policy of nonintervention if any Buddhist volunteered to attend in an individual capacity (MS 26 March 1893). That July, several sects and Buddhists planned to attend by themselves, though they soon reversed their decision.

Japanese Buddhists had reason to worry that Barrows and the Parliament would promote Christianity. In summer 1892 in New York, Barrows argued in one of his many public addresses that Christian missionary enterprises failed in Africa and Asia because of arrogant and “selfish and indifferent” attitudes toward non-Christians; for example, he argued that the racial exclusion of Chinese in America impacted relations with China. Barrows assured his audiences that Christianity would not be “eclipsed by the lanterns and rush-lights of other faiths” at the Parliament. He believed it prioritized the consolidation of Christians and the global spread of Christianity to suggest an alternative approach, especially in the words of T. F. Hawks Pott, President of St. John’s College in Shanghai, to foster a “conciliatory attitude” to relax local peoples’ hostility (MS 4 March 1893; WPR 1: 56).

Barrows had hoped to use the Parliament to assert Christian dominance, but financial concerns and his desire to host an international religious gathering limited his efforts. In addition to the Buddhist representatives, he invited those of Shinto, Islam, Zoroastrianism, Hinduism, Confucianism, Jainism, and Taoism from Japan and other Asian countries. Unable to provide travel expenses and conference accommodation (BARROWS 1904, 258; DOWNEY 1983, 132),<sup>5</sup> he promised great latitude to representatives of non-Christian faiths, including the freedom to speak frankly without censorship (WPR 1: 18, 44, 61, 72; BONNEY 1895, 323–24). Most Japanese Buddhists were unaware of Barrows's struggle.

Most of the council's board members, head abbots and senior priests, were distrustful of the Parliament. Since its inception in 1890, the council had been representing atomized sects and branches to negotiate with the government and address their collective concerns. They believed that attending an event organized by Christians in a Christian country would position Japanese Buddhist delegates as a vulnerable minority. In July 1892, when the Japanese Buddhist community was divided over whether or not to attend the Parliament, Barrows had been delivering speeches in the United States articulating his intention to prioritize Christian interests (BARROWS 1904, 260–67). Unaware of the tension in Japan, Barrows's secretary sent a copy of Barrows's speech to Japan, which Ashitsu received that November; Shimaji received a similar one (MS 8 July 1893). The letters immediately alarmed the Japanese of Barrows's pro-Christian agenda. In December, Ashitsu wrote to Barrows expressing his confusion. Barrows responded promptly in the following January reiterating that his speech was intended for a conservative Christian audience, though he admitted that Christians would constitute the majority of the representatives. Nevertheless, Barrows "hastened to assure them that the spirit of kindness and fraternity would prevail in the Parliament" (MS 4 March; 8 July 1893; WPR 1: 61).

Barrows's letter was only able to persuade Shimaji, Ashitsu, and other Buddhists who valued the globalization of Buddhism and believed in Barrows's promise of hospitality and respect. In January 1893, the more conservative sectarian leaders and senior priests agreed that the Parliament was a Christian scheme to expand Christianity and to undermine non-Christian faiths (MS 16 January 1893; WPR 1: 61). That month, Nishi Honganji withdrew its support for Shimaji to attend the Parliament (MS 20 January 1893). The Jōdo sect expressed interest in February but dropped the topic in March (MS 28 February; 28 March). Shimaji and Nanjō wrote to Barrows to decline his invitation, although as Western-educated

5. Barrows's daughter wrote that he had solicited "thousands of dollars" from Chicago businessmen to subsidize Asian delegates' travel expenses. In spring 1893, Barrows further created the Parliament Publishing Company to save costs and publish tracts and pamphlets to gain support for the Parliament (BARROWS 1904, 258; DOWNEY 1983, 132).

English speakers they were well equipped to visit Chicago.<sup>6</sup> Ogino Dokuon 荻野独園 (1819–1895), the head abbot of the Shōkokuji 相国寺 branch, and Hara Shinmō 原心猛 (1833–1906), the head abbot of the Shingon sect, also wrote to decline Barrows's invitation. They were traditionally educated, but their high monastic status and influence would have made them ideal candidates. Leaders of other sects did not respond to Barrows (TOKI and NINKAI 1994, 811–15).<sup>7</sup>

The council had reasons to be careful. This inclusive transsectarian organization was closely attuned to the domestic interests of Japanese Buddhism. The new laws had removed clerical electoral franchise and eligibility for political office and required monks and clergy to serve in the army. In 1891, the council appealed collectively to exempt the clergy from military service (MS 16 February; 18 July 1893). Two years later, in January and February 1893, some sects also petitioned the government to exclude monks from military service (MS 2, 4 February). Some clerics even tried to use their connections in the top echelons of the government to make the political system more responsive to them.<sup>8</sup>

Sectarian leaders were aware of the government's indifference toward the Parliament despite its interest in attending the exposition to increase Japan's international prestige and expand its commercial export. Government and business leaders in Japan knew the United States was consuming more than a third of Japan's exports at the time (*Rinji hakurankai jimukyoku hōkoku*, 27–28). *Meikyō shinshi* reported in February 1893 that to support the government and business entrepreneurs, the imperial family had donated their calligraphy and woolen fabrics to the women's exhibition at the White City (MS 22 February). At the exposition, the Japanese government hoped to “challenge the Western... cultural superiority and protest the lowly position assigned to [Japan] as an Asian nation in the hierarchy of evolutionary development” (SNODGRASS 2006, 80). The government also hoped to present Japan as an equal to the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and the Netherlands to prepare for the treaty revision with these powers. Attending the Parliament would offer little assistance for the council's desire to regain its possessions and privileges in Japan; sectarian leaders focused instead on demonstrating Buddhism's compatibility with Shinto

6. *Sanbō zasshi*, a Honganji Buddhist periodical, reported in December 1892 that Shimaji planned to attend the Parliament as a representative of Nishi Honganji, who also agreed to provide him with \$4,000 to cover travel expenses and costs to print pamphlets to distribute at the Parliament (DAKE 2011, 259).

7. In Chicago, Barrows showed Toki a letter (dated April 1893) from Hara Shinmō, who declined Barrows's invitation but indicated his approval of Toki's attendance (TOKI and NINKAI 1994, 811–17).

8. It was not until 1901 that the Home Ministry permitted students attending a religious school to postpone their military duty (IKEDA 1976, 15).

and Confucian traditions to show their willingness to modernize and support the Meiji state.

Moreover, attending the Parliament would aggravate many sects' financial situation. As mentioned previously, the confiscation of estates had impoverished the Ji, Jōdo, Rinzai, Shingon, and Tendai sects, but not the two Honganjis, Nichiren, and Sōtō sects. In 1871, the two Honganjis and the Nichiren sect followed the government's territorial expansion and spearheaded missions in Asia and the Pacific. They dispatched missions to Okinawa (the Ryukyu Islands) once it became a Japanese possession, and in 1872 they participated in the colonization of Hokkaido, which took them a decade. In 1876, Higashi Honganji set up a branch temple (*betsuin* 別院) in China, and in 1877, a branch in Korea (AUERBACK 2007, 67; FOGEL 2009, 86–90). In the 1880s, Japan competed with the Western powers for dominance in East Asia and the Pacific, and the Nichiren and Sōtō sects sent missions to Korea and China (KIM 2012, 80–96). By 1893, the Jōdo sect had been proselytizing in the Kurils, Hawai'i, and Okinawa, where the Shingon and Rinzai sects also sent missions (MS 8 April; 22 November; 12 October 1893; *The Japan Weekly Mail* 30 December 1893). These costly missionary expansions not only put the two Honganjis and Sōtō and Ōbaku sects deep in debt, but also aggravated the sects' financial stress (MS 26 January; 4 April; 14 December 1893; AMA 2011, 199 note 3).

To ameliorate the fiscal stress, temples negotiated with the government to reclaim the property lost in the early Meiji years. In 1892, Inoue Kaoru 井上馨 (1836–1915), minister of Home Affairs (Naimushō 内務省), began to draft edicts and regulations to protect temples' interests. The council responded by asking the government to return the confiscated forests and woods to temples (MS 2 February 1893). In June 1893, the council even submitted a signed petition to Itō Hirobumi's 伊藤博文 (1841–1909) cabinet and the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce (Nōshōmushō 農商務省) (MS 12, 26 June 1893). Several temples also petitioned the government directly. Among them, Myōshinji 妙心寺 was most active in organizing its temples to petition (MS 16 June; 2 July 1893). By 24 September, Buddhist and Shinto priests worked together and mobilized public support to lobby the government (MS 24 September 1893).

In summer 1893, Shimaji, Nanjō, Ōuchi, Horiuchi, Toyama, Sōen, Toki, Ashitsu, and eighteen others asked the council to reconsider the Japanese participation in the Parliament, through an open letter also published in *The Japan Weekly Mail* (6 May; 3 June 1893) and other periodicals to solicit more signatures. In May, some emphasized the Parliament's ten official objectives to foster inter-faith understanding, discourage criticism, and avoid “any formal and outward unity” between different faiths (MS 20 May; 24 September 1893; WPR 1: 28). However, the council was not persuaded and vetoed their proposal in June.

The majority of the sectarian leaders saw the Japanese participation as highly risky despite Barrows's promises. Many Japanese had observed the Western fascination with the historical Buddha and Buddhism in South Asia. They were aware that Western scholars had been questioning Mahāyāna's relation to early Buddhism after they found the Pali canon's historical closeness with the teachings of the Buddha. The council was concerned that any failure to favorably impress the audiences at the Parliament would cause irrevocable damage to the reputation of Japanese Buddhism, hindering its domestic revival and future propagation in the West (MS 16 and 22 June 1893).

Conceiving of the Japanese attendance as a national event, some Buddhist intellectuals suggested that the council coordinate resources in Japan and offer indirect assistance to individual volunteers (MS 26 June 1893), but to little avail. Despite the lack of backing from the council, the more open-minded members persisted, using the popular press to support Japanese participation in the Parliament.

### *Attending the Parliament*

Around the time the council and the other conservative Buddhists declined Barrows's invitation in 1892, the others decided to make use of the opportunity, despite Japanese Buddhism's domestic challenges. This was a decision reached only after reflection. Horiuchi, a direct correspondent with the Parliament, agreed that the Parliament may be pro-Christian, but he argued the benefits in participating would outweigh the risk. He believed Barrows's promise that non-Christian representatives would be respected so he continued calling for Buddhist volunteers to attend the Parliament over the following year (MS 16 June; 6, 8 July 1893). He had faith in the Parliament's proclamation to value "the truth" of each religion as the "great progress in human thought and demonstrate their necessity in a materialistic" modern society (MS 18 July).

Like Horiuchi, Ōuchi, Shimaji, Toyama, and Nanjō, Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1856–1944) and members of the Indo Busseki Kōfukukai decided to take advantage of the opportunity to advance their objectives. Most of them were middle-class elites who were generally familiar with the Western thinking about Buddhism and active in their sects or organizations. Nanjō and Inoue were Western-educated scholars teaching at Tokyo Imperial University. Toyama was a government bureaucrat after earning a bachelor's degree in the United States. Ōuchi was responsible for the publication of multiple periodicals, including *Meikyō shinshi* (IKEDA 1976, 113, 154 note 3). Sōen, Ashitsu, Toki, and other monks in their twenties and thirties had been following these influential senior revivers' activities and slowly building their careers. By 1892, these Japanese were familiar with groundbreaking Buddhist studies and turbulent religious conditions in the West, so they felt optimistic about the Parliament. Even though it was impossi-

ble to foresee every contingency, they tapped into the increasingly convenient trans-Pacific communication and networking to collect information. As early as 10 February 1893, *Meikyō shinshi* published information about the living conditions and estimated lodging costs in Chicago.

These Buddhists felt empowered by Japan's modernization and rising prestige in the West. This new generation, unlike those in the early Meiji years, believed they had much to offer as well. Ernest F. Fenollosa (1853–1908; in Japan 1878–1889, 1897–1900) and William Surgis Bigelow (1850–1926; in Japan 1881–1889) were some of the first Americans to live in Japan, where they helped the Japanese government preserve temples and art treasures while collecting Japanese art to promote their value in the West. Thanks to their efforts, by 1893 the “refined aesthetics” of Japanese paintings and sculptures became widely admired in the West. Toki and his contemporaries even argued that Buddhism had influenced these Japanese arts throughout history (MS 2 August; 14 September 1893), although by espousing Japanese art as uniquely Japanese, Toki downplayed Chinese and Korean influences.

The Japanese believed that the Orientalist scholars in the West valued Pali and Sanskrit Buddhist scriptures from China, Tibet, and places in South and Southeast Asia also might show interest in Japanese Mahāyāna if the opportunity arose. The Japanese observed that Christianity was increasingly challenged by academic criticism of the Bible and the rise of other faiths in the West. This made them believe that Buddhism was a welcoming alternative; for example, Horiuchi wrote that Buddhism had been spreading in Great Britain, the United States, Germany, and France (MS 6 July 1893). In the previous December, Shimaji wrote to the Buddhist periodical *Sanbō zasshi* 三宝雜誌 and expressed that after attending the Parliament he would spend two years propagating Japanese Buddhism in France (DAKE 2011, 259), although he later decided not to visit Chicago. The other Japanese hoped to jump on the trend and introduce Buddhism to the United States, the most Christianized nation in the West.

The Japanese hoped to claim Mahāyāna's connection with the Buddha to bolster the significance of Japanese Buddhism. They felt emboldened by Barrows's and other Westerners' identification of Japanese Buddhism as Mahāyāna, one of the two main branches of Buddhism. Moreover, several Westerners had recently embraced Japanese Buddhism. In 1885, Fenollosa and Bigelow converted to Tendai Buddhism (FAIRBANKS 1930; TWEED 2000, 40, 71–74). Eight years later in May 1893, Horiuchi invited Charles J. W. Pfoundes (1840–1907, also known as Omoi Tetsunosuke 重鉄之助), an Irish Theosophist, to meet Shaku Unshō in Japan. *Meikyō shinshi* reported on 16 June that Pfoundes was critical of Christianity and proclaimed his interest in Japanese Buddhism. Ōuchi was pleased that Pfoundes wanted to be ordained and study Buddhism in Japan (MS 8 August 1893). These examples gave the Japanese a sense of pride, since few foreigners had

previously sought Buddhist inspiration from Japan. They hoped that spiritually thirsty Westerners might embrace Japanese Buddhism once they gained sufficient knowledge about Mahāyāna (YOSHINAGA et al. 2004–2007, 85). The Japanese gained confidence from their proselytization in Asia and the Pacific. On 26 March 1893, Horiuchi, Ōuchi, Toyama, and several others agreed that the Japanese participation in the Parliament might help introduce Japanese Buddhism to the West (MS 26 March; 8 August 1893).

From 1892 to 1893, both the internationally inclined and the more conservative Buddhists engaged in a heated debate about the Parliament. The council members prioritized their domestic and sectarian interests, considering sects as the only manageable units for revival at a time of transformative social and cultural change in Japan. They believed that focusing on national concerns had a more tangible impact on individual sects as opposed to the broader and more abstract international level. The daring ones believed that the success of representing Japanese Buddhism in Chicago was contingent on the delegates' Japanese identity and the global appeal of Buddhism. They sought to promote a palatable Japanese Buddhism whose teachings would encompass the majority of the sects, especially since the West was lacking in general knowledge. The sectarian approach to Japanese Buddhist revival versus the international approach was the fault line between the two parties. Despite their competing visions, they agreed on the importance of national identity to define the delegates and Japanese Buddhism in the international community. They also agreed that if the delegates succeeded at the Parliament, it would enhance the status of Buddhism in Japan, preparing for its domestic revival and overseas mission; on the other hand, if the Japanese became an embarrassment, the failure would bring harm to Japanese Buddhism's national reputation and future development (MS 16 June; 8 October 1893).

### *The Buddhist Candidates*

The council and various sects' caution notwithstanding, the internationally-minded Buddhists continued calling for volunteers. Ashitsu, Sōen, and Toki, having received Barrows's invitation letter in 1892, decided to attend the Parliament by January 1893 (MS 20 January). In a letter to Kimura Junseki on 4 November 1892, Sōen wrote that he had accepted the invitation since his sectarian supporters would help raise funds for his Chicago trip (MS 4 November 1892, 93–94). He was the only volunteer from the Zen sect, though he would attend individually instead of being a sectarian representative. The three-year monastic study in Ceylon might have inspired him, as he had observed the crucial support from the West for the Theravādins to reinvigorate their religion (MS 20 January 1893).

Except for Ashitsu, Sōen, and Toki, the number of Buddhist volunteers had been fluctuating from January to early August. Unaware of the ongoing dis-



cussion in Japan and becoming anxious, Barrows contacted the Indo Busseki Kōfukukai at its Tokyo office in May 1893. He recommended the attendance of six additional Buddhists, including Horiuchi, Toyama, Yatsubuchi, Kuroda Shintō 黒田真洞 (1855–1916), and Murata Jakujun 村田寂順 (1838–1905), head abbot (*zasu* 座主) of the Tendai sect and representative of the Bukkyō Kakushū Kyōkai (MS 24 April; 24 May 1893).<sup>9</sup> Barrows's list did not include Sōen, whose decision to attend probably had already reached him. Since Barrows remained silent about financial support and travel accommodation, his recommendation had little effect on Japanese Buddhists. Of the six, Yatsubuchi was the only one to accept Barrows's invitation (MS 20 February; 30 June; 26 September 1893).

By mid-May, the volunteers narrowed down to eight, including Ashitsu, Sōen, Toki, Yatsubuchi, Katō Eshō 加藤恵証 (1858–1916), and Mitsuno Michihide 水野道秀 (d.u.), a member of the Maha Bodhi Society (MS 20 May 1893). In June, as if to respond to the council's second veto, Ashitsu, Sōen, Toki, Yatsubuchi, Katō, and several others immediately announced their decision to visit Chicago (MS 22 June 1893). Soon that summer, however, Katō, Mizuno, and two others reversed their decision due to sectarian disapproval or financial concerns. In July, Toki reiterated his interest to attend the Parliament (TOKI and NINKAI 1994, 3). By the time of their departure for Chicago that August, Ashitsu, Sōen, Toki, Yatsubuchi, and the layman Noguchi still persisted in their decision (MS 4 July; 2 August 1893).

These Buddhists worked with the press and private organizations to collect resources for the delegates, who were brave enough to visit Chicago without the necessary social connections and intellectual background. Prior to the Chicago journey, Ashitsu, Sōen, Toki, and Yatsubuchi already knew each other and were active in the greater Tokyo area although Yatsubuchi lived far away from the capital area. All five had been publishing, networking, and proselytizing. The Parliament would use only English, which Noguchi and Hirai spoke, but the four monks knew very little. To ensure the effective communication of their presentation, that July and August, Horiuchi and Inoue suggested that the delegates seek an interpreter who spoke Japanese and English and understood Buddhist terminologies (MS 12 July; 6 August 1893). Sōen was the only one who had an interpreter; by August, he chose Nomura Yōzō 野村洋三 (1870–1962), a pro-Western Yokohama tradesman who was practicing *zazen* at Engakuji (SUZUKI 1962, 94–98; SHIRATO 1963, 84–87, 95–96).

Shibata Reiichi, a representative of Shinto, and Kozaki Hiromichi and Yokoi Tokio 横井時雄 (1857–1927), two converted Japanese Christians, had also decided

9. Toyama Yoshibumi was a lay Buddhist and government official working at Japan's consulate from about the late 1890s to 1910. In 1897, he was dispatched to Japan's consulate in Brazil as an interpreter. By 1902, he was working at Japan's consulate in Siam and Burma (*Kanbō* 4180: 10; 5796: 2; 7248: 2).

to present at the Parliament (MS 2 October 1893; TOKI and NINKAI 1994, 816). The skeptical Buddhists were concerned that these three men might compete with the Buddhist delegates in Chicago, but the more progressive ones were less worried (MS 16 August 1893).

### *Presentation Topics and Strategies*

After the council's second veto in June, *Meikyō shinshi* continued providing the latest news about the Parliament in Chicago and the Buddhist preparation in Japan (MS 4 August 1893). Despite their optimism, the progressive Buddhists were sophisticated enough to acknowledge potential risks and challenges that the delegates might encounter abroad. Being proactive helped the delegates to navigate the asymmetrical power relations with the Christian majority at the Parliament. Horiuchi emphasized that the delegates would be received as representatives of Japanese Buddhism instead of individual sects (MS 6 July). Ōuchi agreed that they should focus on the themes common to the majority of the sectarian teachings. Horiuchi and Toyama advised that the delegates prepare their topics according to their order of presentation to convey a consistent and unified message (MS 22 June; 12 July; 8 August 1893). They took more than a year to discuss appropriate topics and tactics.

The Japanese accepted Barrows's conception of Japanese Buddhism as the northern branch of Buddhism and identified it with Mahāyāna Buddhism. Sōen's fundraising letter in January 1893 proclaimed that his goal at the Parliament was to propagate Mahāyāna Buddhism (MS 20 January 1893). This vision was shared by the other Japanese delegates (MS 6 July; 2, 4 August 1893; NAKANISHI 2010, 35). From June to July, Toyama and Horiuchi suggested doctrinal terms such as "nirvana" and "the doctrine of cause and effect" as suitable topics. They proposed that the delegates interpret them from a Japanese Buddhist perspective which would demonstrate its doctrinal connection with the Buddha's teachings (MS 22 June; 12 July 1893). Horiuchi emphasized Mahāyāna's "comprehensive, profound messages" and encouraged the delegates, "the followers of the Buddha's holy teaching," to "spread Japanese Buddhism to the world" (MS 6 July 1893). Presenting Japanese Buddhism as "Northern Mahāyāna Buddhism" helped advance its domestic objectives.

The Japanese capitalized on Śākyamuni Buddha's popularity in the West and claimed that the Buddha taught Mahāyāna teachings. Horiuchi recommended topics including "theism" and "soul" (MS 12 July 1893); he, Inoue, and Toyama agreed that "the law of cause and effect" would be a safe topic, since it had been "scientifically proven" in the West. Inoue suggested a philosophical and philosophical interpretation of the topics to demonstrate the compatibility of Japanese Buddhism with modern science and philosophy. He believed that this approach

would indicate a continuity from the Buddha's teachings in South Asia to Japanese Buddhism, the custodian of Mahāyāna in North Asia (MS 4 September 1893). The delegates were even urged to invoke Mahāyāna polemics from the Buddhist scriptures in literary Chinese and Japanese to demonstrate the "Hīnayāna" to be "superficial" (MS 4 August 1893). The views shared by the *Meikyō shinshi* articles from July 1892 to September 1893 were consistent with the open letter in *The Japan Weekly Mail* in July 1892. The letter outlined reincarnation, the doctrine of "theism," "the soul," cause and effect, nirvana, the sectarian development of Buddhism, the Maha Bodhi Society, and other topics for the delegates to consider (SNODGRASS 2003, 202–20). For more than a year, *Meikyō shinshi* provided a robust platform for readers to discuss suitable presentation topics.

Some Japanese suggested that the delegates introduce Mahāyāna to the West since Japan was the only country in East Asia with a continuous monastic tradition and a complete collection of the Chinese Buddhist canon (MS 12 June; 30 September; 10 November 1893). Toyama, Horiuchi, and Inoue maintained that "Japan's Mahāyāna Buddhism" was largely unknown in Europe, so introducing it would help Westerners distinguish Mahāyāna in North Asia from "Hīnayāna" in South Asia (MS 22 June; 6 July; 6 August 1893). In the early 1890s, few Western scholars had as yet used Buddhist scriptures from Japan.

The Japanese also worried about challenges in Chicago from Western scholars and from delegates of other Asian countries representing Mahāyāna. Japan contained major Mahāyāna sects, but they were not all-inclusive. On 20 May 1893, *Meikyō shinshi* suggested the delegates be diplomatic and cautious when interacting with others in Chicago (MS 20 May 1893). On 22 June, several days after the council's veto, Toyama voiced concerns that if Dharmapāla, a respected Ceylonese lay Buddhist of "Southern Hīnayāna Buddhism," presented the teachings of "Northern Mahāyāna Buddhism" at the Parliament, the Japanese delegates might lose credibility in introducing their version of Mahāyāna. This failure would confirm the Western reservations about associating Japanese Mahāyāna tradition with the teachings of the Buddha (MS 22 June 1893). Inoue agreed with Toyama, and in early August, he added that European scholars and Buddhist representatives from China, India, and Tibet might also challenge or contradict the Japanese claims (MS 6 August 1893).

To avoid potential conflicts with the views of the delegates from other Asian countries on Buddhist doctrines, the daring Japanese Buddhists recommended palatable topics to present from the perspective of Japanese history, culture, and society. On 22 June, Toyama cautioned the delegates to avoid sophisticated doctrinal discourse, because Barrows was expecting general topics such as the roles of Buddhism in East Asian history, on world civilization(s), and on Japanese society. Toyama proposed a discussion of the historical significance of Buddhism in Japan, especially in the lower strata of society (MS 22 June 1893). Less than a

month later, on 12 July, Horiuchi suggested introducing Buddhism's spiritual impact on Japanese politics, literature, art, commerce, social life, and family (MS 12 July 1893). On 18 July, Horiuchi translated and published the Parliament's daily itinerary—conference themes and topics from 11 to 27 September. He suggested the delegates consider the Parliament's ten objectives, conference themes, and items listed on its daily schedules when preparing their presentations. On 6 August, Inoue proposed additional topics, including the history of Japanese Buddhism, its involvement in secular funerals and weddings, and the sutras that monks commonly read (MS 6 August 1893).

The Japanese believed that a cohesive presentation and performance would contribute to the Buddhist delegates' success at Parliament. To present a version of Japanese Buddhism in line with the Western perception, a vegetarian diet was suggested on 20 June for the delegates when in Chicago. The Japanese also decided to avoid mentioning their practice of eating meat since 1872, when the government allowed it (MS 20 June 1893; SAKURAI 1971, 672–73). On 22 June, Toyama suggested that those scheduled to speak first should introduce the general teachings of Japanese Buddhism, because framing the subject would help the delegates present a unified theme. On 3 August, Inoue capitalized on the Western interest in ancient Pali and Sanskrit texts and suggested the use of Sanskrit and Pali equivalents, instead of Japanese and Chinese translations of Buddhist terms, in the delegates' English presentation (MS 6 August 1893). These tactics helped verify the validity and international significance of Japanese Buddhism. Their teamwork helped the delegates increase the credibility and impact of their presentations.

### *Evolving Support of the Buddhist Public*

The Japanese were aware of American racism toward the Japanese and of Christian dismissal of other faiths. Some worried that to provoke the Christians in Chicago might risk personal security and social success; for example, Toki shared that he had been advised to be submissive in front of Westerners who usually possessed “intimidatingly bulky physiques” (MS 2 August 1893). The more ambitious Japanese Buddhists sought ways to boost the delegates' morale. On 8 July, hoping to increase their confidence in front of the Christian audience in Chicago, Horiuchi invoked the examples of the Buddha and ancient Buddhist missionaries' courage in spreading the dharma (MS 8 July 1893). He also recommended collegial interaction with other parliamentary representatives (MS 6 July 1893). Inoue and others agreed that the Japanese should be open-minded and forbearing for the sake of spreading the “noble truth” of Buddhism to the West, the heartland of “aggressive” Christianity (MS 4; 6 August 1893). In August, *Kaigai Bukkyō Jijō* 海外仏教事情 (Affairs of Overseas Buddhism) published Yatsubuchi's article in which he expressed his wish to position Buddhism along with

science and philosophy and to introduce Japanese Buddhism to enrich the Christian life of the Americans (DAKE 2011, 261–62).

The Japanese also drew courage from Japan's successful modernization after being forced open for trade with the United States by Commodore Matthew C. Perry (1794–1858) in 1853. On 4 August, a *Meikyō shinshi* article argued that introducing Japanese Mahāyāna Buddhism to America was to return the favor (*hōon* 報恩) of Perry's ushering Japan into the era of "advanced" material civilization and "sophisticated" natural science. However, the article failed to mention the unequal treaties that the Americans had imposed on Japan.

Toki, Horiuchi, and several others urged the delegates to meet and coordinate their preparations in Japan to ensure their successful teamwork in Chicago (MS 20; 24 May 1893). The concerned Buddhists, the popular press, and private organizations volunteered to arrange for the delegates to convene and prepare. From May until their departure for Chicago on 4 August, the clerical delegates met several times (MS 4, 6 August 1893; SHAKU SŌEN 1929–1930, 10: 190). For example, on 25–26 July, the Bukkyō Gakkai 仏教学会 (Japanese Buddhist Research Association) arranged for the five delegates to convene in Tokyo (MS 4; 26 July 1893). The meeting was organized by Horiuchi, Iwahori Chimichi 岩掘智道, Matsuyama Matsutarō 松山松太郎 (d.u.) of *Kaigai Bukkyō jijō*, a *Meikyō shinshi* representative, and several other prominent laypeople, who offered the venue, presentation suggestions, and other resources. On 3 August, these same organizers invited Ōuchi and other dignitaries to share advice and financial resources at the farewell-cum-fundraising party for the five delegates (MS 28 July; 4, 8 August 1893).

### *Fundraising for the Buddhist Delegates*

The four monastic delegates relied on their social networks to raise funds for their travel. As early as January 1893, Sōen's dharma brother Ōzora Kandō 霄貫道 (1825–1904), senior members of the Engakuji and Kenchōji 建長寺 branches, and Yokohama and Tokyo dignitaries had launched fundraising appeals for Sōen (MS 20 January 1893). Ōzora's support was especially important because he was the head abbot of the Kenchōji branch (from 1884 to 1904). Sōen gained lavish support from his Engakuji branch and the Kenchōji branch and their nationwide networks of temples (OBATA 1973, 3: 245–49). According to the Home Ministry's statistics in 1904, the institutionally powerful Myōshinji branch controlled 3,625 temples with 1,062,530 parishioners (*danto* 檀徒), making it the most influential in the Rinzai sect. The Kenchōji branch was the third most influential in the Rinzai sect, commanding 468 temples and 133,167 parishioners, whereas the Engakuji branch had 209 temples and 30,887 parishioners (TSUCHIYA 1939, 219–25). Sōen might have gained some support from his Myōshinji connections, but the members of the Engakuji and Kenchōji branches must have felt obligated

to donate. By that August, Sōen's fundraising committee had received substantial financial contributions from members of the Engakuji and Kenchōji temples and families affiliated with them; laypeople in Yokohama also provided material and social support. Sōen's sixth fundraising report that November announced the receipt of ¥1,753.80, and several later reports show even more funds. Overall, Sōen's fundraiser was successful, as he received more than ¥1,902.70 for his Chicago journey (MS 10, 12, 14 November 1893). He even used a portion of the funds to pay Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (1870–1966) for his translation of his presentation papers (SUZUKI, YAMAMOTO, and INOUE 1989, 153–54).

Ashitsu, Toki, and Yatsubuchi had no sectarian endorsement (MS 6 July 1893), but they received funds from the monastics and laypeople associated with their temples and some voluntary societies. In April 1893, *Kokkyō* and other local papers in Kyushu published a fundraising letter for Yatsubuchi, and much to his surprise, more than ten thousand lay donors responded within a month. By July, he had collected more than ¥2,000 from members of the Kyūshū Bukkyō Kurabu and others, which made him the first to be financially ready for the Chicago trip (MS 2, 4 July 1893; DAKE 2011, 260–61). Unlike Yatsubuchi, the others expanded their fundraisers to gain national support. On 8 February and 24 April, Ashitsu had his fundraising letter published in *Meikyō shinshi* and *Kyōto shinpō* 京都新報 (30 March). On 24 April, *Meikyō shinshi* began to publish the list of his donors. On 8 August, *Meikyō shinshi* issued Toki's fundraising report (NAKANISHI 2010, 35, 39).

Toki's fundraising by his Shingon colleagues and lay patrons was successful, because after the Parliament he was able to visit major cities in the United States and travel to several European countries, including France and Great Britain (MS 4 November; 26 December 1893; SHIRATO 1963, 103; TOKI and NINKAI 1994, 631, 843–47, 856–57, 876–77). On 28 July, Shingon priests held a farewell party for Toki at Nihonbashi Club 日本橋クラブ, a meeting place for Tokyo businessmen, entrepreneurs, and industrialists (MS 2 August 1893). The party was also an occasion to collect donations for Toki. Similarly, the farewell party at Engakuji on 30 July was another occasion to solicit funds for Sōen. Both Sōen and Toki received thirty yen from Fukuzawa Yukichi 福澤諭吉 (1835–1901), who also wrote a letter (dated 2 August 1893) to introduce them to Clay MacCauley (1843–1925), an American Unitarian clergyman and missionary in Japan from 1889 to 1900 (UMEZAWA, TOKURA, et al. 2018, 97–98).

In contrast, Noguchi Zenshirō was not a monk so he had less opportunity to raise funds. He only had enough money for his trip to Chicago but not for his return to Japan. No extant sources show that he had a fundraising campaign, although he was invited to Toki's farewell party as a guest on 28 July (MS 2 August 1893). The press and voluntary societies invited social dignitaries and organized parties to donate for the five delegates. On 3 August, Horiuchi and *Meikyō shinshi*

invited more than a hundred and thirty dignitaries and organized another farewell-cum-fundraising party for the five (MS 28 July; 4, 8 August 1893). *Meikyō shinshi* offered Noguchi supplementary income by hiring him as a part-time reporter at the Parliament (8 November 1893). This suggests that despite laypeople's increasing importance, monastics maintained greater social influence than laypeople to gain donations, partly because of the nationwide distribution of their sectarian temples that had long-term relations with local parishes and parishioners.

### *Conclusion*

The Japanese preparation in the early 1890s for the Parliament demonstrates that the press and private Buddhist organizations mobilized societal and material resources for matters of common interest. The popular press, printing, sectarian organizations, and voluntary societies across Japan animated the Buddhist community after sectarian Buddhism had been split into institutionally independent sects and branches in 1887 and made private in 1899. The regular interaction among the Buddhists in preparation for Chicago encouraged frequent circulation of information and long-term partnerships. Their collaboration and resource sharing helped sectarian Buddhism survive in Japan. As people connected across geographical and sectarian divides, they formed a network of support and increased their sense of national belonging. Moreover, the Japanese also networked with Buddhists in South Asia and those in the West based on their common interests in Asian Buddhist revival and Euro-American discussion of Buddhism. Such interaction facilitated their collaboration across national borders while intensifying Japanese Buddhists' sense of national identity.

The Japanese discussion about their participation in the Parliament reflected something more complex than the rise of Japanese nationalism. It represented the attempts by Western-educated intellectuals to grapple with the forces of globalization and make use of wider opportunities. The question of participating in the Parliament drove a wedge between the Buddhists, with the less conservative ones hoping to introduce Japanese Buddhism to an international audience. Most of the sectarian leaders, senior priests, and members of the Bukkyō Kakushū Kyōkai concerned themselves primarily with their domestic revival. They were suspicious of the Parliament in the context of global white hegemony and the Western domination of scientific knowledge about Buddhism. The cosmopolitan and urban lay Buddhists such as Horiuchi Seiū, Ōuchi Seiran, and Toyama Yoshibumi, and modern-educated scholars such as Inoue Tetsujirō actively assimilated international influences to revive Japanese Buddhism, and they orchestrated the public discussion about the Parliament. The conservative leaders viewed the Parliament suspiciously as a Christian scheme against Buddhism, but the progressives Buddhists valued it as a fair, yet competitive, opportunity

to participate in Buddhist globalization. They believed in Barrows's promise of interfaith dialogue and shared with Western liberals an inclusive vision of global Buddhism. This openness to Christians in the West clashed with the suspicions of sectarian leaders, although the two groups shared a similar nationalist commitment. The more progressive faction saw Japanese Buddhism as an important part of Buddhist traditions that had been rising in South Asia and the West. The more powerful council's and sectarian leaders' withdrawal of support for the Parliament illustrated their reluctance and pragmatic concerns, whereas the younger and more progressive Buddhists, having less at stake, attempted to tap into Buddhism's international appeal to advance Japanese Buddhism's goals.

The cosmopolitan Buddhists continued to use print media, including newspapers, many of which they owned, to encourage individuals to volunteer for the Parliament. They garnered social, intellectual, and financial support across class and sectarian lines to help the volunteers prepare for the Chicago journey. The five volunteers or delegates were relatively inconspicuous in the Buddhist public, and none of them had been to the West. Sōen ranked high in the monastic hierarchy, whereas the other three monastic delegates were mostly middle-rank in their sects. These four monks, not the lay delegate Noguchi, received generous support from the Buddhist community. To minimize potential risks for the delegates, the resourceful Buddhists shared knowledge about the Parliament and Buddhism in the West. The five delegates accepted the suggestions to represent Japanese Buddhism as Mahāyāna, the Buddha's northern branch of teachings. To appeal to the popular Western perception, they chose a vegetarian lifestyle and topics about basic Buddhist doctrines. Apart from emphasizing Japanese Buddhism's universal, modern, and ethical appeal, the delegates also leveraged Japan's rising international status and prepared topics about Buddhism in Japanese history and culture. They hoped that to comply with the Parliament objectives and Western perceptions would further their domestic objectives. At the Parliament that September, the delegates claimed Japanese Buddhism's connection with the Buddha, although their conception of the Buddha might not have been the same historical Buddha the West sought in the ancient Indian subcontinent. The Japanese delegates' popularity in Chicago made them national heroes in Japan and helped advance their domestic Buddhist revival.

## REFERENCES

### ABBREVIATIONS

- MS *Meikyō shinshi* 明教新誌. 1874–1901.  
 WPR *The World's Parliament of Religions: An Illustrated and Popular Story of the World's First Parliament of Religions, Held in Chicago in Connection*



*with the Columbian Exposition of 1893*. 2 vols. By John Henry Barrows.  
Chicago: The Parliament Publishing Company, 1893.

## PRIMARY SOURCES

- Bukkyō kakushū kōyō* 仏教各宗綱要. Ed. Bukkyō Kakushū Kyōkai 仏教各宗協会.  
Kyoto: Baiyō Shoin, 1896.
- Kanpō* 官報. 1897–1907.
- Rinji hakurankai jimukyoku hōkoku* 臨時博覽会事務局報告. Ed. Rinji Hakurankai  
Jimukyoku 臨時博覽会事務局. Tokyo: Rinji Hakurankai Jimukyoku, 1895.
- The Japan Weekly Mail*. 1877–1915.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

AMA, Michihiro

- 2011 *Immigrants to the Pure Land: The Modernization, Acculturation, and Globalization of Shin Buddhism, 1898–1941*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

AUERBACK, Micah L.

- 2007 *Japanese Buddhism in an Age of Empire: Mission and Reform in Colonial Korea, 1877–1931*. PhD dissertation, Princeton University.

BARROWS, Mary Eleanor

- 1904 *John Henry Barrows, A Memoir*. Chicago: Revell.

BLACKBURN, Anne M.

- 2010 *Locations of Buddhism: Colonialism and Modernity in Sri Lanka*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

BOAS, Franz

- 1893 Ethnology at the exposition. *The Cosmopolitan, An Illustrated Monthly Magazine* 15/5: 607–608.

BONNEY, Charles Carroll

- 1895 The World's Parliament of Religions. *The Monist* 5: 321–44.  
[doi.org/10.5840/monist18955313](https://doi.org/10.5840/monist18955313)
- 1900 *The World's Congress Addresses*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.

COLLCUTT, Martin

- 1988 Buddhism: The threat of eradication. In *Japan in Transition: From Tokugawa to Meiji*, Marius B. Jansen and Gilbert Rozman, eds., 143–67. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

DAKE Mitsuya 嵩満也, ed.

- 2011 Shikago Bankoku Shūkyō Kaigi to Meiji shoki no Nihon bukkyōkai: Shimaji Mokurai to Yatsubuchi Banryū no dōkō o tōshite シカゴ万国宗教会議と

明治初期の日本仏教界一島地黙来と八淵蟠龍の動向をとおして. *Kokusai Shakai Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 13: 255–65.

DHARMAPALA, Anagarika, and Jaipal GIR

1895 *The Budh-Gaya Temple Case: H. Dharmapala Versus Jaipal Gir and Others* (Prosecution Under Sections 295, 296, 297, 143 & 506 of the Indian Penal Code). Calcutta: W. Newman & Co.

DOWNEY, Dennis B.

1983 The congress on labor at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (1908–1984) 76: 131–38.

FAIRBANKS, Arthur

1930 William Sturgis Bigelow (1850–1926). *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 64: 507–10.

FOGEL, Joshua A.

2009 *Articulating the Sinosphere: Sino-Japanese Relations in Space and Time*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

HARDING, John S.

2008 *Mahāyāna Phoenix: Japan's Buddhists at the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions*. New York: Lang.

HAWTHORNE, Julian

1893 Foreign folk at the fair. *Cosmopolitan, A Monthly Illustrated Magazine* 15/5: 568–70.

HUFFMAN, James L.

1997 *Creating A Public: People and Press in Meiji Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

IKEDA Eishun 池田英俊

1976 *Meiji no shin Bukkyō undō* 明治の新仏教運動. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

1994 *Meiji Bukkyō kyōkai kesshashi no kenkyū* 明治仏教教会結社史の研究. Tokyo: Tōsui Shobō.

JAFFE, Richard M.

2004 Seeking Śākyamuni: Travel and the reconstruction of Japanese Buddhism. *Journal of Japanese Studies* 30: 65–96. doi.org/10.1353/jjs.2004.0019

2006 Buddhist material culture, “Indianism,” and the construction of pan-Asian Buddhism in prewar Japan. *Material Religion: The Journal of Objects, Art and Belief* 2: 266–92. doi.org/10.1080/17432200.2006.11423052

KEMPER, Steven

2015 *Rescued from the Nation: Anagarika Dharmapala and the Buddhist World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

KETELAAR, James E.

1991 Strategic occidentalism: Meiji Buddhists at the World's Parliament of Religions. *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 11: 37–56. doi.org/10.2307/1390253

- 1993 *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 2006 The non-modern confronts the modern: Dating the Buddha in Japan. *History and Theory* 45/4: 62–79.
- KIM, Hwansoo Ilmee  
 2012 *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877–1912*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center.
- KITAGAWA, Joseph Mitsuo  
 1987 The 1893 World's Parliament of Religions and its legacy. In *History of Religions: Understanding Human Experience*. AAR Studies in Religion 47, 353–68. Atlanta: Scholars Press.  
 1990 *Religion in Japanese History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McRAE, John R.  
 1991 Oriental verities on the American frontier: The 1893 World's Parliament of Religions and the thought of Masao Abe. *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 11: 7–36. doi.org/10.2307/1390252
- NAKANISHI Naoki 中西直樹  
 2010 Meijiki ni okeru Kyūshū Shinshū no ichidanmen: Kyūshū Bukkyōdan to Kyūshū Bukkyō kurabu no chūshin ni 明治期における九州真宗の一断面—九州仏教団と九州仏教倶楽部を中心に. *Chikushi Jogakuen Daigaku, Tanki Daigakubu Ningen Bunka Kenkyūjo nenpō* 21: 15–39.  
 2015 Zasshi Kokkyō ni miru tsūbukkyōteki kessoku to sono zassetsu: 1890 nendai shotō Kyūshū ni okeru Shinshū no dōkō o chūshin ni 雑誌『國教』にみる通仏教結末とその挫折——一八九〇年代初頭九州における真宗の動向を中心に. *Ryūkoku Daigaku Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 54: 21–32.
- OBATA Buntei 小畠文鼎  
 1973 *Kinsei zenrin sōhōden* 近世禪林僧宝伝. 3 vols. Kyoto: Shibunkaku. Reprint. (Originally published 1938.)
- PROTHERO, Stephen R.  
 1996 *The White Buddhist: The Asian Odyssey of Henry Steel Olcott*. Religion in North America. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- RYDELL, Robert W.  
 1987 *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at the American International Expositions, 1876–1916*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- SAKURAI Kageo 桜井景雄  
 1977 *Nanzenjishi* 南禅寺史. Kyoto: Daihonzan Nanzenji.
- SAKURAI Masashi 桜井 匡  
 1971 *Meiji shūkyōshi kenkyū* 明治宗教史研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

SATŌ Tetsurō 佐藤哲朗

- 2008 *Dai Ajia shisō katsugeki: Bukkyō ga musunda, mō hitotsu no kindaiishi*  
大アジア思想活劇—仏教が結んだ、もうひとつの近代史. Tokyo: Sanga.

SEAGER, Richard Hughes

- 1995 *The World's Parliament of Religions: The East/West Encounter, Chicago, 1893*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

SEAGER, Richard Hughes, ed.

- 1994 *The Dawn of Religious Pluralism: Voices from the World's Parliament of Religions, 1893*. La Salle, IL: Open Court.

SHAKU SŌEN 釈宗演

- 1929–1930 *Shaku Sōen zenshū* 釈宗演全集. 10 vols. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

SHAKU SŌEN, SHAKU TAIBI 釈大眉, and NAGAO Daigaku 長尾大学, eds.

- 1931 *Sōen Zenji shokanshū* 宗演禪師書翰集. Tokyo: Nishōdō.

SHAKU SŌEN, INOUE Zenjō 井上禪定, and MASAKI Akira 正木晃

- 2001 *Shin'yaku, Shaku Sōen "Saiyū nikki"* 新訳・釈宗演「西遊日記」. Tokyo: Dai-hōrinkaku. (Originally published 1941.)

SHAKU TAIBI, ed.

- 1942 *Ryōgakutsu nenjiden* 楞伽窟年次伝. Shizuokaken Suntōgun Kanaokamura: Daichūji.

SHIRATO Hideji 白土秀次

- 1963 *Nomura Yōzō den* 野村洋三伝. Yokohama: Nomura Mitsumasa.

SNODGRASS, Judith M.

- 1997 The deployment of western philosophy in Meiji Buddhist revival. *The Eastern Buddhist*, new series, 30: 173–98.
- 1998 *Budda no Fukuin*: The deployment of Paul Carus's *Gospel of Buddha* in Meiji Japan. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25: 319–44. doi.org/bgjz
- 2003 *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism, Occidentalism, and the Columbian Exposition*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- 2006 Exhibiting Meiji modernity: Japanese art at the Columbian Exposition. *East Asian History* 31: 75–100.
- 2012 Japan's contribution to modern global Buddhism: The World's Parliament of Religions revisited. *The Eastern Buddhist*, new series, 43: 81–102.

SUZUKI Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, ed.

- 1962 *Watakushi no rirekisho* 私の履歴書. In *Watakushi no rirekisho* 15, 67–115. Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Shinbunsha.

SUZUKI Daisetsu, YAMAMOTO Ryōkichi 山本良吉, and INOUE Zenjō, eds.

- 1989 *Suzuki Daisetsu mikōkai shokan* 鈴木大拙未公開書簡. Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo.

- TAKAOKA Ryūshin 高岡隆真  
2005 “*Meikyō shinshi*” *no seikaku to sono hensen* 『明教新誌』の性格とその変遷. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 53: 514–16.
- TAKENUKI Genshō 竹貫元勝  
1989 *Nihon Zenshū shi* 日本禪宗史. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.
- TAMAMURO Taijō 圭室諦成, ed.  
1967 *Nihon Bukkyōshi: Kinsei, kindai hen* 日本佛教史—近世, 近代編 3. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- TAMURA Kōyū 田村晃祐  
2005 *Kindai Nihon no Bukkyōsha tachi* 近代日本の仏教者たち. Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai.
- TOKI Hōryū 土宜法龍 and NINKAI Miyazaki 宮崎忍海, eds.  
1994 *Mokumodō zenshū: Denki, Toki Hōryū* 木母堂全集—伝記・土宜法龍. Tokyo: Ōzorasha.
- Tsuchiya Senkyō 土屋詮教  
1939 *Meiji Bukkyō shi* 明治佛教史. Tokyo: Sanseidō.
- Tsunemitsu Kōnen 常光浩然  
1968 *Meiji no Bukkyōsha* 明治の佛教者. 2 vols. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Tweed, Thomas A.  
2000 *The American Encounter with Buddhism, 1844–1912: Victorian Culture & the Limits of Dissent*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- UMEZAWA Megumi 梅沢 恵, TOKURA Takeyuki 都倉武之, et al.  
2018 *Shaku Sōen to kindai Nippon: Wakaki zensō, sekai o kakeru: Shaku Sōen onki 100 nen kinen tokubetsu ten* 釈宗演と近代日本—若き禅僧、世界を駆ける—釈宗演遠諱100年記念特別展. Kamakura: Engakuji.
- YAMAKAWA Kazushige 山川一成  
2000 *Anagārika Darumapāra to Nihon: Dai ikkai, dai nikai no hōnichi ni tsuite* アナガーリカ・ダルマパーラと日本—第一回・第二回の訪日について. *Pārigaku Bukkyōgaku bunkagaku* 14: 43–52.
- YOSHINAGA Shin'ichi 吉永進一, AKAI Toshio 赤井敏夫, et al.  
2004–2007 *Hirai Kinza and the Globalization of Japanese Buddhism of Meiji Era: A Cultural and Religio-Historical Study*. Grants-in Aids for Scientific Research (Category C) no. 16520060, Japan. [http://www.maizuru-ct.ac.jp/human/yosinaga/hirai\\_report.pdf](http://www.maizuru-ct.ac.jp/human/yosinaga/hirai_report.pdf) (accessed 14 June 2018).
- ZIOLKOWSKI, Eric Jozef et al., eds.  
1993 *A Museum of Faiths: Histories and Legacies of the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions*. Classics in Religious Studies 9. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

