

# *Journal of World Buddhist Cultures*

Vol. 6

## CONTENTS

### ❖ Articles ❖

- ◆ The Construction of History in English Translations of Shin Buddhist Texts: Through the Creation of the Bibliography of Japanese Buddhist Texts

Nobuya DAKE

### ❖ Book Reviews ❖

- ◆ Review of *Nishida, Kawabata, and the Japanese Response to Modernity* by Andrew Feenberg

A. Can PIRTICI

- ◆ Review of *Theosophy Across Boundaries: Transcultural and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on a Modern Esoteric Movement* edited by Hans Martin Krämer & Julian Strube

Gouranga Charan PRADHAN



***Journal of  
World Buddhist Cultures***

**Vol. 6**

**Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures,  
Ryukoku University**

**— March 2023 —**



---

---

## Editorial Note

---

---

**Kenichi Wakita**

**Director, Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures**

The Research Centre for World Buddhist Cultures (RCWBC) was able to arrange two symposia and as many as twenty-five colloquiums, seminars, workshops, and other academic events during the 2021-2022 academic year. We also successfully conducted several academic events in collaboration with the Research Institute for International Society and Culture, Ryukoku University. Some of them were in-person events, while many were conducted in hybrid formats. It has already been three years since Covid19 pandemic began and we are not yet fully out of the difficult situation. We strongly believe that it was only due to the active support of all the stakeholders that we at RCWBC were successful in organizing such a large number of academic events despite the ongoing difficult times.

With great pleasure, we present the sixth volume of the *Journal of World Buddhist Cultures*. The journal upholds the rigorous standards of a peer-review process. We are very proud of the articles that have been included in this volume and would like to thank all the reviewers for their kind and thoughtful comments. We would also like to express our sincere gratitude to all the contributors.

One of the main objectives of our center is to make RCWBC an international hub for Buddhist studies. Together with all the stakeholders from all over the world, we will continue to make every effort to promote Buddhist studies. We look forward to your continued support in the future.

---

# 発刊の辞

---

脇田 健一  
世界仏教文化研究センター長

2022年度、龍谷大学世界仏教文化研究センターでは、二つのシンポジウム、二十五回ほどの講演会・セミナー等を開催することができました。また、国際社会文化研究所との共催でも研究会を開催することができました。いずれも、オンライン、そしてオンラインと対面のハイブリッド形式により実施されました。新型コロナウイルス感染拡大が始まってから3年目になりますが、厳しい状況が続く中でも、このような充実した研究活動を展開できていることは、関係者の皆様のご尽力の賜物と考えております。

さて、このような活発な研究活動を通して、『世界仏教文化研究』第6号を皆様のお手元にお届けできることを心より喜んでおります。本誌は厳しい査読審査を設けており、今号に掲載された学術論文は、そのような査読を通過した優れた水準を持つものと自負しております。査読いただきました皆様には、心より御礼申し上げます。

世界仏教文化研究センターのミッションのひとつは、仏教研究の国際的なハブを構築することにあります。世界各地の皆様と共に仏教研究を推進していけるよう、今後とも努力をして参りたいと考えております。何卒、よろしく願いいたします。

# Table of Contents

**Editorial Note** i

**Table of Contents** iii

❖ **Articles** ❖

**The Construction of History in English Translations of Shin Buddhist Texts: Through the Creation of the Bibliography of Japanese Buddhist Texts**  
**Nobuya DAKE** 3

❖ **Book Review** ❖

**Review of *Nishida, Kawabata, and the Japanese Response to Modernity* by Andrew Feenberg**  
**A. Can PIRTICI** 35

**Review of *Theosophy Across Boundaries: Transcultural and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on a Modern Esoteric Movement* edited by Hans Martin Krämer & Julian Strube**  
**Gouranga Charan PRADHAN** 40

**Purpose of the Journal** 46

**Authors' Profiles** 49

# 目次

発刊の辞	i
目次	iii

## ◆ 論文 ◆

<b>The Construction of History in English Translations of Shin Buddhist Texts: Through the Creation of the Bibliography of Japanese Buddhist Texts</b>	
<b>Nobuya DAKE</b>	<b>3</b>

## ◆ 書評 ◆

<b>Review of <i>Nishida, Kawabata, and the Japanese Response to Modernity</i> by Andrew Feenberg</b>	
<b>A. Can PIRTICI</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Review of <i>Theosophy Across Boundaries: Transcultural and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on a Modern Esoteric Movement</i> edited by Hans Martin Krämer &amp; Julian Strube</b>	
<b>Gouranga Charan PRADHAN</b>	<b>40</b>

発刊の目的	46
執筆者一覧	49



## 凡 例

- 1, 本誌は、英語を主言語とするが、日本語による投稿もさまたげない。したがって、目次、巻末執筆者等は、英語と日本語を併記する。
- 2, 漢字表記については、翻訳を含む日本語原稿の場合、一部の人名、書名を除き、原則、常用漢字に統一する。
- 3, 本誌中に使用されている図版の無断コピーは固く禁ずる。



# *Articles*





# **The Construction of History in English Translations of Shin Buddhist Texts:**

**Through the Creation of the Bibliography of Japanese Buddhist Texts**

**Nobuya DAKE**

Ryukoku University

Part-time Lecturer

**Abstract**

In this paper, I analyze some of the main Shin Buddhist texts translated into English in the early Meiji period as part of my larger project to construct a history of English-translated texts. Previous studies have shown the way modern Japanese intellectuals converted and adopted religious concepts originating from the West. Further scholarship has pointed out that these ideas were rearranged and disseminated within the Japanese context and also had an impact when they spread back to the West. However, few studies have attempted to link these two patterns. This paper aims to bring these two approaches together by specifically considering the process of translation. The analysis of English translations (of Shin Buddhist) texts from the early Meiji period can contribute to shed light on the dynamics of the circulation of ideas on religion between Japan and the West. This paper especially focuses on four English translations: Akamatsu Renjō's "A Brief Account of Shinshiu"; James Troup's "On the Tenets of Shinshu or True Sect of Buddhists"; Nanjō Bunyiu's *A Short History of The Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects*; and Katō Shōkwaku's "Shinshu Catechism." These were translations spun by Japanese Buddhists as they struggled with Westernization, and some of them were English translations of Shin Buddhism. Through the analysis of these international collaborations for translation productions, this paper will contribute to the scholarly debate on the modern "co-creation" of Buddhism.

# The Construction of History in English Translations of Shin Buddhist Texts: Through the Creation of the Bibliography of Japanese Buddhist Texts\*

Nobuya DAKE

**Keywords:** Translation, Strategic Occidentalism, Buddhism, Shin Buddhism

## 1. Introduction

“Westernization” and “Western Impact” are key indicators of the modernization of Japanese Buddhism.<sup>1</sup> The opening of Japan to the West at the end of the Edo period (1603-1867) was a major shock to Japan. As Japan sought to join the ranks of “civilized nations (文明国)”, it was necessary to immediately embrace Western thought as one’s property, and Japanese Buddhism was no exception to this trend. Japanese Buddhists made serious efforts to incorporate the latest academic achievements by actively establishing opportunities for exchange with the Western world, such as the Iwakura Mission (1871–1873) to Europe, the invitation of theosophist Henry Steel Olcott (1832–1907), and the importation of European Buddhist studies. They also attempted to incorporate the latest scholarly achievements by actively engaging in exchanges with the Western world. Shinshū priests were among the first to adapt to this “Westernization” trend.<sup>2</sup>

Most previous studies focusing on the issue of Buddhist Westernization have

---

\* I deeply appreciate the comments of Paride Stortini and Nathan Jishin Michon. I also would like to thank Gouranga Charan Pradhan and two anonymous reviewers at the Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures of Ryukoku University. This paper was funded by a grant from “Seiyōsekaihenō Nihonbukkyō no ‘hasshin’ to Juyō’ 西洋世界への日本仏教の「発信」と「受容」” (Dake Nobuya, JSPS number:22K12985).

<sup>1</sup> Ōtani, “Kindai ka to Bukkyō no Kankei toha?”, 15–16.

<sup>2</sup> Honganji Shiryōken, *Zōho kaiteiban honganji Shi* 3,383.

followed the movements of people who traveled to Europe.<sup>3</sup> For example, in 1872, Kōnyo 広如, the head of the Jōdo Shinshū Nishi Honganji branch (Honganji-ha 本願寺派), ordered the priest, Umegami Takuyu 梅上沢融 (1835–1907) to carry out a study tour of Europe and the United States, and Shimaji Mokurai 島地黙雷 (1838–1911) was assigned to accompany him. In the same period, Akamatsu Renjō 赤松連城(1841–1919), Horikawa Kyō'a 堀川教阿 (date of birth and death unknown), and Kōda Inen 光田為然(1848–1875) traveled to England and Germany to study scientific approaches to Buddhism and religion. It is well known that Shimaji Mokurai, based on the knowledge that he gained during his travels in Europe, wrote “Sanjō Kyōsoku Hihan Kenpaku Sho” 三条教則批判建白書 (Critical Commentary on the Sanjō Doctrinal Rules), and made an important contribution to the debate and establishment of the laws governing freedom of religion and the separation of church and state in Japan, modeled on Western legislation. Akamatsu Renjō, who studied in England and Germany, served as an international liaison for the Honganji.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, in the Jōdo Shinshū Higashi Honganji branch (Ōtani-ha 大谷派), Gennyō 現如 (1852–1923), the head of the sect, sent Kasahara Kenju 笠原研寿 (1852–1883), Nanjō Bun'yū 南条文雄 (1849–1927), and others to England in 1876. The purpose of their visit was to collect sutras and specifically study the Sanskrit versions of the Pure Land sutras. In particular, the methodologies and approaches to texts that Nanjō Bun'yū learned under the Indologist Max Müller(1823–1900) at Oxford University laid the foundation for the so-called “Kindai Bukkyō Gaku 近代仏教学(Modern Buddhist studies)” in Japan. The catalog that he composed while working in Europe as a way to correct Chinese translations with Sanskrit texts that Nanjō brought back to Japan, commonly known as the “Nanjō Catalog,” played an important role in the development of modern Buddhist studies in Japan.

Recent scholarships have traced the footsteps of these Japanese scholar priests abroad, identified who trained them, and what they brought back to Japan.<sup>5</sup> Their study-abroad experiences, from an intellectual perspective, were the driving force behind the rapid modernization of Shinshū. However, little attention has been paid to the English translations of Buddhist texts, which can shed light on the knowledge gained by these traveling scholar priests. A critical consideration of these English translations reveals the strategic use of Western knowledge in the translation process.

<sup>3</sup> Important results include Ogawara, *Kindai nihon no Bukkyō-sha—Ajia taiken to shisō no henyō*, Dake, Yoshinaga and Ohmi, *Nihon bukkyō to seiyō sekai*.

<sup>4</sup> Isabella Bird evaluates Akamatsu Renjō as “a priest of great intellect, high culture, indomitable energy, wide popularity, and far-fetching ambitions for the future of his faith.” See, Isabella, *Unbeaten tracks in Japan*, 248.

<sup>5</sup> See Dake, Yoshinaga, Ohmi (eds.), *Nihonbukkyō to seiyō Sekai*.



It is well known that Japanese intellectuals brought back Western thoughts while returning from abroad. However, they did not simply bring back Western thoughts. Indeed, several conflicts existed. The first section of this paper illustrates the premise of this study, which is the relationship between Orientalism and the Japanese reception of modern Western concepts of Religion and Buddhism. These topics are important to reconsider English-translated texts in Japan. The second part of this essay presents prior research on the English translations related to Japanese Buddhism. Previous scholarships have focused on the World Parliament of Religions held during the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago and on the role of D. T. Suzuki (1870–1966). However, I believe it is important to analyze the surrounding circumstances as well to have a better grasp. In particular, it is important to take into account the entangled pre-history of these translations. Finally, I will lay the foundation for writing a “history of English translations of Shin Buddhist texts.” In this study, the texts under consideration will be organized into two categories: English-translated texts and English texts, and particular attention will be paid to the texts from the early Meiji period (1879–1889). Through this study, I will examine the process of what David McMahan calls “co-created Buddhism,” by looking at it from the Japanese context of the early Meiji period.<sup>6</sup>

## 2. The Reception of Japanese Buddhism in the Western Context

### 2-1 Orientalism

Until the eighteenth century, the term “Orientalism” was a Western academic term that generally indicated knowledge of the language, science, customs, and history grounded in the Orient. However, the meaning of the term underwent a major shift with the appearance of Edward Said’s *Orientalism*. Said took issue with the analytical method of “Orientalism,” and criticized this system for creating a violent relationship in which the Western world is the supreme subject of representation and non-Western societies are merely posited as the objects of recognition, unilaterally defined by the representing subjects “Orient.” According to Said, “If the essence of Orientalism is the ineradicable distinction between Western superiority and Oriental inferiority, then we must be prepared to note how in its development and subsequent history Orientalism deepened and even hardened the distinction.”<sup>7</sup> In short, Said pointed out that a power structure of “ruler” and “ruled” is embedded in the academic system, which is far from its claims of neutrality and objectivity.

<sup>6</sup> McMahan, *The Making of Buddhist Modernism*.

<sup>7</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 51.

The category of “Orientalism” that Said considered problematic is mostly limited to the aspects of literary works and linguistics of the Islamic world of the Middle East. However, this framework has gained traction in other fields of the humanities and has been applied to religious studies and Buddhist studies as well. One of the earliest works that applied Said’s criticism of Orientalism to the field of the modern study of Buddhism is Philip C. Almond’s *The British Discovery of Buddhism*.<sup>8</sup> In his study, Almond argues that the modern image of the “Buddha” is a product of Western perceptions. He reveals that Western “Oriental Studies” represented the Buddha alternatively as an African, a Mongol, or a deity of various nations when they first started to explore Buddhist texts. Almond’s work illustrated that this image of the “Buddha” was created in a way that conformed to Western worldviews, revealing the impact of Orientalism in Buddhist studies. Despite its pioneering role in applying postcolonial theory to the study of Buddhism, Almond’s book has been criticized by scholars for several methodological problems.

As Charles Hallisey has pointed out, “Orientalism makes it materialize and embody an absolute division between ‘the West’ and ‘the East,’ and rejects the voice of the ‘East’.”<sup>9</sup> The concept of Orientalism, a Western-centered view of history, implies that the “East,” as defined by the West, is the correct form that should exist. As a result, Almond’s approach created a dichotomy between “Western Buddhism” and “Eastern Buddhism.” For example, in eighteenth-century European Buddhist studies, the concept of Buddhism was based on the idea that its original meaning had to be sought in ancient texts, which informed prejudices against the Mahāyāna-based traditions of East Asian Buddhism, as they were far removed from the Sanskrit and Pali sources.<sup>10</sup> Thus, Almond’s perspective risks to reinforce the clear power relationship between the “West” as ruler and the “East” as ruled, as it ignores the reality of Buddhism and actual Buddhists in Asia.

Building on these considerations, David L. McMahan and Donald Lopez Jr took the responsibility to develop a new study called “Buddhist modernism.”<sup>11</sup> For instance, McMahan has astutely pointed out that the modern concept of “Buddhism,” was not simply “Western Buddhism,” but a “Global Buddhism” co-created by Asians and Westerners.<sup>12</sup> James Ketelaar, Judith Snodgrass, Jørn Borup, and other have elucidated this point by focusing on the Japanese context. Snodgrass, for example, has argued that the Japanese had a strategy to promote “Japanese Buddhism” as “Eastern Buddhism” at

<sup>8</sup> Almond, *The British Discovery of Buddhism*.

<sup>9</sup> Hallisey, “Roads Taken and Not Taken in the Study of Theravāda Buddhism,” 32.

<sup>10</sup> For more detail, see Hayashi, “Kindainihon ni okeru bukkyōgaku to shūkyōgaku”, 29–53.

<sup>11</sup> Lopez Jr, “Buddha,” 31–62.

<sup>12</sup> McMahan, *The Making of Buddhist Modernism*, 259–261.

the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago, the world's first international religious congress.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, Yoshinaga Shin'ichi, while focusing on the relationship between Japanese Buddhism and Theosophy, has shown the process by which D. T. Suzuki's thoughts became prominent in Western representations of Zen.<sup>14</sup> These studies reveal that the modern concept of Buddhism was not created unilaterally, but through a two-way process involving both Euro-American and Asian intellectuals and religious leaders. As previous studies have pointed out, there is a serious need to redefine their respective roles in this complex and intertwined relationship. To consider this point in more detail, it is useful, first of all, to briefly provide an overview of the recent scholarship on the construction of the concept of religion in modern Japan.

## 2-2 Concept of Religion in Modern Japan

Isomae Jun'ichi is largely credited with the recent burgeoning research in the intellectual history of religion in modern Japan. After examining discussions of Orientalism in the West, Isomae pointed out the problem that "discussions by Western religious scholars tend to cite Japan as a means of rethinking Western religious studies and concepts, and that their ultimate goal is self-criticism of Western society."<sup>15</sup> In other words, the study of Orientalism in the West has mostly aimed solely at self-criticism but has yet to actively address issues and problems from the Japanese context. Isomae rightly states: "In order not to be reduced to a tool in the struggle for intellectual hegemony among indigenous elites over the incorporation of Western intellectual fads, one must be aware of one's position and for what purpose one is discussing this issue."<sup>16</sup> He further adds: "We can no longer regard the concept of religion as a neutral observational description. Rather, it is the very construction of our cognition or subjectivity."<sup>17</sup>

Thus, Isomae's scholarship shows how the idea of "religion" and "religious studies" were born and transformed in Japan. He concluded that "religion" in modern Japan was characterized by a transition from a practice to a belief-based meaning and he has re-emphasized the need for research on the concept of religion in modern Japan. According to him, from the standpoint of the Christian concept of religion, to even call Japanese

<sup>13</sup> Snodgrass, *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism and the Columbian Exposition*, 198–221.

<sup>14</sup> See Yoshinaga, *Shinchigaku to bukkyō*, Jørn Borup, "Pizza curry skyr and whirlpool effects - religious circulations between East and West," 13–21.

<sup>15</sup> Isomae, *Kindainihon no shūkyō gensetsu to sono keifu —Shūkyō • Kokka • Shinto*, 14.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

religiosity by the term “shūkyō” may be seen as incongruous. Nevertheless, the Japanese do believe in the workings of unseen presences. If that belief is called “religion,” then Japanese society has its own way of being religious, though it might differ from the Western way.<sup>18</sup> Isomae redefined religion and religious studies in the context of the relationship between non-Western Japan and Western civilization, and in the context of the Japanese Imperial system. The pioneering work by Isomae has spearheaded a lively debate in later research on the concept of religion in modern Japan.

Hoshino Seiji’s study offers a concrete model of what Isomae has proposed. Hoshino’s research shows that the term “religion” has been viewed as universal and ahistorical, but that such a perception itself is historically constructed. His research has focused on the writings of several Christians of the Meiji period, such as Kozaki Hiromichi 小崎弘道 (1856–1938) and Nakanishi Ushirō 中西牛郎 (1859–1930).<sup>19</sup> According to his interpretation, Christians were searching for ways in which the term “religion” could be reconstructed in the Japanese context. Ultimately, Hoshino argued that the term “religion” was redefined in a way to fit the Japanese context through the medium of modern Japanese Christians such as Ozaki and Nakanishi. His study has demonstrated that the word “religion” gained a new meaning, which often conflicted with Western conceptual conventions. Hoshino’s study can be considered a concrete example of how Isomae’s call was met by a growing scholarly debate over the concept of religion in modern Japan.

Hans Martin Krämer re-examined the idea of “religion” through the case study of Shimaji Mokurai. Krämer has analyzed how Western elements in early Shimaji’s thoughts were reorganized and used by Shimaji, and argued that Western thought was not simply transplanted through Shimaji, but rather he made the concept of “religion” his own through a complex process.<sup>20</sup> Krämer showed how Western elements were reorganized and appropriated in Shimaji’s formative thought. The landmark of Krämer’s study is that it revealed that Shimaji did not merely “accept” Western concepts but “reconstructed” them in a way that was in line with the Japanese context.

The scholarships on the concept of religion in modern Japan are not limited to the exploration of the term “religion” but they have also studied the term “Buddhism.” Orion Klautau’s research focused on prominent scholars who contributed to the birth of “modern Buddhist studies 近代仏教学” in Japan, such as Murakami Senshō 村上專精 (1851–1929) and Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 (1866–1945). Klautau analyzed “how

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 66.

<sup>19</sup> Hoshino, *Kindainihon no shūkyōgainen-shūkyōsha no kotoba to kindai*, 210.

<sup>20</sup> Krämer, *Shimaji Mokurai and the Reconceptation of Religion and the Secular in Modern Japan*, 3–9.

modern Japanese Buddhist scholars accepted and rejected various concepts (Buddhism, religion, science, philosophy, etc.) which were introduced from the “West.” His research concludes that the modern Japanese term for Buddhism, *Bukkyō* 仏教, in its current usage, especially in the context of *yasokyō* 耶蘇教 (Christian) is found in modern Japan since the early 1870s, but this concept was not widely accepted until the late 1880s.<sup>21</sup> As for the specific process of acceptance, he concludes, “Although we can already find examples of the use of *Bukkyō* as a translation for the Western word Buddhism in 1876, the use of ‘Buddhism’ in 1884 was still confused with the idea of ‘Buddhist law’ and could not be said to have taken root.”<sup>22</sup> In this sense, Klautau states that it is possible to view the process of the establishment of the word “Buddhism” or the process of understanding “Buddhism” as a “religion” as the narrative of *Bukkyō* becoming Buddhism. When the European conceptualizations of Buddhism started to spread in Japan in 1876, they were not yet clearly defined, and their meanings were not concrete. Therefore, Modern Japanese Buddhist scholars were entrusted with the mission of shaping what the word “Buddhism” meant. Klautau’s study, after discussing the work of several Buddhist scholars, comes to the following conclusions:

In the context of public universities, “Bukkyō” was reconstructed within the new framework of academic knowledge brought about by the “civilization and enlightenment” movement, but this process was by no means smooth. In other words, among those who could be called “Buddhist scholars” from today’s perspective, various opinions coexisted on how Buddhism should be understood, the role it should play in society, and the concrete methods to achieve this role.<sup>23</sup>

Japanese Buddhists did not simply comply with Western ideas of “Buddhism.” Rather, within the Japanese intellectual context, there were active attempts to convert and incorporate it into the Japanese academic system, and there were discussions about its social role and specific methods of researching Buddhism. As Klautau claims: “Buddhism was not a religion but a philosophy, a philosophy rather than a religion or a philosophy at the same time, and through this process, ‘Buddhism’ was shaped by its disciplinary framework within its academic field of ‘Indian philosophy’.”

This brief sketch of recent scholarship shows that there has been a broad discussion on how Japanese intellectuals not only received but also reconstructed the Western-

<sup>21</sup> Klautau, *Kindainihonshisō toshite no bukkyōshigaku*, 26.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>23</sup> Klautau, “Kindainihon no bukkyōgaku niokeru “Bukkyō Buddhism” no katarikata,” 68–86.

derived concepts of “Religion” or “Buddhism” in Japan.

### **2-3 Circulation of Religious Concepts: Making Transnational Buddhism**

How did then the religious concepts that were accepted and redeveloped in Japan make their way back to Europe and North America? Ketelaar, Snodgrass, and others have suggested that Japanese Buddhists strategically transmitted these concepts to the West, using specifically the World Parliaments of Religions in Chicago as their platform.<sup>24</sup> For a recent example, Aihua Zheng examined how the Japanese Buddhist delegates to the World Parliaments of Religions in 1893 prepared in Japan for their task of representing Japanese Buddhism to the West.<sup>25</sup> There is no doubt that these are very important research. However, Japanese Buddhists reconceived modern concepts of religion and transmitted them to the West not only at the Parliament of World Religions but also through English translations that I will analyze in this paper. In doing so, this paper will contribute a “prehistory” of Shinshū conceptualizations of Buddhism leading to the Parliament of Religions in Chicago. Were they simply following ideas and approaches they learned in Europe and America? Did the Japanese have their own unique theory? If so, what were the specific methods used? These questions can be elucidated through the analysis of the Japanese Buddhist texts translated into English.

The aim of this paper is also to introduce the project of a “History of Japanese Buddhist texts translated into English.” By this, I mean the activities of those Japanese Buddhists who transmitted abroad the concept of religion that they had reorganized borrowing selectively from Western sources. By analyzing these translation works, we can present an aspect of transmission that goes beyond acceptance, and which has not been given much attention by previous scholars. In addition, English translation differs depending on the translator. Therefore, by carefully considering their translation choices, we can hypothesize the contexts and projects of the translators. Through this study, we will be able to understand how modern Japanese intellectuals “transmitted” their ideas to the West by referring to Western knowledge, and shed light on how they strategically used this frame of European Buddhist studies to spread their own ideas about religion, Buddhism, and civilization to the West.

In the context of Shinshū studies, this study falls within the field of Shin Buddhist

---

<sup>24</sup> See Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Also see Snodgrass, *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism and the Columbian Exposition*.

<sup>25</sup> Zheng, “Buddhist Networks: The Japanese Preparation for the World’s Parliament of Religions, 1892–1893,” 247–270.

doctrinal history. This is a field that examines how Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1263), the founder of Shinshū (真宗), has been read and interpreted over time. However, the traditional focus of Shinshū studies has been on Shinran's thoughts in Japan and little attention has been paid to the reception of Shinran's thoughts in other countries. There are studies focusing on international missions, but they have focused on how Shinran's thoughts were “accepted” in those countries. In short, very few scholars have studied how Shinran's thought was transmitted and accepted outside Japan, or the relationship between Japanese modern re-conceptions and their reception in the West.<sup>26</sup> Analyzing the process of translation makes it possible to show how Japanese Buddhists received and transmitted Western concepts. In other words, a more circular analysis between accepted and transmitted ideas is possible. The history of English-translated texts of Shin Buddhism, the subject of this study, is the history of “transmission” woven by scholars, priests, and sometimes Christian missionaries involved in the propagation of Shinshū while struggling to communicate their ideas across different cultures.<sup>27</sup> This method promoted Shinshū understanding in the Western world by substituting expressions used in the Christian Bible as translations of Shinshū doctrine. By analyzing English-translated texts of Shin Buddhism, I believe I can shed light on an aspect of the history of globalizing Shin Buddhist doctrine that has been overlooked by previous scholarship.

### 3. History of Shin Buddhist Texts Translated into English

#### 3-1. Previous Scholarship

There have been only a few studies that focus on English translations of Shin Buddhist texts. An overview of research methods reveals that most studies have focused on individual aspects such as texts, translators, and translated terms.<sup>28</sup> Scholarship in this field has overwhelmingly focused on D. T. Suzuki's English translations, especially, Suzuki's own texts in English and important Buddhist sutras translated by him. This is largely because he is regarded as a leading figure in spreading Japanese Buddhism in North America and Europe. He was the pioneer of the global interest in “zen,” and also

<sup>26</sup> Galen Amstutz shows how Shin Buddhism is interpreted in European and American contexts. For more detail, see Amstutz, *Interpreting Amida: History and Orientalism in the study of Pure Land Buddhism*.

<sup>27</sup> I will not get into detail here, but the debate on Christianity in Japan began during the late Meiji period. In this respect, Christianity and Shin Buddhism were to follow a cooperative path in the translation process in the late Meiji period.

<sup>28</sup> For example, Ishi, “Suzuki Daisetsu no ‘ejaculation’ wo megutte,” 102–110, Dake, “Shinshū niokeru eigohonyaku no kenkyū – Suzuki Daisetsu no eiyaku wo chūshinni –,” 17–38, Tamura, “Ugokidasu Daihi: ‘The Original Prayer’ ni tsuiteno ichi kosatsu,” 254–227, Ando, *Daisetsu*.

played an essential role in the international study of Mahāyāna Buddhism through his writings and translations, such as *Açvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* and *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*. In a recent study of D.T. Suzuki's global influence, Shizuka Sasaki described his work as “a new scripture that should be called the ‘D.T. Suzuki's Mahāyāna Sūtra’ (鈴木大乘經) on the same level as Buddhist scripture, such as the *Heart Sūtra* 般若心經, the *Avatamsaka Sūtra* 華嚴經, and other Buddhist scriptures.”<sup>29</sup>

The important role that D.T. Suzuki played in English-translated texts on Buddhism can also be seen more specifically in his Shinshū texts. For example, the recently published volume *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki - Pure Land*, collects both his translations and original writings in English related to Pure Land Buddhism.<sup>30</sup> Further, various scholars have translated Suzuki's English *Kyōgyōshinshō* 教行信証 back into modern Japanese.<sup>31</sup> In addition to translations of Shin Buddhist doctrinal texts, Suzuki also translated many other works related to Shinshū, such as the *Tannishō* 歎異抄 and he published studies on the “Myōkōnin 妙好人” in English. The large body of scholarship focused on Suzuki as previously mentioned is largely due to his enormous contributions to Buddhist scholarship in the English language. Even though D.T. Suzuki was a towering figure in English-language publications and his knowledge of Shinshū was high, nonetheless he was not the only translator and popularizer of Shinshū in English. During the Meiji and Taishō eras, a wide variety of individuals, including Shin Buddhist priests in Japan, Buddhist missionaries to North America, Christian missionaries, scholars of Buddhism, and scholars of religion made efforts to translate Shin Buddhist texts, while dealing with the cultural and social challenges of the times. Their work has not received adequate academic attention. Why have these English translations of Shin Buddhist texts not received attention? There are two major reasons which have made it difficult to analyze these texts and the translation process.

First, there is a lack of documentation of English-translation related to Shin Buddhism during the Meiji and Taishō periods. An important exception to this lack of scholarship is the recent study of the international exchange between Japanese Buddhism and the West in *Bukkyō kokusai nettowāku no genryū—Kaigai Senkyōkai (1888~1893) no hikari to kage* 仏教国際ネットワークの源流—海外宣教会の光と影 (*The Origins of the International Network for Buddhism—Lights and Shadows of Overseas Missions*). This study pointed out that the main factors that facilitated the contact between

<sup>29</sup> D.T. Suzuki, Sasaki Shizuka trans., *Daijōbukkyō gairon*, 490–491.

<sup>30</sup> Dobbins and Jaffe (eds.), *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume II: Pure Land*.

<sup>31</sup> Shinran Bukkyō center (eds.), *Shinran Kyōgyōshinshō (gendaigoyaku)*.



Japanese and Western Buddhists were the networks and exchanges between Japanese Buddhism and the Theosophical movement. Examples of these interactions were the initiative to invite Henry Steel Olcott (1832–1907) to Japan and the establishment of overseas missions by the school of the Nishi Hongwanji sect (*Futsū kyōkō* 普通教校).<sup>32</sup> Particularly important from the perspective of this paper is the English journal *The Bijou of Asia* (1888–1893), which has been recently rediscovered by historians and republished. This was an English-language magazine published by the members of the *Kaigai Senkyō kai* 海外宣教会 (Overseas Mission Association). It is noteworthy that in the early Meiji period, Jōdo Shinshū priests were already seeking to establish relations with the Western world and to promote internationalization at a very early stage. The fact that the journal was both in English and in Japanese shows an effort in spreading Buddhism not only among first-generation Japanese immigrants but also to anglophone readers. The rediscovery of this English-language journal has prompted the publication of the recent volume *Bukkyō Eisho Dendō no Akebono* 仏教英書伝道のあけぼの (*The Dawn of Buddhist-English Book Propagation*). This book features several English translations of Buddhist texts prior to the publication of *The Bijou of Asia* and introduces the content of each of them. Nakanishi Naoki points out the importance of analyzing Buddhist texts in English from the Meiji period in the introduction of the book, “In considering what modern Buddhism tried to convey to different cultures in the West, future research needs to re-examine the English texts that emerged during the Meiji period.”<sup>33</sup> However, this book and other scholarship focus only on the first half of the Meiji period, while the English translations and texts on Shinshū from the later period have not been fully investigated. This lack of a complete picture of English texts is one of the reasons why research on English translations has not progressed.

The second reason for the little scholarly attention given to English translations is the lack of an overall picture that brings together both English texts on Shinshū and English translations of Shinshū texts, which so far have been studied separately. The lack of a general view of the historical process of translation and publication has also affected the kind of arguments and analyses, which have focused on single texts. It is necessary to take a bird’s-eye view of the English-translated texts and debates on Shinshū of the same period, otherwise, we will fall into the narrow tendency to consider individual texts. One of the reasons for the current research situation that focuses on the analysis of D. T. Suzuki’s English-translated text is the lack of clarification of the whole picture. The

<sup>32</sup> Nakanishi, Yoshinaga (eds.), *Bukkyō kokusai nettowāku no genryū—kaigai senkyōkai (1888~1893) no hikari to kage*, 65–66.

<sup>33</sup> Nakanishi, Nasu, Dake (eds.), *Bukkyō eisho dendō no akebono*, 25.

investigation of the whole picture of English translations and publications on Shinshū will also help to contextualize D.T. Suzuki's English works on Shinshū, which so far have received limited attention. Without a complete picture of English-translated texts in each period, it is difficult to accurately evaluate the English texts and translated books.

Based on the considerations above, this paper aims at introducing a "History of English Translations of Shin Buddhist Texts" during the early Meiji era. In the following sections, I will outline the characteristics of the English-translated texts related to Shinshū in the early Meiji period (1879–1889).

### **3-2. Clarification of Key Terms and Purpose of Study: Transmission and Reception**

My analysis is based on a distinction between "English-translated texts" and "English texts." The term "English-translated texts" here refers to texts for which original texts exist, for instance in Japanese or various forms of classical Chinese and Sino-Japanese (*kanbun*), including English translations of sutras or medieval texts such as *Tannishō*. Most of the authors of the English-translated texts are translators who have been involved in different ways with the context of Japanese Buddhism. On the other hand, I define "English texts" as those texts that exist only in English. Most of the authors of these English texts are Western intellectuals. Of course, it is difficult to completely separate the two categories of English-translated texts and English texts, because sometimes these texts were written by a group of authors. In this paper, however, we will make an effort in categorizing them and use the terms "English-translated texts" and "English texts."

The reason for this categorization choice is that it helps to point out that the cultural backgrounds of the authors of the English texts are completely different from those of the English translations of Buddhist texts, even though they are written in the same language. The English translation of a Buddhist text can analyze the ideas that lie beyond the "acceptance" and "reconstructed" in line with the Japanese context. On the other hand, English texts are more affected by the influence of Orientalism. Some of these English texts were scathingly critical of Japanese Buddhism, some others were defensive of Japanese Buddhism. The English-translated texts and English texts were published in the same period, and the ideas contained in them were in dialogue with each other and in response to each other. Therefore, the classification of English-translated texts and English texts enables us to analyze similar circulating content written in English by considering it into two separate aspects of its "transmission" (English-translated texts) and "reception" (English texts). By precisely separating these two aspects, it is possible to shed light on both Japanese and the Euro-American approaches, and on their

combination in a hybrid form of modern, co-created Buddhism. This process reveals the dynamics of the creation of co-created “Japanese Buddhism” by Asians and Westerners on a global scale. In the following section, I am going to examine more in detail both categories of texts, pointing out the reciprocal influences and the relations established among them.

#### 4. The Formation of “co-created Buddhism” through the Translation Process

##### 4-1 English Translations of Shinshū Buddhist Texts, 1879–1889

Previous studies have pointed out that the English-translated Buddhist texts of this period were influenced by the publication of *A Buddhist Catechism*<sup>34</sup> by Henry Steel Olcott.<sup>35</sup> Therefore, the English-translated texts of the early Meiji period can be considered to be “co-created Buddhism”: a joint effort between members of the Theosophical Society and Japanese Buddhists. Several English-translated texts were published in this period, but in this study, I will focus on four Buddhist doctrinal texts written by Shinshū priests, because they were particularly successful in leaving a strong imprint on the Euro-American reception of Buddhism.<sup>36</sup> In this section, I will analyze the four texts and try to answer the following important question. What methods were used to translate English-translated texts of Japanese Buddhism before Olcott’s arrival in Japan, and how were they evaluated in the Western context? In doing so, I hope this study will supplement the previous scholarship to better understand the conception of “co-created Buddhism.”

##### (1) Akamatsu Renjō, “A Brief Account of Shinshū”, 1879

One of the pioneering works in the translation of Shinshū doctrines in English was “A Brief Account of Shinshū,” a Japanese pamphlet *Shinshū Taii Ryakusetsu* 真宗大意略説<sup>37</sup> translated into English by the Honganji Shinshū priest Akamatsu Renjō in 1879. As for its publication, the Buddhist magazine *Kyōgaku Ronshū* 教学論集 states that it was prepared by Akamatsu to be sent to Senator Edward J. Reed (1830–1906), a member of the British Parliament. This English translation of the Buddhist text first states that Buddhism is a teaching focused on “cause-and-effect” relationships, and then explains

<sup>34</sup> Olcott, *A Buddhist Catechism*.

<sup>35</sup> Nakanishi and Yoshinaga (eds.), *Bukkyō kokusai nettowāku no genryū—Kaigai senkyōkai (1888~1893) no hikari to kage*, 76–80.

<sup>36</sup> For more detail on the English-translated texts and English texts related to Japanese Buddhism, see the “Appendix” given at the end of this paper.

<sup>37</sup> Akamatsu, “Shinshū Taii Ryakusetsu.”

and translates the words “self-power 自力,” “other-power 他力,” and “gratitude 報恩,” which are central doctrines in Shinshū. At the end of the text, under the title “Creed,” an English translation of Rennyō’s *Ryōge-mon* 領解文 (“Creed”) is provided.<sup>38</sup> Akamatsu laid the foundation for the Western reception of Shinshū doctrine, as this was the first publication to introduce Shinshū to the anglophone readership. If we consider this text from the perspective of its connection with its Western audience, we can make two important observations.

First, it sheds light on Japanese Buddhist ways of seeing the concept of *nirvāṇa* at that time. Akamatsu apparently translated this book without much awareness of the already heated debates in European scholarship on Buddhism centering on the idea of *nirvāṇa*. For example, Akamatsu explains the word *nirvāṇa* as follows:

The principal object of Buddhism is to enable men to obtain salvation from misery according to the doctrine of//extinction of passion//(sic). This doctrine is the cause of saluation (sic), and salvation is the effect of the doctrine. This salvation we call Nirvāna which means eternal happiness and is the state of Buddha.<sup>39</sup>

It is not clear to what extent Akamatsu was familiar with European Buddhist studies at this point. However, the fact that his adaptation of the above-mentioned passage indicates that he did not interpret *nirvāṇa* as emptiness, as was the case in the work of many European scholars of Buddhism.<sup>40</sup> Therefore, Akamatsu may not have been aware of the debates around the idea of *nirvāṇa* in the European intellectual milieu.

The second point is that this text reflects an intense awareness of anti-Christian discourse. In fact, in an interview after the publication of this text, Akamatsu explained that one of his intentions in publishing this pamphlet was to criticize Christianity.<sup>41</sup> In this regard, Akamatsu’s English translation emphasized the content of the sentence “kigan suru koto wo kinzu 祈願スルコトヲ禁ズ” by translating it as “forbids all prayers” in his English version. In my interpretation, the text was aimed to distinguish between Christianity and Jōdo Shinshū touched on the problem of translating with the word

<sup>38</sup> Rennyō 蓮如 (1415–1499) was the eighth abbot of the Honganji school of Jōdo Shinshū and was responsible for the wide dissemination of Jōdo Shinshū throughout Japan.

<sup>39</sup> Akamatsu, “A Brief Account of Shinshū.”

<sup>40</sup> Akamatsu states “樂邦即涅槃界に往生せしめんといへる” in the original Japanese text. See Akamatsu “Shinshū Tai Ryakusetsu.”

<sup>41</sup> See *Kinichi Shinpō*, “Eibun Shinshū taiino hyō.”

“prayer” the Shinshū practice called *Sangō Wakuran* 三業惑乱.<sup>42</sup> However, such a strong emphasis on forbidding prayer in Akamatsu’s translation was not retained in the following translations by the same author. As evidence of this, in one of his later publications, the chapter on Shinshū in the volume *A Short History of The Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects*, edited by Nanjō Bun’yū, the English sentence “forbid all prayers” was replaced by “neither spells nor supplications.”<sup>43</sup> The term “prayer” came to be used to refer to Amida Buddha’s “Original Prayer 本願.” This is because Akamatsu learned that the Sanskrit word *praṇidhāna* should be translated as “prayer” with Nanjo’s help. This pattern also can be found in a statement by James Troup.<sup>44</sup> The emphasis in the translation was on making the terminology as Sanskrit as possible.

How was this book read and understood in terms of the English text (reception) from the English-translated texts (transmission)? The person for whom the pamphlet was originally written, Edward Reed, published an account of his travels in Japan in 1880. In this book, Reed described his understanding of Shinshū doctrine based on Akamatsu’s “A Brief Account of Shinshū.” Reed’s understanding reflects a reconstruction of Shinshū doctrine based on Christian worldviews. Just as “Buddha” was represented in various ways and through orientalist projections in the Western world, Shinshū ideas were read through the filter of Christianity. For example, Reed quotes Akamatsu’s text in its entirety and then evaluates Shinshū as follows:

It is obvious from this statement coming from a source entirely unquestionable, that for six centuries and a half there has existed and flourished in Japan a section of Buddhists who believe in the doctrine of salvation by faith; who consider heaven attainable at the close of this life using that faith; who have swept aside many of the most prominent restrictions of what we have all supposed to be the ancient Buddhist faith—Celibacy, penances, fastings, seclusions, pilgrimages, etc.<sup>45</sup>

In his English text, Reed interpreted the expression “enter into paradise” in Akamatsu’s

<sup>42</sup> *Sangō Wakuran* 三業惑乱 concerns the understanding of “tanomu 頼む(prayer),” which was not only a dispute among scholars but also escalated into a riot involving the local monks.

<sup>43</sup> Akamatsu wrote “*Kinyō kitō no Hō wo mochiizu*”(禁厭祈祷ノ法ヲ用イズ) in his original text. See Ogurusu Kōcho (ed.), *Bukkyō Junishu Yōko*, 111.

<sup>44</sup> James Troup states “In this paper, the term “Prayer” has been used throughout, and not “Vow,” as the translation of the character 願, which it appears, is used as the equivalent of “*praṇidhāna*,’ which is better rendered by “prayer” than “vow.” The expression “Hon-gan” (Transaction Vol.XVI page8, et al.) had better be rendered, “Great Prayer.” See Troup, “The Gobunsho or Ofumi of Rennyō Shōnin,” 111.

<sup>45</sup> Reed. *Japan: Its History, Traditions and Religions*, 86–89.

pamphlet according to the Christian idea of “reaching heaven,” and this contributed to Reed’s positive evaluation of the Shinshū sect. However, it was by no means clear that this was Akamatsu’s intention. From the perspective of Reed’s English text (reception) of Akamatsu’s English-translated text (transmission), Akamatsu’s purpose of criticizing Christianity and proclaiming the uniqueness of Shinshū had failed. As Reed’s assessment of Shin Buddhism as “a religion closely linked to the ideal form of Christianity”<sup>46</sup> shows, Shinshū doctrine was still interpreted in the light of Christianity.

## (2) James Troup, “On The Tenets of the Shinshiu or ‘True Sect’ of Buddhists,” 1885

On October 21, 1885, James Troup, British Consul in Osaka and Kobe, presented a reading of “On The Tenets of the Shinshiu or ‘True Sect’ of Buddhists” at the Asiatic Society of Japan. This text is a direct translation of Ogurusu Kōchō’s *Shinshū Doctrine* (Chinese text, 真宗教旨), published in 1876.<sup>47</sup> This book was reviewed by Nanjō Bun’yū who had just returned from his study abroad at Oxford University, and Akamatsu Renjō.

Troup’s translation was to consult Nanjō and Akamatsu about the points of the Shinshū doctrine that he did not understand, which facilitated his steady progress in translating the text into English. Troup also mentioned that he received help from James Summers (1828–1891), who was teaching English literature at *Tokyo Kaisei Gakko* 東京開成学校 (the predecessor of Tokyo Imperial University) to complete the translation.

At the time, the only text that gave an outline of Shinshū doctrines in English was the previously mentioned “A Brief Account of Shinshiu” by Akamatsu Renjō. Therefore, Troup’s translation contributed to the creation of some of the earliest English terminology for many Shinshū doctrinal terms. This translation received high praise in the press.<sup>48</sup> However, when seen from the perspective of our definition of English texts (reception) from an English-translated text (transmission), we can shed light on different aspects of this text. Troup’s translation was once on the list of books that the representatives of Japanese Buddhism were planning to bring to the World Parliaments of Religions of Chicago in 1893.<sup>49</sup> Nonetheless, it was decided not to include it in the list of items to bring to Chicago. Despite its great domestic reputation, this book was not used for dissemination to the Western world and was never brought to the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago. Moreover, it was not used as a missionary tool for the propagation

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 89.

<sup>47</sup> Ogurusu, *Shinshu Kyōshi*.

<sup>48</sup> See “Osaka Tsushin.”

<sup>49</sup> Kaigai Senkyōkai (eds.), “Eigo Bussho Sehon,” 20.

of Shin Buddhism in North America. Nor, as far as I can tell, did it appear as a reference in any English-language texts outside of Japan.

The reason for this lack of success abroad could be ascribed, in my view, to the methodology of translation used in Troup's text. The book was mostly based on Chinese terminology and mostly focused on showing the points of contact between Chinese Buddhism and Japanese Buddhism. The book mostly referred to Chinese Buddhist terminology. For instance, Troup states "The term 'temporary,' (權) is explained by 'means,' or devices used towards an end, as opposed to the 'true' (實) or real."<sup>50</sup> Troup employed a translation strategy that sought the meanings directly in the Chinese characters. Further, James Troup introduces the origin of Shin Buddhism from the Tendai sect in China and describes how Pure Land Buddhism in China has been passed down through Hōnen and Shinran. Such a Sino-centric approach was criticized by scholars who were informed by the methods of modern European Buddhist studies, which gave priority to finding a connection between later forms of Buddhism with Indic forms and with the historical founder Śākyamuni. The reason why this book was not widely disseminated outside of Japan, despite its high reputation, is largely because it was adapted from Ogurusu's *Shinshū Kyōshi* 真宗教旨, which used categories and approaches based on Chinese Buddhism.<sup>51</sup> In other words, Troup's text was never used to establish a dialogue with Europeans and North Americans because it was intended for an audience with familiarity with Chinese Buddhism and its language. In this sense, this book did not contribute to developing "co-created Buddhism," but was used only by Japanese readers who wanted to study Buddhism in English.

### (3) Nanjō Bunyū, *A Short History of The Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects*, 1886

Nanjō Bun'yū's English text *A Short History of The Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects*, and its Japanese edition *Bukkyō Jūnishū kōyō* 仏教十二宗綱要 appeared simultaneously in December 1886.<sup>52</sup> The proposer of these books was the publisher Sano Shōdo 佐野正道 (?–1917), who wanted to publish a book offering an overview of the twelve sects of Japanese Buddhism. The most significant feature of this book is its use of Buddhist terminology in transliteration from Sanskrit rather than Chinese. This is due in large part to the involvement of Nanjō, who studied Sanskrit and worked as an editor of Buddhist texts under the guidance of Max Müller at Oxford University.

<sup>50</sup> Troup, "On The Tenets of The Shinshū or 'True Sect' of Buddhists," 4.

<sup>51</sup> Ogurusu, *Shinshū Kyōshi*.

<sup>52</sup> Japanese edition: Ogurusu (ed.), *Bukkyō Junishū Yōko*, English edition: Nanjō (ed.), *A Short History of the Japanese Buddhist Sects*.

Looking at it from the perspective of dynamics of translation (transmission to reception), this book has been used as a source of reference in numerous English texts on Buddhism, and it has served as an introduction to understanding Japanese Buddhism in the anglophone world. Shortly after its publication, it was also translated into French. In 1889, Fujishima Ryōun 藤島了穩 (1852–1918), a Honganji priest who was sent to study in France, translated Nanjō's book into French and published it.<sup>53</sup> In recognition of his achievement, Fujishima was awarded the *Officier d'Académie* by the French government. This fact shows that Nanjō's book was highly evaluated in France, which was one of the most important countries for scholarship on Buddhism at that time.

The appearance of this book by Nanjō made it possible to connect Western perceptions of Buddhism with English translations of Japanese Buddhist texts. With the publication of *A Short History of The Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects*, English-translated texts related to Japanese Buddhism took a new step toward joining the scholarly debate on Buddhism in the West. In this sense, this book is a monumental text in that it marks the transition from translations based on Chinese to English translations based on Sanskrit.

#### (4) Katō Shōkwaku, “Shinshu Catechism”, 1889

In September 1889, Katō Shōkwaku 加藤正廓 (1852–1903), a Shinshū priest, published a series of articles titled “Shinshu Catechism” in the theosophical magazine *The Theosophist*. The series ran for three months until December 1889. These essays offered an introduction to the doctrines of Shin Buddhism in a question-and-answer format following the style included in Henry Steel Olcott's *Buddhist Catechism* (1881). The introduction to the book was written by Olcott himself. In the introduction, Olcott mentions a number of Shinshū believers and presents some of the characteristics of their sect's doctrines and practices, such as the so-called *hisō hizoku* 非僧非俗 (neither monk nor layman) principle for Shinshū priests of “non-monasticism” and permission to have a wife.

Olcott pointed out the curious coincidence of Shinshū doctrine with Nestorianism, an ancient form of Christianity that spread in China around the sixth century, which prompted Olcott to hypothesize a Nestorian influence on the origins of Shinshū. Since the introduction also stated that the comparison of Shinshū doctrine with Christianity was essential for the future propagation of Shinshū, the reader might be led to think that this book preached Shinshū in parallel with Christianity. However, in his text, Katō made it clear that his aim was not to preach Christianity, but to present the historical contact of

<sup>53</sup> See Fujishima, *Le Bouddhisme Japnais Doctrines Et Historie Des Douze Grandes Sects Bouddhisques Du Japon*, 25.



Shin Buddhism with the historical Buddha, as in the following passage:

Q. How do you know that the preaching of this doctrine was the original desire of Sâkyamuni?

A. Because it is explained by him in the sūtra, and, moreover, it is Buddha's mercy to pity them who are sinful and helpless; just as a life-boat is prepared for drowning men and not for anyone on the bank.<sup>54</sup>

Although this book used the “catechism” method following Olcott's example and was inspired by a substrate of Christian methods of proselytism, the focus of Katō's text was not the history of Christianity, but a comparison between Southern Buddhism and Northern Buddhism. The reason for this may be that he wanted to coordinate that the roots of Olcott's conception of Buddhism and the Japanese conception of Buddhism are different. In a recent scholarship, Baba Norihisa astutely pointed out that Shaku Sōen 釈宗演 (1860–1919) had a strategic classification of Buddhism.<sup>55</sup> This translation clearly shows that Japanese Buddhists became aware of the position of their Buddhism on a global scale after encountering Olcott. The dialogue with the Southern Buddhists, Olcott gave Japanese Buddhists an opportunity to become aware of their different traditions. Therefore, although the book has a question-and-answer format, it reveals a clear awareness of concepts and methods of European Buddhist studies, rather than a reflection of Christian ideas and approaches to proselytization.

#### **4-2 Characteristics of “co-created Buddhism” through Translations in Early Meiji**

The analysis of the four texts above shows that English translations of Shinshū texts contributed to modern “co-created Buddhism.” However, the co-creation of Buddhism through these translations and the circulation of ideas still reveal conflict between self-expression and Westernization. The translators show different and at times conflicting ways of assimilating Western concepts. These conflicts can be classified into three major groups.

First of all, the methods and terminologies used in the translations shifted from following traditional models of Japanese Buddhist Studies to European Buddhist Studies. For example, one of the characteristics of these texts of the early Meiji period was the shift from translations that had previously been based on Chinese Buddhist terminology

<sup>54</sup> Katō, “A Shin Shu Catechism,” 753.

<sup>55</sup> See Baba, “Kindai ni okeru daijōbukkyō to Jōzabu Bukkyō no Sōzo,” 213–241.

to translations that stressed the association between Japanese Buddhist terms and Sanskrit ones. This is particularly visible in Nanjo's text, where he particularly emphasized the use of Sanskrit, even if the terminology was not refined. This can be interpreted as a result of Japanese Buddhist's acceptance of European approaches in Buddhist studies and their application to their transmission.

The second point of conflict shown by the texts analyzed can be seen in the question-and-answer format as a kind of strategy to introduce Japanese Buddhism. The question-and-answer format was an innovative means in the Japanese context and was originally inspired by Christian proselytism. A publication that followed this model closely was Olcott's *Buddhist Catechism*. Katō Shōkwaku's "Shinshu Catechism" adopted this text's question-and-answer structure. Despite using Olcott's book as a model, Katō did not frame his presentation in terms of the relationship between Buddhism and Christianity as Olcott did, but portrayed Shinshū in the form of a question-and-answer discussion between Southern and Northern traditions of Buddhism. This is probably because the audience for "Shinshu Catechism" was not a general Christian one, but was ideally made of Theravada Buddhists or European scholars of Buddhism with whom Japanese Shinshū priests were engaging in discussing their own tradition.

The third and last point of the conflict centered on a strong awareness in the English translations of Shinshū texts of the debate concerning the fact that "Mahāyāna Buddhism was not the word of the Buddha (*daijō hibussetsuron*" 大乘非仏説論). This debate is famously exemplified by the scholarship and polemics raised by one of the most famous historians of Buddhism of the Meiji period, Murakami Senshō 村上專精 (1851–1929), who separated historical and doctrinal approaches, and took the following conclusion: "From the perspective of the Mahāyāna theory of *buddhakāya* 仏身論 ("Buddha-bodies"), we can state that Mahāyāna Buddhism was definitely Buddhism."<sup>56</sup> It was already an obvious assumption for Buddhist intellectuals of the late Meiji period that the Mahāyāna was not a direct teaching of the Buddha. However, a similar point had already been strongly forwarded by translators in the early Meiji period.

In short, the process of translation into English of Shin Buddhist doctrines in the early Meiji period reveals a search for Shin Buddhism's position within the ambivalent relationship of cooperation and confrontation with European scholarship.

<sup>56</sup> Murakami Senshō is a famous scholar and Buddhist priest who belonged to the Shinshū sect. He devoted himself mainly to the development of higher education during the Meiji and Taisho eras. In particular, he has conducted research on Buddhist thoughts and history in a form that can withstand criticism from modern academic systems. For more detail of *daijō hibussetsuron*" 大乘非仏説論 see Murakami, *Bukkyō touitsuron taikō*, Klautau (ed.), *Murakami Senshō to nihon kindai bukkyō*.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper examined four English-translated texts on Shin Buddhism written during the early Meiji period. Previous studies have shown how modern Japanese intellectuals adopted and converted the religious conceptions they learned through their contact with the West. These ideas were then reformulated and circulated within the Japanese contexts, from where they again traveled back to the West. However, little effort has been done by previous research to link these two patterns. This paper has brought these two patterns of circulation of ideas together by analyzing in detail the process of translation.

The first part of this paper offered an overview of the previous relevant scholarship in order to introduce a key concept: “co-created Buddhism.” Previous studies have focused on Orientalism and the historical reception of Japanese Buddhism in the West, providing the premise for this study. Orientalism also affected the study of Buddhism, and in recent years the study of various forms of Buddhist modernism has produced a vibrant scholarly debate. This paper especially builds on what David McMahan defined as “co-created Buddhism,” pointing out that the concept of “Buddhism,” which became globalized in the modern era, was not simply the product of Western representations of Buddhism, but a co-creation by Asians, Europeans, and North Americans intellectuals.

The second part of this paper focused on the English texts and translations of Shin Buddhism and on the methodology employed in this paper to analyze the translations and circulation process. A review of the research methods revealed that most studies have limited their attention to individual aspects of this textual production, such as texts, translators, and translated terms. In addition, these scholarships have been almost exclusively centered on D. T. Suzuki’s English texts and translations. However, this paper argues that it is important to read the texts in their broader historical contexts with an eye on the periphery in order to unravel the whole picture. In terms of the methodology, I made a distinction between “English-translated texts” and “English texts.” The term “English-translated texts” here refers to those texts for which original Japanese texts exist. Most of the authors of the English translations of Buddhist texts are translators involved in the context of Japanese Buddhism as priests, lay intellectuals, or teachers. On the other hand, the English-language text exists only in the English language without any direct adaptation from Japanese sources. Most of the authors of these English texts are European and American intellectuals. Through a close reading of the dynamics of the translation process, I have attempted to elucidate the conditions under which the modern concept of Buddhism is created and developed globally.

Finally, I observed some salient characteristics of translations in the early Meiji

period. One of the features of early Meiji period translation was the circulation and dialogue between Japanese and European Buddhist study circles. The translation of Japanese Buddhism, which had previously followed a strong reference system to Chinese language canonical sources, was facilitated with the start of Nanjō Bunyu's scholarship, which influenced the production of English translations of Shinshū texts building on the approaches of European Buddhist studies. Although the vocabularies were not yet refined, the aim was to produce translations that showed a connection between Japanese Buddhism and Sanskrit sources. The search for a way to place Japanese Buddhism within European-based modern Buddhist studies was one of the hallmarks of the English translation history of Japanese Buddhism in the early Meiji period. The second characteristic of the texts produced in this period is the employment of a question-and-answer format, such as the case of "Shinshu Catechism." Although this essay uses the word "catechism" in its title and is modeled on the question-and-answer structure of Christian missionary literature, its focus nonetheless was not a comparative study of the history of Buddhism in relation to Christianity, but it focused a comparison between Southern Buddhism and Northern Buddhism. The third feature of the texts analyzed in this paper is that there was a strong awareness of the debate around Mahāyāna Buddhism not being the direct utterance of the historical Buddha. These three characteristics which emerged from my analysis of the texts show that it was truly a time when translators were searching for ways to deal with new ideas and methods coming from the West, and in doing so they participated in the co-creation of the modern concept of Buddhism with the West.

The four English-translated texts this paper discussed clearly help better understand what McMahan calls "co-created Buddhism." Through the exploration of such dynamics of international translation processes, this paper aimed at contributing to the ongoing scholarship about "Global Buddhism" or "Buddhist Modernism." Of course, the examples discussed here are only a small fraction of what can be investigated. Further developments of this research project will shed more light on the historical development of English texts and translations of Shin Buddhism.

## Appendix

English texts and English-translated texts mention "Japanese Buddhism"				
Year(年)	著者(Author)	論文・書籍名(Title)	掲載誌 (Journal)・出版社(Company)	Vol (Number)
1879	Akamatsu Renjio	A Brief Account of "Shinshiu"	「興隆雜誌」 (Kōryū zasshi)	12
1879	Bruhmet, M. A.	Religion of Japan	<i>Potter's American Monthly</i>	13
1879	Satow, Ernest M.	Ancient Japanese Rituals (Part I, II)	<i>Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan</i>	7
1879	Unknown	A Buddhist Tract	<i>The Missionary Herald</i>	75(12)
1880	Bird, Isabella L. (Isabella Lucy)	Unbeaten tracks in Japan; an account of travels in the interior including visits to the aborigines of Yezo and the shrine of Nikkō	New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons	Book
1881	Henry steel Olcott	Buddhist Catechism, According to the canon of The Southern Church	Theosophical Society in Colombo	Book
1880	Max Muller	On Sanskrit Texts Discovered in Japan	The Royal Asiatic Society	Book
1881	Max Muller, Nanjo	Buddhist Texts from Japan	Anecdota Oxonesia	Book
1881	Unknown	The Religions of Japan	<i>Theosophist</i>	3(1)
1881	Unknown	The Pupil of Swami Dayanund at the Congress of Orientalists	<i>Theosophist</i>	3(3)
1881	Gordon, M. L.	The Shinshiu Buddhist doctrine of Amida Buddha and the Theism of the Old Testament	<i>Chrysanthemum</i>	1
1882	Gordon, J. W.	The Legend of Amida Buddha	<i>Chrysanthemum</i>	2
1882	Gordon, M. L.	The Doctrine of Amida Unauthentic	<i>Chrysanthemum</i>	2
1882	William Gray Dixon	The Land of the Morning	Edinburgh: James Gemmell	Book
1883	Unknown	Col. Olcott's Buddhist Catechism	<i>Theosophist</i>	4(12)
1884	Satow, Ernest M.	Buddhism	A Handbook for Travelers in Central and Northern Japan	Book
1885	H.P. Blavatsky	A Bewithoued Life	<i>Theosophist</i>	6(11)
1885	H.P. Blavatsky	A Bewithoued Life	<i>Theosophist</i>	6(12)
1886	Nanjo Bunyiu	A Short History of Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects	Tokyo: Bukkyō Sho Eiyaku Shuppankai	Book
1886	James Troup	On the Tenets of Shinshiu	<i>Asiatic Society of Japan</i>	14
1886	Gordon, M. L.	The Buddhisms of Japan	<i>Andover Review</i>	5 (27)
1887	Maurice Fredal	Buddhism in Japan	<i>Theosophist</i>	8
1887	William Q. Judge	Literary Notes	<i>The Path</i>	2(7)
1888	Matsuyama Matsutarō	Extracts from Letters	<i>The Buddhist Ray</i>	1(7)
1888	Matsuyama Matsutarō	Questions and Answers	<i>The Buddhist Ray</i>	1(10)
1888	Unknown	WHAT WE MEAN	<i>The Bijou of Asia</i>	1(1)
1888	Unknown	Precious Gatha	<i>The Bijou of Asia</i>	1(1)
1888	William Q. Judge	Literary Notes	<i>The Path</i>	3(5)
1888	Eusebio Urban	A Buddhist Doctrine(「英文真宗教旨」)	<i>The Path</i>	3(6)
1888	Unknown	A Brief Outline of Buddhism in Japan	<i>The Bijou of Asia</i>	1 (1)
1888	Richard Collins	Nirvana, as the final goal of the Buddhist	<i>The Bijou of Asia</i>	1(2)
1888	Belle Budsh	The Highest Love; Little Bijoi(Japan)	<i>The Bijou of Asia</i>	1(2)
1888	Theodore Wright	Little Bijou	<i>The Bijou of Asia</i>	1(2)
1888	Unknown	Precious Gatha	<i>The Bijou of Asia</i>	1(2)
1888	Unknown	A Brief Outline of Buddhism in Japan	<i>The Bijou of Asia</i>	1(2)
1889	William Q. Judge	Japan	<i>The Path</i>	4(2)
1889	Matsuyama Matsutarō	Japan	<i>The Path</i>	4(5)
1889	Unknown	A Buddhist Propaganda(The Bijou of Asia)	<i>The Buddhist Ray</i>	2(3)
1889	M. Matsuyama	The Six Paramitas	<i>The Buddhist Ray</i>	2(6)
1889	Shokwaku Kato	A Shinshu Catechism Part 1	<i>Theosophist</i>	10(120)
1889	Shokwaku Kato	A Shinshu Catechism Part 2	<i>Theosophist</i>	11(121)
1889	Shokwaku Kato	A Shinshu Catechism Part 3	<i>Theosophist</i>	11(122)
1889	James Troup	The Gobunsho or Ofumi, of Rennyo Shōnin	<i>Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan</i>	17
1889	Archibald Scott, D.D	Buddhism and Christianity-A Pararell and a Contrast	Edinburgh: David Douglas	Book
1889	One of the Staff	Off to Japan	<i>Theosophist</i>	10

**Bibliography**

- Aihua Zheng. “Buddhist Networks: The Japanese Preparation for the World’s Parliament of Religions, 1892-1893.” In *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 46 (2) 2019: 247-270.
- Akamatsu, Renjio 赤松連城. “A Brief Account of //Shinshiu//” In *Kōryū-Zasshi* 興隆雑誌 3, 1879.
- Ando Reiji 安藤礼二. *Daisetsu* 大拙. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2019.
- Baba Norihisa 馬場紀寿. “Kindai ni okeru daijō Bukkyō to Jōzabu Bukkyō no Sōzo” In *Bukkyō no Seitō to Itan*, 仏教の正統と異端 Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai (2022) : 213-241.
- Bird, Isabella L. *Unbeaten tracks in Japan; an account of travels in the interior including visits to the aborigines of Yezo and the shrine of Nikkō*, 2 New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1880.
- Charles, Hallisey. “Roads Taken and Not Taken in the Study of Theravāda Buddhism.” In Lopez Jr., Donald (ed.), *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism Under Colonialism*, ed. Donald Lopez. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Dake Mitsuya 嵩満也. Yoshinaga Shin’ichi 吉永進一, Ohmi Toshihiro 碧海寿広 (eds.). *Nihon Bukkyō to seiyō Sekai* 日本仏教と西洋世界, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2020.
- Dake Nobuya 嵩宣也. “Shinshū ni Okeru Eigohonyaku no Kenkyū—Suzuki Daisetsu no Eiyaku wo Chushinni—”真宗における英語翻訳の研究—鈴木大拙英訳を中心に—, In *Ryukoku Daigaku Daigakuin Bungaku Kenkyūka Kiyō* 龍谷大学大学院文学研究科紀要 38, (2016):17-38.
- Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki 鈴木大拙. *Açvaghosha's Discourse on the awakening of faith in the Mahāyāna*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1900.
- . *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, London: Luzac Company, 1907.
- Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki trans. *Kyōgyōshinshō: The Collection of Passage Expounding the True Teaching Living, Faith, and Realizing of the Pure Land*. Edited by Eastern

- Buddhist Society. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtaniha, 1973.
- D.T.Suzuki, Sasaki Shizuka trans 鈴木大拙著・佐々木閑訳. *Daijō Bukkyō Gairon* 大乘仏教概論, Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko, 2016.
- David L. McMahan. *The Making of Buddhist Modernism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Edward J. Reed. *Japan: Its History, Traditions and Religions*, London: John Murray, 1880.
- Edward W. Said. *Orientalism*, New York: Pantheon books, 1978.
- Fujishima Ryōun 藤島了穩. *Le Bouddhisme Japnais Doctrines Et Historie Des Douze Grandes Sects Bouddhisques Du Japon*, Paris Et Ch. Leclerc, Éditeurs 25 Quai Voltaire, 25, 1889.
- Galen, Amstuz, *Interpreting Amida: History and Orientalism in the study of Pure Land Buddhism*, New York: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Hans Martin Krämer. *Shimaji Mokurai and the Reconception of Religion and the Secular in Modern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015.
- Hayashi Makoto 林 淳. “Kindainihon niokeru bukkyōgaku to shūkyōgaku” 近代日本における仏教学と宗教学. In *shūkyō Kenkyū* 76, no.2 (2002):29-53.
- Henry Steel, Olcott. *A Buddhist Catechism*, Tokyo: Meikyō-sha, 1886.
- Hongwanji Shiryo Kenkyusho 本願寺史料研究所 (eds.). *Zouho kaiteiban hongwanji-shi* 3 増補改訂版本願寺史 第3巻, Kyoto: Honganji Shuppansha, 2019.
- Hoshino Seiji 星野靖二. *Kindai Nihon no shūkyōgainen-shūkyōsha no kotobato Kindai*, 近代日本の宗教概念—宗教者の言葉と近代— Tokyo: Yushisha, 2012.
- Ishi Shūdo 石井修道. “Suzuki Daisetsu no ejaculation wo megutte” 鈴木大拙の ejaculation の説をめぐって, In *Indogaku Bukkyō gaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 64 ,no.1, (2015):102-110.
- Isomae Jun'ichi 磯前順一. *Kindainihon no shūkyō gensetsu to sono keifu—Shūkyō・Kokka・Shinto* 近代日本の宗教言説とその系譜—宗教・国家・神道, Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 2003.

- James C. Dobbins, Richard. M. Jaffe (eds.). *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume II: Pure Land*. California: University of California Press, 2015.
- James, Troup. “On The Tenets of The Shinshiu or ‘True Sect’ of Buddhists”, In *The Asiatic Society of Japan* 14, Tokyo: The Hakubunsha 1886.
- . “The Gobunsho or Ofumi of Rennyō Shōnin”, In *The Asiatic Society of Japan* Vol.17, Tokyo: The Hakubunsha 1889.
- Jørn, Borup. “Pizza curry skyr and whirlpool effects - religious circulations between East and West.” In Jørn Borup, Marianne Qvortrup Fibiger (eds.), *Eastspirit Transnational Spirituality and Religious Circulation in East and West*. Boston: Brill, (2017):13-35.
- Judith, Snodgrass. *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism and the Columbian Exposition*, Chapel hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Kaigai Senkyōkai 海外宣教会 (eds.). “Eigo Bussho Sehon 英語仏書施本”, In *Kaigai Bukkyō Jijō* 海外仏教事情, Kyoto: Kaigai Senkyōkai, Vol.34, 1893.
- Katō Shōkwaku 加藤正廓. “A Shinshu Catechism” In the *Theosophist*, 10(120) 1889.
- Ketelaar, James Edward. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Lopez Jr., Donald. “Buddha” In Lopez Jr., Donald (ed.), *Donald Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, (2005):31-62.
- Murakami Senshō 村上專精. *Bukkyō touitsuron taikō* 仏教統一論 大綱論 Kyoto: Kinkō-dō,1901.
- Nanjō Bunyū ed. *A Short History of the Japanese Buddhist Sects, Eibun Bukkyō Junishu Yoko* 英文仏教十二宗綱要、Bukkyō Sho Eiyaku Shuppankai, 1886.
- Nakanishi Naoki 中西直樹, Nasu Eisho 那須英勝, Dake Mitsuya 嵩満也 (eds.). *Bukkyō Eisho Dendō no Akebono* 仏教英書伝道のあけぼの Kyoto:Hōzōkan,2018.
- Nakanishi Naoki 中西直樹, Yoshinaga Shin’ichi 吉永進一 (eds.). *Bukkyō Kokusai Nettowāku no Genryū—Kaigai Senkyōkai (1888~1893) no hikari to kage* 仏教



- 国際ネットワークの源流－海外宣教会（1888～1893年）の光と影－,  
Kyoto:Sanninsha, 2015.
- Ogawara Masamichi 小川原正道 (ed.). *Kindainihon no bukkyō-sha—Ajia taiken to shiso no henyō* 近代日本の仏教者—アジア体験と思想の変容—, Tokyo: Keio Gijuku Shuppankai, 2010.
- Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一. “Kindai ka to Bukkyō no Kankei toha?,” in Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一, Yoshinaga Shinichi 吉永進一, Kondo Shuntaro 近藤俊太郎. (eds.), *Kindai Bukkyō Studies—Bukkyō kara Mita mouhitotsu no Kindai* 近代仏教スタディーズ—仏教からみたもうひとつの近代 Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2016.
- Ogurusu Kōcho 小栗栖香頂. *Shinshū Kyōshi* 真宗教旨, Kyoto: Shinshū Higashi-ha Honganji Kyōikuka, 1876.
- Ogurusu Kōcho 小栗栖香頂 (ed.). *Bukkyō Junishū Yōko* 仏教十二宗綱要, Kyoto: Bukkyō Eiyaku Shuppankai, 1886.
- Orion Klautau オリオン・クラウタウ. *Kindainihonshisō toshite no bukkyōshigaku* 近代日本思想としての仏教史学, Kyoto: Hōzōkan 2012.
- . “Kindainihon no bukkyōgaku ni okeru “Bukkyō Buddhism” no katarikata,” 近代日本の仏教学における“仏教 Buddhism”の語り方. In Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士, Hayashi Makoto 林淳, Yoshinaga Shinichi 吉永進一, Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一 eds, *Buddha no Henbō* ブッダの変貌, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, (2014):68-86.
- Orion Klautau オリオン・クラウタウ (ed.). *Murakami Senshō to nihon kindai bukkyō* 村上専精と日本近代仏教 Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2021.
- Osaka Tsushin 「大阪通信」. *Kinichi Shinpō* 奇日新報 April 25, 1886.
- Philip, C. Almond. *The British Discovery of Buddhism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Rhys, Davids. *Buddhism*, Londres: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1877.
- Shinran Bukkyō Center 親鸞仏教センター (eds.). *Shinran ‘Kyōgyōshinshō (Gendai-goyaku)’ Suzuki Daisetsu no Eiyakuni motodoku Gendainihongoyaku*, 親鸞『教行信証』（現代語訳）—鈴木大拙の英訳にもとづく現代日本語訳—, Kyoto:

Higashi Honganji Shuppan, 2015.

Tamura Akinori 田村晃徳. “Ugokidasu Daihi: “The Original Prayer” ni tsuiteno ichi kosatsu” 動き出す大悲: “The Original Prayer”についての一考察, *Gendai to Shinran* 現代と親鸞 36, (2017):254-227.

Yosinaga Shin'ichi 吉永進一. *Shinchigaku to Bukkyō* 神智学と仏教, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2022.

# *Book Review*





## Book Review

Feenberg, Andrew

*Nishida, Kawabata, and the Japanese Response to Modernity*. Studies in Japanese Philosophy 18.

Nagoya : Chisokudō Publications, 2019. 148 pages.

ISBN 978-170200678. US \$8.00 (paperback) | US \$5.00 (kindle)

### A. Can PIRTICI

(Graduate Student, Graduate School of International Studies, Global Studies,  
Ryukoku University)

Andrew Feenberg's book *Nishida, Kawabata, and the Japanese Response to Modernity* is a collection of the author's articles written on the examination of Nishidan philosophy, Zen Buddhism, and Japanese literature with the aim of tracking ways for alternative modernity. Even though Feenberg is not a specialist in the field of Japanese studies, as he has duly stated, he is a remarkable philosopher of the 21st century and is known for his writings on critical theory and technology. He was also a student of one of the leading members of the Frankfurt School, Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979). Feenberg writes that the Japanese case of modernisation and Japanese thinkers' approach to modernity inspired him to revise his own works and to investigate Japan further (1). Feenberg points out that many Japanese thinkers, most notably Nishida Kitaro (1870-1945), struggled to create an alternative way of Asian modernity which would be rooted in their own culture by using Western sources (38-39). He argues that this collective initiative has been successful for Japan to a considerable extent. Thus, he points out that today's Western society, which is undergoing a crisis of cultural self-confidence, has much to learn from the example of Japan to rejuvenate itself intellectually, just as Japan did in the past (1).

The book consists of an introduction and five different articles. The introduction has been written by Yoko Arisaka, who is a Japanese philosophy expert at the University of Hildesheim in Germany, wherein she shares her personal experience by relating it with the author and the theme of the book. The first article "Technology in Global World", explores Miki Kiyoshi's and Nishida Kitaro's idiosyncratic insights into 'rationality' as an effort to find a mediation between its Western and Japanese forms. The second article "The Problem of Modernity in the Philosophy of Nishida", explores Nishida's alternative understanding of modernity established around a multicultural worldview. The third article entitled "Alternative Modernity? Playing the Japanese Game of Culture", reviews Nobel Prize-winning Japanese author, Kawabata Yasunari's (1899-

1972) novel *The Master of Go* (1951) in the context of the confrontation between the aestheticism of old Japan and new Western methods. In the fourth article “Experience and Culture: Nishida’s Path to ‘The things themselves’”, Feenberg evaluates Nishida’s concept of ‘pure experience’, ‘basho’, and ‘absolute nothingness’ in reference to Heidegger, Zen Buddhism, and some other philosophers. The final article “Zen Existentialism in America”, introduces Henry Bugbee (1915-1999), a Western Philosopher to the readers, who was influenced by Zen existentialism through the writings of D.T Suzuki.

In the introduction, Arisaka Yoko introduces us to the content and significance of articles through her personal story about how she came to the United States to study Western philosophy, but with the encouragement of Feenberg, how she found herself in a process that would lead her to Japanese philosophy, and how these articles of Feenberg in the book emerged during the years of her academic dialogue with Feenberg. She also mentions her experience of how she came to the United States in the 1980s to get away from the ‘rigid’, ‘misogynistic’, ‘freedom-robbing’ society in Japan, but surprisingly finds herself as a ‘Japanese’ who looks at Japan from ‘outside’ that helped her to develop a new way to appreciate the Japanese way of life, Zen Buddhism and Nishidan Philosophy (5-14). This personal anecdote at the beginning gives us a clue about the overall calling of the book for searching ‘alternative’ ways of modernity and globalisation.

In the first chapter, Feenberg criticises today’s problematic understanding of ‘pure rationality’ which cuts the ties of ‘technology’ with ‘culture’. In this regard, he examines Nishida Kitaro’s ‘truly global world’ (jp. sekaiteki sekai) theory which envisions a multi-cultural way of modernity structured on the understanding of ‘rationality’ as historically and culturally conditioned through dialectics (24). He gives historical anecdotes from Japan on how modern techniques and methods imported from the West have changed through a process wherein Western technologies have been kept to the extent that they are more advantageous for the everyday life of people compared to traditional technologies, but also merging with Japanese traditional crafts and technique. He gives also concrete examples from the invention of the Japanese national anthem to the miniaturisation of computers (18-19, 22). He finds Nishida’s globalisation vision genuine since this way of globalisation brings different cultures and techniques into the cross-cultural dialogue in which they can express themselves and contribute to a single fund of inventions (29-30). Therefore, he argues that reason with its technological realizations cannot/should not be accepted as ‘universal’ because, they are always concrete expressions of ‘particular’ culture, and there has been no distinction between technical insights and ethical/aesthetics values (33-36). He ends this chapter with the claim that technology cannot be neutral in the sense of culture and politics if it is a ‘particular’ expression of ‘doing things technologically’ (11, 35-36).

In the second chapter, Feenberg analyses Nishida's thoughts on modernity, universality/particularity, and culture, comparing it with Buddhism and the thoughts of philosophers such as William James, Leibniz, Heidegger, Hegel, and Marcus. He also analyses

the oft-discussed relationship between Nishida's philosophy and Japanese ultranationalism in the context of Nishida's intellectual transformation during his lifetime (37-42). Feenberg emphasises Nishida's idea that each culture has the potential to contribute something to world civilization and that in order to do so it must first actualize its own self-realisation. In this regard, he argues that in the presence of such a world system based on the equality of cultures, as envisaged by Nishida, each particular culture and tradition can contribute something to today's technological and scientific developments in its own way (64-67).

In the third chapter, he reviews Kawabata Yasunari's famous novel, the *Master of Go*, from a different perspective. He uses the main theme of the novel as if they are metaphors for his argument on alternative modernity. He examines Kawabata's narration of the championship of the Go match between the old master representing the aestheticism and tradition of old Japan; the young challenger representing Western scientific rationality and individualism (2). He emphasises the fact that even though both the players aim for victory, they reflect 'rationality' from different standpoints. On the one hand, the old master aims self-realisation by losing all his awareness of self while waiting for the other side's move, or by 'no-mind (mushin)' state of Zen Buddhism, and tries to be 'one' with the 'board', 'adversary' and 'the game' in order to reach a realm of harmony and aesthetic game (75-77). On the other hand, the young challenger is full of ambitions to gain victory and uses modern methods including aggressive manoeuvres and tricks. He violates all etiquettes of Go and disturbs the harmony and pattern of the game. His aggressive and individualistic strategy makes the master disturbed and puzzled, who sees himself as one with 'the game', and the game goes to the young adversary after a match that lasted six months (77-86). Based on this case, Feenberg calls us to think about the fact that the relationship between formal rules and their cultural context has the same pattern as the relationship between technology and culture, and he claims that there are layers of meaning in the system of all culture, just like in the game (86-89). Consequently, he posits that even if we draw scientific perspectives from this system, we must also not forget the cultural background which helps make concrete sense (94-95). He concludes this chapter with the insights that we must search for alternative ways of modernity, which would be culturally concrete and universally available. He further notes that it is necessary to renew the tradition, not in a way that is not a mere imitation of the western tradition, but in a way that contributes genuinely to the global system (99-101).

In the fourth chapter, Feenberg scrutinises various concepts of Nishida such as 'absolute nothingness', 'basho', 'action intuition', and especially 'pure experience', and their reflections on the understanding of culture and modernity. He puts forth identical and distinctive dimensions of these Nishidan concepts with Husserlian phenomenology, Heideggerian existentialism, and Jamesian 'pure experience'. He argues that Nishidan 'pure experience' finds its roots in Zen Buddhism's 'no-mind'(mushin) by referencing dialogues of Nishida with D.T Suzuki (105), and points out how traditional Western understanding of experience, as 'the foundation of knowledge or ontology', is different from Zen understanding of 'experience' which puts experience prior to

‘the knowing self’ (103-105). Feenberg claims that Nishida’s ‘pure experience’ based on no-mind of Zen, represents a plural, and more inclusive universality than Western reason that relies on self-centered experience, rational pursuit of knowledge, reduction of experience to measurable form by excluding ‘subjective’ dimension (104). In this regard, he introduces Nishida’s understanding of history, culture, and world system by referencing his concepts of ‘absolutely contradictory self-identity’ (jp. zettai mujunteki jikodooitsu), ‘place’ (jp. basho) (117-121). However, he does not forget to mention Nishida’s ambivalent remarks, on Japan’s positions in world politics in the 1940s, into consideration from a point of view that takes care to be impartial (121-123). He reaches the conclusion that Nishida’s understanding of a global world, which assures truly cosmopolitan self-realisation and cross-cultural dialogue of world and nations without sacrificing their particular ‘experiences’, can provide us with an alternative way to construct modernity (123-125).

In the final chapter, Feenberg introduces us to a distinctive American existentialist philosopher, Henry Bugbee (1915-99), who was influenced by the Zen concept of experience through D. T. Suzuki’s introduction of Zen Buddhism to the West, especially the US. Feenberg highlights the fact that Suzuki was the first Zen Buddhist to claim that Zen experience could be articulated in different systems of thought such as Western philosophy as if he joins Nishida’s efforts to build a conceptual bridge between the West and the East (126-127). According to Feenberg, Suzuki’s efforts have paid off to a certain extent because a Western philosopher, Bugbee, came along and entered a dialogue with the East. He elaborates on Bugbee’s philosophy as part of his dialogue with Zen existentialism and American pragmatism. In this context, Feenberg compares Bugbee’s notion of ‘standing forth’ with the Nishidan ‘place of nothingness’, or he searches the roots of his concept of ‘pre-reflective experience’ with Zen tradition notion of immediate unity of acting subject and the world (128). Besides, Feenberg also points out that Bugbee was keen on finding a way to build a bridge between American pragmatism which prioritises action over abstract thought, and Zen. Toward the end of the chapter, Feenberg remarks that even though Bugbee was influenced by Zen and Suzuki’s thoughts, he was equally unsatisfied with Zen, since Zen emphasises the opposition between experience and reflection, and disregards the creativity of the agent and personal identity (131-133). Feenberg claims that Bugbee’s attitude makes him closer to Nishida, who also emphasises the creativity of individual(s) (133-134).

Even though the book is a collection of five separate articles, surprisingly, these five articles remain faithful to the main theme of the book, which is to trace a way of alternative modernity through the example of Japan, as is stated in the title of the book. Additionally, the fact that Feenberg participates in the dialogue in order to interpret the philosophers’ thoughts from his own point of view shows us how a philosopher from a relatively different philosophical tradition can bring a remarkable perspective to understand different traditions of thought. Moreover, he builds a conceptual bridge between his philosophy of technology and Nishidan philosophy as he



did in his various articles and books but notably in his salient books, *Between Reason and Experience Essays in Technology and Modernity* (2010) and *Transforming Technology: A Critical Theory Revisited* (2002). In this sense, while constructing his own philosophy, Feenberg as a Western philosopher indeed entered into a dialogue with the Eastern thought. Therefore, such a position Feenberg brings him closer to Bugbee too.

This book is clearly a product of the author's endeavours to overcome the West-East duality through creative processes by ensuring a dialogue between both traditions. It serves as a precedent for readers who want to interact with other systems of thought such as Japanese philosophy or Zen Buddhism and contributes original perspectives to the intellectual world.

### **Bibliography**

- Feenberg, Andrew. *Between Reason and Experience Essays in Technology and Modernity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010.
- Feenberg, Andrew. *Transforming Technology: A Critical Theory Revisited*. New York, NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 2002.
- Bugbee, Henry Greenwood. *The Inward Morning: A Philosophical Exploration in Journal Form*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1999.

## Book Review

Krämer, Hans Martin & Julian Strube, eds.,  
*Theosophy Across Boundaries: Transcultural and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on a Modern Esoteric Movement.*  
New York: SUNY Press, 2020, 486 pages  
ISBN 9781438480428. US \$34.95 (paperback) | US \$95.00 (hardcover)

**Gouranga Charan PRADHAN**

(Postdoctoral Fellow,  
Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures,  
Ryukoku University)

The problem of historical epistemology for scientific knowledge production has constantly been a hot topic in scholarly debates within the emerging field of ‘global history’ over the last several decades. We have come a long way from the Wallersteinian world systems that neatly divide the singular world into blocks based on asymmetrical power relationships and claim that culture flows in a unidirectional direction. One of the many factors that significantly shaped the field of global historiography in the recent past is undoubtedly the theoretical tools offered by postcolonial discourses. Postcolonial studies offer research methodologies that help to decenter the linear narrative model of scholarship. Edward Said’s conception of ‘contrapuntal,’ for instance, is immensely helpful to expose the dialogic and intertwined nature of the historical realities within the seemingly binary asymmetrical dynamics. For we now know that while the so-called ‘superior’ ‘civilized’ Europeans welded power over their non-European counterparts, so did the non-Europeans have access to devices to subvert the very power structure.

The volume under consideration here persuasively attests to the aforesaid fact. But it goes beyond that by showing how power dynamics also create ‘indistinctive zones,’ to borrow a term from Agamben, which allows the formation of subjectivity that not only disrupts hierarchical power structure but also creates its own power zones. By doing so, this volume brings a new perspective to global history through intervention from a variety of fields; history, religious esotericism, Buddhism, art history, and politics with a broader geographic viewpoint covering Europe, South Asia, South-East Asia, East Asia and beyond and does a noteworthy contribution to our understanding of the historical milieu of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

The book begins with an exhaustive introduction by the editors which sets the path for this otherwise voluminous volume with multiple and intertwined themes. It is composed of two thematically arranged parts. The first part consists of seven essays bound together with a common thread of 'New Perspective on Theosophy.' The second part constitutes six essays that concern the broader theme of 'Theosophy in Literature, the Arts and Politics.'

The first part of the volume "attempt(s) to map the global landscape of Theosophy's manifold and often ambiguous influences" (9) by investigating hitherto unexplored geographical areas like the Middle and Far Eastern countries such as Israel, Vietnam, and China. In that sense, as the editors rightly claim, this book is a "pioneer" in the field of theosophy as well as in global esoterism. For instance, the first essay by Hanegraaff squarely shows the way Western esoterism in the early days of the Theosophical movement was very much informed by the premodern European notion of "the East" that revolved around the idea of a "universal Kabbalah" with its origin in the oriental Chaldea and Egypt. Indeed, this general Western interest in Kabbalah might have contributed to, in whatever small way, the numerous British excavation expeditions in Egypt in the 1880s and the resulting expropriation of artifacts. The early Western Theosophical leader's interest in Kabbalah was a process of their subjectivity formation for which the presence of the Other, in this case, preoccupations with the Kabbalah studies, was not merely a coincidence but a necessity.

Similarly, the second essay by Bergunder is important not only because it focuses on the "non-Western" actors situated in the margins but the way these non-state actors working at the margins shaped the very identity of the "Western" Theosophy. This essay is critical to appreciate how the present-day socio-political and religious conditions of some parts of the world, India in this case, were shaped by the Theosophist movement at the turn of the twentieth century. The following two essays by Jérémy Jammes and Chuang Chienhi focus on Vietnam and China respectively, two previously unexplored geographical areas where Theosophy also left its imprint. Jammes's chapter shows the complex and intertwined process of cultural flow and the way Theosophist doctrines were ingested and reproduced in local Vietnamese contexts. Chuang's study in turn shows how Theosophy in early twentieth-century China was more than merely an esoteric religious movement but was equally active in the domains of politics, education, and even anti-imperialist activities. The extraterritorial territories occupied by the Western powers like the Shanghai International Settlement, which is Chuang's focus of study, served as rife grounds for the activities of non-state actors like the Theosophists which in the case of China worked to subvert the myth of Western cultural superiority by introducing local cultural ethos through establishing schools and spreading education.

Ulrich Harlass, in the fifth chapter, revisits the role of the Indian-origin Theosophists, who were mostly ignored from prior scholarship despite they played a crucial role in the formation of the movement in South Asia. His study on the tangled relationship between A.P.

Sinnet and Mahatma Gandhi and the vital contributions of T. Subba Row, one of the earliest Indian supporters of Theosophy but completely forgotten today, are insightful to understand the way non-Western actors played an equally vital role in shaping the core tenets of Theosophy.

Perry Myers, in chapter six, takes a closer look at the political consequences of Theosophy in India and Germany and shows how the conditions in India echo the contemporary German Theosophical developments despite a lack of any direct connections but engendered largely by their respective local applications. The last essay of part one by Boaz Huss, on the other hand, concerns the Jewish Theosophists and their understanding of Kabbalah. Huss exposes the inherent contradictions in form of the concurrent presence of “modernity” and “tradition” in the Jewish Theosophist’s articulation of Kabbalah and how it shaped what we know as Jewish Theosophy today.

Whereas the seven essays constituting part one offer unique perspectives on the Theosophical movement by exploring varied geographical areas, the six essays included in part two explore the way Theosophy molded, sometimes in a very substantial way, the local political, historical, and above all, the cultural and aesthetic milieus by playing out in altogether new ways than what the founding leaders of the movement envisioned. For instance, Laurence Cox and Alicia Turner’s in-depth study of the Arakan branch of Theosophy in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries explicate how the Arakan leaders “appropriated,” to borrow a postcolonial terminology, the available resources, including human resources like Olcott and Dharmapala, to promote their own agendas, such as the revival of local as well as international Buddhism. Likewise, Hans Martin Krämer’s chapter on the interactions between Paul Richards and his Japanese Pan-Asianist interlocutors demonstrates how Theosophy played out differently in different parts of Asia. Paul Richards, as Krämer shows, was a somewhat reluctant supporter of Theosophy and called upon his Japanese associates to help remove the Westerners from Asia. But at the same moment, his Japanese associates and fellow Theosophists like Okawa Shumei, Uchida Ryohei, and others were working diametrically in the opposite way for building an Asian colony.

These area-specific unique development informed by a specific globalized milieu finds a detailed treatment in Hashimoto Yorimitsu’s chapter. He takes a closer look at the Irish poet James Cousins and demonstrates how the cosmopolitan globe-trotting Westerners’ disillusionment with their socio-political and religious conditions combined with their orientalist image of Asia led them to support Theosophy. Cousins, like many of his Western contemporaries, exalted Asian religions and called for a synthesis of all religions to nurture a perfect spiritual human being. But at the same time, he could never get rid of his deep-rooted Western superiority complex for he viewed Western religious traditions as superior. Cousins believed in a civilizing mission as the Westerners’ responsibility to guide the inept non-Westerners to the realm of light. This essay also attests to the fact that non-state

cosmopolitan agents like Cousins worked at the margin in collusion with disgruntled bodies like the *Kokuryukai* (Black Dragon Society) in Japan that shaped the broader contour of Asian historiography having a far-reaching impact on the past global history to which our present belong.

One of those many pasts created through interactions with Theosophy in which our present lies is the artistic and architectural productions that Helena Čapková's focuses on in her chapter. She explores the hidden history behind the construction of the Golconde Dormitory in Puducherry which is considered by many as India's first modernist building structure and was commissioned by the Aurobindo Ashram. The Aurobindo Ashram was a newly formed spiritual community, the founder of which envisioned, like the founders of Theosophy, "[a] higher spiritual consciousness and embody a greater life of the spirit" for the followers of this faith. (Aurobindo, 2011) Interestingly though, irrespective of their general ambivalent attitude towards Theosophy, the Ashram commissioned the building's design work to two Theosophist couples; the Czech-French Raymonds and the Polish Łubienskis, which clearly shows how history is constitutive of nonlinearity and contradictions.

Yan Suarsana's penultimate chapter on the "making of esoteric Bali," a locale that is also often overlooked while studying Theosophy, shows how the image of the present-day Indonesian province of Bali as an esoteric spiritual hub was actually a product of Bali's colonial past intersected with its association with Theosophy. The process of plotting Bali in the map of global Hinduism, according to Suarsana, began with Indonesia's Dutch colonial rulers and was furthered in the early twentieth century with the revival of Neo-Hinduism in India, a development in which Theosophists played a crucial role. However, as Suarsana rightly mentions, the Balinese past reverberates today in Indonesia's politics, economy, and religion as much as in people's everyday social practices.

The final essay by Björn Seidel-Dreffke explores Theosophy's cultural impact on Russia, another often ignored but critical region, to fully appreciate the global bearing of the movement. Unlike the Balinese Theosophist experience however, which was the sum of a combination of factors like colonialism, Theosophy, and the rise of New Hinduism in India, the Russian Theosophy was mostly an organic development rising out of the Russian intellectual's quest for a new spiritual human from a synthesis of science and religion something which Theosophy offered. Writing in 1916 on Theosophy in Russia, philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev mentions "[theosophy] has begun to play a remarkable role in Russian spiritual life, within our cultural strata, and its role undoubtedly will grow" which proves the movement's popularity as well as its prospects. (Berdyaev, 1916) Of course, the impact of Theosophy in Russia, as Seidel-Dreffke's states, was not restricted to a handful of intellectuals but it had far-reaching cultural significance most prominent among which is the distinct Russian symbolism artistic movement. What's more, unlike the dwindling number

of Theosophists in most parts of the world, Seidel-Dreffke mentions the thriving Theosophist circles in present-day Russia, a topic that merits its own independent study.

All the articles included in this volume brilliantly show, to borrow Helena Čapková's words, the "horizontal and voluntary social associations intersecting at several points" that resulted in "a set of unforeseen complex social dynamics." (376) Needless to say, the consequences these interactions resulted are far beyond mere "social dynamics." For as Bergunder, Suarsana, and others' essays demonstrate, the present socio-political, religious, and even economic dynamics of some of the regions covered in this book are shaped by Theosophy. The rise of Hindutva and Hindu nationalism in present-day India is perhaps one of those prime examples that show the extent to which Theosophy shapes our present. Likewise, the religious and political skirmishes in present-day Indonesia cannot be understood without Indonesia's past relationship with Theosophy. Seen from this perspective, this volume goes a long way in decentering the earlier historiography on Western esoterism in general and Theosophy in particular.

While the multifaceted scholarship offered on global Theosophy in this volume is undoubtedly enriching, nonetheless a lacuna, which is perhaps generic to these kinds of studies, haunts the volume. Most of the individuals covered in this book are social elites and the episodes concern the upper echelons of their respective societies. This lacuna makes it difficult to appreciate the way ordinary followers of Theosophy in various parts of the world, who were situated in the margins as was often the case, shaped Theosophy and consequently global history. Do the local resources, for instance, regional newspapers printed in vernacular languages during the early twentieth century shed some light on the involvement of people from the margins? Or can we still find traces of global Theosophy in the local religions and practices that might have been impacted through syncretism? We will wait for more research on Theosophy to know more about its global bearings.

All chapters in this book are well annotated and come with extensive bibliography something which seasoned scholars as well students interested in Theosophy, as well as global history, will find very useful. The volume also has an index which is equally helpful to wade through the hundreds of individuals and key concepts covered in this book. This book deserves a place in all university libraries.

### **Bibliography**

Aurobindo, Sri, "Letters on Himself and the Ashram," in *The Complete Works of Sri Aurobindo*, Vol. 35, Sri Aurobindo Ashram Trust (2011): 593.

Berdyayev, N. A., “Theosophy and anthroposophy in Russia.” *Russkaya Mysl'*, 1916, trans. S. Janos. Last accessed on Jan 31, 2023.  
[http://www.berdyayev.com/berdiaev/berd\\_lib/1916\\_252b.html](http://www.berdyayev.com/berdiaev/berd_lib/1916_252b.html)

---

---

## *Journal of World Buddhist Cultures*

---

---

### **Purpose of the Journal**

The Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures at the Ryukoku University in Kyoto, Japan was established with the aim of forming an international research institute for Buddhism, which could respond to the serious challenges facing the modern world. An important mission of the center is to accomplish a wide variety of academic projects on Buddhism and thereby contribute to an increasingly globalized society. All knowledge is expected to be transformed into information in a globalized society. Thus, at its inauguration last year, the center also decided to publish an electronic journal to disseminate the center's research results more widely in order to fulfill its main purpose—in line with global trends of internationalization and informatization. Electronic journals have become indispensable platforms to interact with researchers, Buddhists, and adherents of other religious traditions outside Japan, and to cooperate with foreign universities and research institutes.

The Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures has started a new electronic journal, *Journal of World Buddhist Cultures*. In its long history, the Ryukoku University has accumulated a large body of knowledge on Buddhism. The center hopes to develop this knowledge further and actively disseminate it all over the world by means of this electronic journal, through which the center will also attempt to encourage international intellectual exchange and seek solutions to various problems facing people in contemporary society.

In contemporary society, people's values are significantly diversified and complicated, and we are indeed hardly able to recognize what is "true." *Journal of World Buddhist Cultures* will include not only scholarly articles on Buddhism, but also articles that respond as a guide to urgent problems that arise in every part of the world. Buddhism has been practiced all over the world for more than 2 500 years. The journal will invite submissions in which this universal religion is discussed from a global perspective.

In addition, *Journal of World Buddhist Culture* will also include reviews of books on Buddhism, records of lectures organized by the center, and a wide variety of translated works. It especially welcomes papers written in English. Through this electronic journal, the center hopes to establish an international platform for Buddhist studies and contribute to Buddhism's further development.



# **Objective of the Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures at Ryukoku University**

## **1. Comprehensive Academic Research of Buddhism**

Our objective is to contribute to the advancement of academic research on Buddhist philosophy, history, culture, and other relevant fields while searching for ways to respond to the challenges facing our modern world. By using effective and appropriate research methodologies, we aim to explore Buddhist topics that meet the needs and concerns of our modern world.

## **2. Interdisciplinary Research that Combines the Fields of Humanity, Science, and Religion and the Creation of New Wisdom**

By combining the three fields of humanity, science, and religion, we will explore the prospects of creating a new wisdom for the 21st century. We will aim to become a global research hub where scholars from both Japan and abroad can converse and interact in order to provide guidelines that can help address social issues and global crises from a Buddhist perspective.

## **3. Building a Global Platform for Buddhist Studies**

By collaborating with universities and research institutions in Asia, the Americas, and Europe, we will carry out projects with overseas scholars, Buddhist priests, and academics of religion. We will publish our research results through our website and publications and provide them in English and other languages. Also, by using information and communication technology (ICT), we will collaborate with overseas universities and research institutions in real time in both the graduate and undergraduate programs. In addition, we will build a system that can quickly respond to requests from overseas research institutions who may ask for information about local historical sites by employing various views from across the university.

## **4. Research Results that will Benefit the Undergraduate and Graduate Schools**

By collaborating on the curriculum for each academic area, we aim to build an integrated program that spans across all the departments. We will also promote participation in educational collaboration programs—not only within our university, but with other educational institutions as well. We will recruit short-term research fellows from graduate and post-graduate programs in and outside of our university, by providing research grants (scholarships) and publishing their findings online or on print.

## Significance of the Publication of *Journal of World Buddhist Cultures*

The Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures consists of following three research divisions: Basic Research, Applied Research, and International Research. Among them, the International Research Division plays a central role in the publication of the electronic journal.



### International Research Division

The International Research Division will be responsible for sharing information about the activities of the center with the international community while continuing the project of translating and publishing Buddhist canons and texts that was originally carried out by the Research Institute for Buddhist Culture. In addition to the publication of the e-journal and the management of the center's website, the division will also promote exchanges with overseas scholars, other Buddhists, and religious specialists through ICT. The division will encourage collaboration with universities and research institutes in different parts of the world, and sponsor international symposiums and invite scholars from overseas to attend them.

As religion becomes more global and multi-dimensional in contemporary society, there has been a growing awareness of a need for inter-religious dialogue. The division will encourage these conversations and interactions by collaborating with various religious research institutions abroad. Under the theme "Inter-Faith Education" the division will carry out research at institutions of higher education.

In the international context of inter-religious dialogue, this division will explore how Japanese Buddhist ideology is viewed by the outside world and what Japanese Buddhism can do to contribute further to inter-religious education. Through these activities, the division's core focus will be to develop young scholars' understanding of the importance of having an international mindset and to facilitate global interaction between scholars.

---

---

## Contributors

---

---

<b>Nobuya DAKE</b>	Part-time Lecturer, Ryukoku University	Shin Buddhist Studies, Religious Studies
<b>A. Can PIRTICI</b>	Graduate Student, Graduate School of International Studies, Ryukoku University	Global Studies
<b>Gouranga Charan PRADHAN</b>	Postdoctoral Fellow, Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures, Ryukoku University	Japanese literature, Japanese studies

---

---

## 執筆 者 一 覧

---

---

<b>嵩 宣也</b>	龍谷大学 非常勤講師	宗教学、真宗学
<b>A. Can PIRTICI</b>	龍谷大学グローバルスタディ ーズ学科 大学院生	国際関係
<b>Gouranga Charan PRADHAN</b>	龍谷大学世界仏教文化研究セ ンター 博士研究員	日本文学、日本研究

---

---

## Editorial Board

---

---

### Editorial Board

Kenichi WAKITA (Editor-in-Chief)

Junshi NOMI

Junshin UCHIDA

Eisho NASU

Aya HONDA

Kosuke SHIMIZU

Sei NORO

Mami IWATA

Yuka OTANI

Markus RÜSCH

### Assistant Editor

Gouranga Charan PRADHAN

### Advisory Board

Yasuro ABE

Yasuko FUKUYAMA

Charles HALLISEY

Noriko KAWAHASHI

Hideaki NAKATANI

Eiichi OTANI

Jacqueline STONE

Jong-min SUH

Micah AUERBACK

Paul GRONER

Dennis HIROTA

Chon-hak KIM

Wenliang ZHANG

Eric SCHICKENTANZ

Fumihiko SUEKI

Yozo TANIYAMA

Mitsuya DAKE

Janet GYATSO

Shoryu KATSURA

Seiji KUMAGAI

Masaaki NONIN

Chih-yu SHIH

Kenneth TANAKA

Yusho WAKAHARA

---

Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures, Ryukoku University

*Journal of World Buddhist Cultures* ~ Vol. 6 ~

March 31, 2023

**Editor** Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures, Ryukoku University, Editorial Board

**Publisher** Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures, Ryukoku University

125-1 Daiku-chō, Shichijō-dōri Ōmiya

Higashi-iru, Shimogyō-ku, Kyoto 600-8268

Hakuakan (Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures)

Phone Number : 075-343-3812 (domestic)

International : +81-75-343-3812

E-mail: [rcwbc-ejournal@ad.ryukoku.ac.jp](mailto:rcwbc-ejournal@ad.ryukoku.ac.jp)

URL: <http://rcwbc.ryukoku.ac.jp>

**Printer** Kawakita Printing Co., Ltd.

© 2023 by Research Center for World Buddhist Cultures, Ryukoku University, Japan

All rights reserved.

---



# 世界仏教文化研究

## 第6号

### コンテンツ

#### ❖ 論文 ❖

- ◆ The Construction of History in English Translations of Shin Buddhist Texts: Through the Creation of the Bibliography of Japanese Buddhist Texts  
Nobuya DAKE

#### ❖ 書評 ❖

- ◆ Review of *Nishida, Kawabata, and the Japanese Response to Modernity* by Andrew Feenberg  
A. Can PIRTICI
- ◆ Review of *Theosophy Across Boundaries: Transcultural and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on a Modern Esoteric Movement* edited by Hans Martin Krämer & Julian Strube  
Gouranga Charan PRADHAN