

Victoria R. MONTROSE

Review for *Japanese Religions* (近代日本の大学と宗教)

The recent volume *Universities and Religion in Modern Japan* (*Kindai Nihon no Daigaku to Shūkyō* 近代日本の大学と宗教) is the first in a three-volume series on “Universities and Religion” edited by Ejima Naotoshi, Miura Shū, and Matsuno Tomoaki.¹ The current volume covers the Meiji period to the early Showa period; the forthcoming second and third volumes will cover the wartime and the post-war periods respectively. As Ejima mentions in the foreword, the goal of this project is twofold. First, to examine the development of religious studies research (*shūkyō no kenkyū* 宗教の研究) in modern Japan. The second aim of this work is to better understand the education of religious practitioners (*shūkyōsha no kyōiku* 宗教者の教育) during this period. With these goals in mind, nine researchers from a variety of disciplines share their research findings. This book adds to the growing body of research on the history of modern Religious Studies, and especially Buddhist Studies in Japan from scholars such as Hayashi Makoto, Isomae Jun’ichi, Ōtani Eiichi, Tanigawa Yutaka, and Orion Klautau. It offers new case studies from the imperial universities as well as much-needed research about the activities and developments within religious universities.

Ejima Naotoshi’s chapter, “Higher Education in Modern Japan: Education and Edification,” focuses on Meiji period legal developments pertaining to religion and education, as well as the shifting cultural landscape of the Meiji period. Although scholars often emphasize Christianity’s influence on Buddhist groups’ various modernization projects during the Meiji period, Ejima argues that the activities and aims of the Great Teaching Institute (*Daikyōin* 大教院), the institute responsible for training priests to participate in the Great Promulgation Campaign, exerted immense influence on Buddhist groups, and that Christianity’s influence on Buddhist groups cannot be seen until later in the Meiji period. This chapter also covers the debate over where moral education (*kyōka* 教化) should take place within the Meiji state’s new education system. That moral education did not survive within

1. Ejima Naotoshi 江島尚俊, Miura Shū 三浦周, Matsuno Tomoaki 松野智章, eds. *Kindai Nihon no Daigaku to Shūkyō* 近代日本の大学と宗教 (*Universities and Religion in Modern Japan*). Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2014, v+346pp., ISBN 978-4831855459.

Japan's higher education and instead was designated to elementary and middle schools, also meant that universities were no longer included in the government's plan for the edification (*kyōka* 教化) of the masses. Ejima argues this had major implications for the extent of the university's influence at the political and social level. Finally, Ejima discusses the different reactions by Buddhist and Christian groups to Directive 12, an administrative directive issued in 1899 that denied accreditation (an important condition for schools to be able to offer deferment from military conscription) to schools that included religious education or worship. He argues that the strategy taken by Buddhist schools in reaction to Directive 12 resulted in a lost opportunity to expand the scope of Buddhist schools to include the general populace, an opportunity the Christian groups seized upon.

Ōe Mitsuru's chapter, "Late-Meiji Christian-Affiliated Schools and their Response to the Directive 12 Issue: The Position Adopted by Rikkyō" expands the discussion of Directive 12, by providing an in-depth look at a variety of Christian groups' responses, especially the Rikkyō School. Ōe points out that with few exceptions, the majority of scholarship on Christian responses to Directive 12 have relied primarily on Christian sources that tended to portray the Directive monolithically, in which Christians are mere victims of a policy that was aimed at oppressing them. Ōe explains that though compulsory religious education and rites within the curriculum were forbidden, voluntary religious study and practice were deemed permissible within school grounds. The government's "flexibility" as Ōe calls it was due at least in part to the fact that Directive 12 led to the immediate closure of many schools, which put a strain on government-run schools. Though much was made by Christian groups about the violation of religious freedom and its unconstitutionality, Ōe asserts that Directive 12 was less binding than it appeared. Nevertheless, this was a watershed policy that created much debate within the Christian world about the role of Christian schools in Japan.

In "Buddhism and Religion in Tokyo Imperial University's Religious Studies Department in the Meiji Period: Clues from the Case of Kamegai Ryōun," Takahashi Hara studies the life of Ōtani monk-turned-Christian-minister, Kamegai Ryōun 亀谷凌雲 (1888-1973). Through a close examination of Kamegai's autobiographical writings as well as concurrent scholarly trends within the department (such as lecture topics and graduation thesis topics), Takahashi asserts academia's role in Kamegai's religious transformation. Takahashi argues that Kamegai's experience as a religious seeker within academia, though not entirely generalizable, was not all that rare and that "Religious Studies" for instructors and students alike during this period involved the "undifferentiated investigation of scholarship and faith." Takahashi also argues that it is possible to see reflected in the course offerings both the standards of the field of Religious Studies as well as the religious views of the faculty, especially in this case, that of Anesaki Masaharu 姉崎正治 (1873-1949), Kamegai's teacher and major intellectual influence.

Koyanagi Atsushi's chapter, "The Establishment of the Faculty of Christian Studies at Kyoto Imperial University," is concerned with the ambiguous relationship between *shingaku* 神学 (theology) and *kirisutokyōgaku* キリスト教学・基督教学 (Christian studies), and seeks to identify some of the unique characteristics of Christian Studies in Japan. Koyanagi describes in great detail the development of Christian Studies at Kyoto Imperial University, from its earliest appearance in the curriculum, to the establishment of Christian Studies as the first independent sub-section within the University's Religious Studies Department, up until World War II. Founded in 1922, the Christian Studies section was first chaired by Hatano Seiichi 波多野精一 (1877-1950). Hatano was influenced by his experience studying abroad in Germany, where the academic theology developing at the time largely focused on asserting the social value of Christianity. As a result, he was less concerned about the division between theology and Christian Studies and focused instead on establishing a place in the university to conduct theological research and education. Koyanagi also explains that the establishment of the Christian Studies section was made possible through the donation of a wealthy private banker. Interestingly, he argues that this privately funded act spurred the demand for a Buddhist Studies section that was established four years later through the use of public funds.

In "Philosophical Studies and the Modernization of Japanese Thought: Common Language in Thought," Matsuno Tomoaki takes a theoretical approach to understand the complex network of relationships between modernization (*kindaika* 近代化), philosophy (*tetsugaku* 哲学), Western thought (*sei'yō shisō* 西洋思想), and Eastern thought (*tō'yō shisō* 東洋思想). Regarding the relationship between modernization and philosophy, he asserts a threefold model. In the pre-modern model, he argues that Eastern thought and (Western) Philosophy, each with their own set of related terms and religions, were completely separate. During the process of modernization, he suggests two opposing models. In one, philosophy (both Western philosophy and Eastern thought are included in this use of the word) is believed to be universal and therefore modernization is also a universal experience. In the second model, "philosophy" is not universal but a Western product and thus, modernization is also a process of *Westernization* (*sei'yōka* 西洋化)(145-147). Matsuno draws two conclusions. First, he points out that although the appearance of "Philosophy" can be seen as a symbol of the modernization of the university, it does not mean it was considered important within universities in Japan. His second point, however, is that philosophy was of great importance to religious universities because it provided a common language for Eastern and Western thought. He contends that while the introduction of Western philosophy did not directly construct modernity in Japan, it did play a major role (or at least acted as a stimulus, he qualifies) in encouraging the awakening of the construction of Japan's own modern identity.

Abe Takako's "Meiji Period Shingon Higher Education: Debates and Realities Surrounding the Introduction of General Education" asks, why was Shingon curriculum reform so late relative to other sects? He argues that government mandated sectarian consolidation had a major role, causing administrative and financial burdens that diverted attention away from education. Abe also points out that there was significant reluctance to move toward a modern education style within the sect. Shingon denominations were concerned that modern subjects would distract students from their main sectarian teachings and that the sect would suffer because of it. As a result, Shingon was slower to reform its curriculum than many other major Buddhist sects in Japan.

In "Buddhism in the Classroom: Curricular Changes and Special Characteristics of Taishō and Early Showa Period Buddhist Universities," Miura Shū uses sources from both the Tendai and Shingon schools to identify several trends in Buddhist Studies transition to what he calls 'Scholarly Buddhism' (*gakushū sareru bukkō* 学習される仏教), from 'historicization' (*rekishika* 歴史化) and 'compactification' (*konpakutoka* コンパクト化) in the Meiji period, to increasing specialization (*tokka* 特化) by the early Showa period. He begins by explaining that the Meiji period saw the role of priest shift from status (*mibun* 身分), to profession (*shokugyō* 職業). This shifting role was accompanied by a shift in the monastic curriculum, especially in the field of Buddhist Studies, best characterized according to Miura as "historicization," or the pursuit of and emphasis on historical coherence in an attempt to understand Buddhism as a whole. Next, Miura discusses the roles of textbooks in Buddhist educational reform. From the mid-Meiji period, young Buddhist academics began the study of Buddhism via textbooks before studying doctrine and history, a process he calls compactification. Textbooks enabled students to cover a broader array of topics within a shorter amount of time and were seen as more suitable for lower level students than the more advanced sectarian doctrine. Responding to Sueki Fumihiko's argument regarding the sectarian dominance in Japan's Buddhist scholarship Miura advocates the need to examine this issue not only at the level of sectarian research but also at the level of primary school curriculum and textbooks.² In another section Miura analyzes curricula from the early Showa period and notes the seemingly paradoxical phenomena of the proliferation of elective courses accompanied by higher levels of specialization, pointing out that at the same time electives increased, students were not required to choose electives outside of their own fields of research. Thus, it was

2. Sueki Fumihiko 末木文士彦, Hayashi Makoto 林淳, Yoshinaga Shin'ichi 吉永進一, and Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一, eds. *Budda no henbō: Kōsaku suru kindai bukkō* ブッダの変貌—交錯する近代仏教 (*Transformations of the Buddha: Criss-crossing Streams of Modern Buddhism*). Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2014. iv+415 pp. ISBN 978-4-901558-64-8.

possible to stay within the narrow confines of one's specialization even while elective choices were growing.

Shibata Taisen's chapter "Shifts in Buddhist Education in the Jōdo Sect and Mochizuki Shinkō" looks at the development of Jōdoshū monastic curriculum from the early modern to the modern period. Shibata is particularly interested in the role of a few Jōdoshū figures, namely Shōgei 聖岡 (1341-1420), his successor Shōsō 聖聡 (1366-1440), and Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨 (1869-1948). Shibata asserts that, prior to the Meiji Period, the goal of the Jōdo School's research methods was to urge the independent self-awakening of Jōdoshū Studies by situating Jōdoshū within a larger Buddhist framework. Through the use of texts created by Shōgei and expanded by Shōsō, early modern Jōdoshū education focused on comparing the Jōdo School to other sects as well as criticizing other sects. This framework was used for centuries and formed the basis of doctrinal studies within Jōdoshū. In the Meiji period, Mochizuki's major reform was to shift the focus of research from contextualizing sectarian doctrine within Buddhism at large, to situating the newly self-conscious "Japanese Buddhism" within world religions and thought. Shibata points out that this was at least partially a response to criticisms of Buddhism within Japan. Finally, he asserts the authoritative position of *Mochizuki's Buddhist Dictionary* 『望月仏教大辞典』 within the global authority of Pure Land Studies in shaping and continuing to shape modern methodology and sectarian university curricula. Mochizuki's work as presented by Shibata provides a useful example of the kinds of specific developments that led to new global perspectives within the Jōdo School.

The final chapter in the volume, Ishida Kazuhiro's "Modern Buddhist Studies at Shūkyō University: Watanabe Kaikyoku's European Trip and Lectures" examines the role and influence of Jōdoshū monk and educator, Watanabe Kaikyoku's 渡辺海旭 (1872-1933), ten years in Germany from 1900 to 1910 on Buddhist Studies at Taishō University (*Taishō Daigaku* 大正大学), known then as Shūkyō University (*Shūkyō Daigaku* 宗教大学). This chapter makes two main contributions. First, it details the travels and intellectual developments of Watanabe and his subsequent impact on Taishō University; namely, the introduction of Sanskrit Studies and Indian Philosophy as foundational courses for students of Buddhist Studies. Ishida notes that the introduction of these subjects provided a different approach for Buddhist Studies in Japan from the traditional study of texts in Chinese (*kanbun* 漢文). Finally, Ishida also examines the influential role of the Japanese community on Japanese scholars abroad. He asserts that in order to best understand the development of modern Buddhist Studies, one must look not only at the role of Western scholars and scholarship on Japanese scholars, but must also take a closer look at interactions *between* Japanese scholars during their time abroad. For instance, Ishida discusses the close relationship between Watanabe and Ogiwara Unrai 荻原雲来 (1869-1937) and their mutual influence on the

development of one another's thought.

The postscript by the three editors adeptly summarizes the major themes of the volume and avenues for further research. Ejima asks “How does the academic notion of *shūkyō* 宗教 [religion], constructed at the meta-level, affect actual religious practitioners and aspiring religious practitioners?” (342), while Miura urges a re-examination of Buddhist Studies in light of the insights of post colonialism, and a re-evaluation of Buddhist Studies that weighs not only Western influence but also Chinese and domestic influences in the development of the field. Finally, Matsuno argues that just as religion and philosophy are not easily separated from one another, it is similarly difficult to separate religion from the university as an institution. In addition to these parting thoughts, the editors have compiled a timeline in the back of the book that lists all religious higher educational institutions from the Meiji period to the end of World War Two and also includes institutional name changes when relevant, a valuable and convenient resource for those interested in further research on religious higher education in Japan.

I have two minor critiques, and both have to do with representation. Of course with a topic as broad and ambitious as “universities and religion,” no edited volume can claim to be completely comprehensive. While the volume includes Christianity, Tendai, Shingon, Jōdoshū, and Jōdo Shinshū, the complete omission of case studies in Shinto and the Zen schools is unfortunate. Further, of the book's nine chapters, six chapters deal with religious universities and two chapters deal with the treatment of religion in the imperial universities. Only Matsuno's chapter deals substantially with the activities of both the imperial and religious universities. Additional discussion on the interactions (of which we know there were many) between the two types of institutions could have further illustrated the broader context of the complicated network of religious studies scholars in this period. Nevertheless, this book makes a substantial contribution to an understudied area. The wide-reaching subject matter and critical analysis provided by all of the contributors offer much food for thought for scholars of modern Buddhism, modern Japanese history, and history of education. I look forward to the future volumes in this thought-provoking series.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Ejima Naotoshi 江島尚俊, “Higher Education in Modern Japan: Education and Edification” (近代日本の高等教育における教育と教化)

Chapter 2

Ōe Mitsuru 大江満, “Late-Meiji Christian-Affiliated Schools and their Response to

the Directive 12 Issue: The Position Adopted by Rikkyō” (明治後期キリスト教主義学校の文部省訓令一二号問題への対応——立教の動向を中心として)

Chapter 3

Takahashi Hara 高橋原, “Buddhism and Religion in Tokyo Imperial University’s Religious Studies Department in the Meiji Period: Clues from the Case of Kamegai Ryōun” (明治期東京帝国大学宗教学科における仏教と宗教——亀谷凌雲の事例を手がかりに)

Chapter 4

Koyanagi Atsushi 小柳敦史, “The Establishment of the Faculty of Christian Studies at Kyoto Imperial University” (京都帝国大学文学部基督教学講座の成立)

Chapter 5

Matsuno Tomoaki 松野智章, “Philosophical Studies and the Modernization of Japanese Thought: Common Language in Thought” (日本思想の近代化と哲学科——思想における共通言語)

Chapter 6

Abe Takako 阿部貴子, “Meiji Period Shingon Higher Education: Debates and Realities Surrounding the Introduction of General Education” (明治期真言宗の大学林教育——普通学導入をめぐる議論と実際)

Chapter 7

Miura Shū 三浦周, “Buddhism in the Classroom: Curricular Changes and Special Characteristics of Taishō and Early Showa Period Buddhist Universities” (『学習』される仏教——大正・昭和初期の宗門大学におけるカリキュラムの変遷とその特質)

Chapter 8

Shibata Taisen 柴田泰山, “Shifts in Buddhist Education in the Jōdo Sect and Mochizuki Shinkō” (浄土宗学教育の変遷と望月信亨)

Chapter 9

Ishida Kazuhiro 石田一裕, “Modern Buddhist Studies at Shūkyō University: Watanabe Kaikyoku’s European Trip and Lectures” (宗教大学における近代仏教学——渡辺海旭の渡欧と講義を中心に)