This article examines the exchange between Paul Carus and Japanese Buddhist priests as well as with other individuals. Their encounter occurred during the Meiji Period, when Japan underwent a rapid modernization and Westernization. During this time, Buddhists were challenged by critics from within the country as well as by Christian missionaries. Hence, they welcomed support by Westerners who were sympathetic to Buddhism. In such a situation, Paul Carus began to play a significant role unintentionally in attempts by Japanese Buddhists to cope with these challenges of modernization and Westernization. In this process, not only were books by Carus translated and published in Japan, but also vice versa, Carus published Japanese Buddhist works, such as those written by Suzuki Daisetsu, in translations available to the West.
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Introduction

Paul Carus (1852-1919) was a prolific writer, who wrote 74 books and nearly 1,500 articles between 1880 and 1920. Best known among his books are *The Gospel of Buddha* (Carus 1894) and *Karma* (Carus 1895). The former was used in Ceylon and Japan as a manual to restore Buddhism. The fourth chapter of the latter was even adapted by the novelist Akutagawa Ryūnosuke 芥川龍之介 (1892-1927) in his well-
known short story *Kumo no ito* 蜘蛛の糸. Both books by Carus were translated into Japanese (Carus 1895c, Carus 1897b) by Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (1870-1966), who went to America to learn the tenets of Buddhism from Carus between 1897 and 1907.

While focusing on the modernization of Japan, this paper links Carus with a series of different individuals in order to highlight the Japanese cultural trends of the Meiji Era. Except for Henderson (1993), there are few academic works on Carus. However, a lot of valuable source material is available, such as letters to and from him and fragmentary notes, in the Morris Library of Southern Illinois University (Carbondale) which needs to be researched. I conducted a short review of this material during a stay at Carbondale in August of 2006, therefore I refer to some of this material in this paper.

In the following deliberation, I will first provide a brief introduction to the modernization of Japan's higher education during the Meiji Period by focusing on the introduction of linguistic studies from Europe. Then I will trace the various phases of Carus' encounters and exchanges with Japanese people including famous Buddhists, a publisher, university teachers and so on, according to historical order.

*The Establishment of Modern Higher Education in Japan and the Beginning of Sanskrit Studies*

Modern higher education in Japan can be said to have truly begun in 1871 with the arrival of Leopold Müller (1824-1893) and Theodor Hoffmann (1837-1894). They were medical doctors from Germany and were invited to establish a modern medical educational system in Japan. First they designed a curriculum for preparatory education and brought in teachers from Germany to train students in algebra, geometry, history, German, and Latin before starting the proper study of medicine. The two departments of this medical school Higashikō 東校 (East School) and the Minamikō 南校 (South School), whose origin was Bansho Shirabe-sho 蕃書調所 (Translation Center of Foreign Books), were combined into Tōkyō Daigaku 東京大学 (The University of Tokyo) in 1877. After that this first university in Japan was united with Kōbu Daigakkō 工部大学校 (The Engineering Academy) and changed its name into Teikoku Daigaku 帝国大学 (The Imperial University) in 1886.

Following its establishment, a department called Hakugen-gakka 博言学科 was founded in the Imperial University. The expression *hakugen-gaku* 博言学 (extensive
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language studies) was a translation of “philology” as devised by Katō Hiroyuki 加藤裕之 (1836-1916), the later president of the Imperial University. Katō considered the establishment of the study of kokugo 国語 (the [Japanese] national language) to be a matter of great urgency, and asserted the need to take into consideration not only modern European languages, but also Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit. (Tokyo Gakushikaïin 1880: 37) With this aim in mind, he sent Ueda Kazutoshi 上田萬年 (1897-1937) to Germany, and it was subsequently the latter’s disciple Hashimoto Shinkichi 橋本進吉 (1882-1945) who contributed greatly to the grammatical theory of Japanese education.

Ueda, who was a student in the department of Japanese literature, harbored a deep-seated respect for Basil Hall Chamberlain (1850-1935), the first chairman of Hakugen-gakka, and he was much influenced by him. Chamberlain’s successor in the Hakugen-gakka was Karl Florenz (1865-1939). He taught Sanskrit to the students, including Sakaki Ryōzaburō 榊亮三郎 (1870-1947), who was later appointed the first chairman of Sanskrit at Kyoto Imperial University.

The first book introducing Sanskrit to Japan was published by Sakaki in 1907. In the preface of this book, he referred to Dogi Hōryū 土宜法龍 (1854-1929), who had encouraged Sakaki to publish the book, in the following words:

Having stayed in Europe, he [Dogi] returned home via India. During his journey he visited famed scholars and benefited greatly. On seeing that the study of Sanskrit is in full flourish everywhere, he regretted that our country is backward in this field and he earnestly wished to promote the study of Sanskrit here. (Sakaki 1907: 19)

Thus it can be seen that Sanskrit learning in Japan started almost at the same time as the beginning of the modernization of its educational system. And Buddhists encouraged it from a nationalistic motive, not only from their Buddhist faith.

Sanskrit study first attracted Europeans because of its linguistic importance. As one of the Indo-European languages, it was a clue for them to search for their linguistic roots. Second, they became interested in it because it showed them a foreign culture in the various forms of literature, religion, philosophy, and so on. And of course a very important motivation was that they needed to study Sanskrit for their colonial management.

In Japan, the study of Sanskrit began as a part of the modernization process. In order to promote Japan’s image as a new power equipped with a world religion, the Japanese tried to adopt the study of Sanskrit as was developed and prevalent in Christian countries. Japanese Buddhists were eager to learn Sanskrit because they wished to read Buddhist scriptures in the original. They sought a firm basis in Buddhism and tried to reconstruct a new framework of Buddhist theory by researching such texts. And those who were eager to establish a Japanese national language were also interested in Sanskrit as an important language for linguistic
study. These two types of the Japanese were often in harmony with each other, just as Sakaki and Dogi were.

As is well known, Germany or Prussia was the most important model of a modernized country for the Japanese intellectuals of the Meiji Era. Paul Carus was from Prussia and had received higher education there. In the subsequent part of this article I will provide an outline of Carus’ life and activities with the focus on his interactions with Japanese during the Meiji Period.

**Young Carus Before Leaving for America**

Carus was born in 1852 in Stettin (Prussia) as a son of a Lutheran pastor. Although little is known of his boyhood, his mathematics teacher at Stettin’s Marienstifts-Gymnasium deserves special mention. His name was Hermann Grassmann (1809-1877). (Cf. Windisch 1920: 365) Made famous by the “Grassmann manifold,” Hermann Grassmann was a mathematician who left a significant mark on the history of mathematics. (Cf. Klein 1995: 176-185) In addition to being a great mathematician, he was a great scholar of Sanskrit, and was well known as the author of the *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. (Grassmann 1873) He also made an epoch-making contribution to Indo-European comparative linguistics by discovering “Grassmann’s law.” With such a great scholar reflecting a truly brilliant aspect of the German educational tradition teaching at his alma mater, it is no wonder that the adult Carus’ interests were not restricted to philosophy and religion. He eagerly participated in mathematical congresses, and counted Ernst Mach (1838-1916), the eminent physicist, among his closest friends. In addition to the above, he even wrote poems and composed music.

After earning a doctoral degree in classical philology at Tübingen, he was appointed Oberlehrer (“Higher teacher”) at the Royal Military Academy of Saxony in Dresden. Here he taught Latin, German, history, and various other subjects. While

5. When Carus edited the magazine *The Open Court* later in America, he published several articles by Mach and was in constant correspondence with him. Many letters to and from Mach are preserved in Morris Library at South Illinois University, Carbondale.

6. Science was an essential subject of *The Open Court* because it was devoted to conciliating religion and science. It published the papers of the zoologist August Weismann and the mathematician Georg Cantor in addition to Mach’s. Moreover, it was also one of Carus’ editorial principles to “form an important link between the Old and the New worlds.” (Henderson 1993: 118) *The Open Court* carried many papers written by European scholars such as the philosopher Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, the psychologists Alfred Binet and Téodule Eibot, the Assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch, and Indologists Richard Garbe, and Hermann Oldenberg, not to mention Max Müller.
teaching at this school, he published a book (Carus 1881), in which he expressed his view of the Bible. He considered it to be a great literary work but denied its historical accuracy. The leadership of the school found his words not in harmony with the Christian spirit in accordance with which the education of officers should be conducted. The school’s reaction caused Carus to resign from the school and leave Germany.

Some time before leaving the country, Carus had met a Japanese Buddhist who introduced him to a religion that "does not prescribe any dogma to be believed in" and gave him "much food for thought." (Carus 1888: 837-839) The Japanese who had impressed him so deeply was Kitabatake Dōryū 北畠道竜 (1820-1907). This "Buddhist" was a unique person whose life was full of brave episodes.7 When he was 63 years old, he was sent to Germany as an "overseas student" (ryūgakusei 留学生) by Nishi Hongan-ji 西本願寺. During his stay in Europe, he met and talked with Hermann Oldenberg and Max Müller.

From 1883 to 1884 Carus went to England, where he stayed in Oxford. This period witnessed the coming into the limelight at Oxford of Friedrich Max Müller (1823-1900). Müller later contributed many articles to Carus’ magazine The Open Court. Many of his letters to and from Carus are preserved in the Morris Library at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

At the time when Carus went to Oxford, also two young Japanese Buddhist scholars were there. Kasahara Kenju 笠原研壽 (1852-1883) and Nanjō Bun’yū 南条文雄 (1849-1927) had arrived in Oxford in 1879 to pursue Buddhist studies under the guidance of Max Müller. Together with Müller, Nanjō edited the Sukhāvatīvyūha in 1883. (Müller and Nanjiō 1883). After returning from England, Nanjō taught Sanskrit as a part-time lecturer at the University of Tokyo in 1885.

*The World’s Parliament of Religions in 1893 and the Exchange between Ceylonese and Japanese Buddhists*

Late in 1884, Carus moved from England to America. His first book in English, *Monism and Meliorism* (Carus 1885), was published the following year. It happened
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7. See Kitabatake Dōryū Keshōkai 1956. Kitabatake Dōryū was an energetic and hot-blooded person who excelled in martial arts. He introduced the Prussian military system into the former fief of Wakayama and sent troops with the military campaign to punish the Chōshū domain (Chōshū seibatsu 長州征伐) 1866. Besides the above, in order to reform Nishi Hongan-ji 西本願寺 he even plotted to liquidate Shimaji Mokurai 島地默雷 (1838-1911) on the order of Ōtani Kōson 大谷光尊. On the other hand, he was also interested in education, and founded the Kōhō-gakusha 講法学舍, the predecessor of Meiji University (Meiji Daigaku 明治大学). There he taught German and Prussian law. Two Japanese historical novels (Kōsaka 1989 and Tsumoto 1984) treat his unique life.
that it caught the attention of Edward C. Hegeler (1835-1910),\(^8\) the founder and owner of the magazine *The Open Court*. Three years later, Carus joined the Open Court Publishing Company and he became the editor of this magazine. Its editorial principle was that religion should be established on the basis of science.

Several years later, a large-scale event was held in Chicago, the World’s Parliament of Religions. This Parliament was held on the occasion of the World Columbian Exposition in 1893. Representatives of various religions from all over the world were invited as speakers. As many as 299,000 persons gathered at the opening ceremony of the Columbian Exposition, and 150,000 persons were drawn to the building where the Parliament of Religions was held. (Seager 1995: 3; 87) Carus served as a counselor of the Parliament of Religions and lectured at one of its sectional meetings.\(^9\) This great event proved to be a turning point in his career.

At the Parliament, there were four men representing their denominations of Japanese Buddhism.\(^{10}\) One of them caught Carus’ interest. This was Shaku Sōen 諱宗演, a Zen monk from Kamakura (1859-1929).\(^{11}\) After the Parliament concluded, Carus invited Shaku Sōen to his mansion in La Salle for a week.\(^{12}\) Another speaker who drew Carus’ attention was Anagārika Dharmapāla (1864-1933), the Ceylonese representative. Carus, who had become acquainted with Shaku Sōen and
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8. Hegeler was born in Saxony, graduated from the Königliche Bergakademie in Freiberg, and emigrated to America in 1856. He settled down in La Salle, Illinois. There, he achieved an amazing success in the zinc processing industry. He entertained distinct personal views on religion and started to publish the new magazine named *The Open Court*. Its main objective was “to be devoted to the work of conciliating Religion and Science.” (Henderson 1993: 44) Hegeler himself also contributed articles to this magazine, such as “The basis of ethics” (Hegeler 1887: 18-22) and “What the monistic religion is to me?” (Hegeler 1888: 725)

9. The paper Carus read on this occasion was translated by Hasegawa Tenkei 長谷川天溪 (1876-1940) in the form of the following appendix: “Shukyōteki tenkei to shite no kagaku 宗敎的天啓としての科學” (Science as Religious Revelation) in the book *Kagakuteki shūkyō* 科學的宗敎 (The Religion of Science) (Carus 1899). When the literary critic Hasegawa once visited Raphael Köber (1848-1923) of the Imperial University, he found the book *The Religion of Science* (Carus 1893) given as a gift by Carus, the author. Hasegawa borrowed and read it through. He thought the book greatly enlightening for readers in both the fields of religion and science.

10. The four above-mentioned representatives were Shaku Sōen 諱宗演 of Rinzai-shū 臨濟宗, Dogi Hōryū 土宜法龍 of Shingon-shū 真言宗, Yatsubuchi Banryū 八淵萬龍 of Jōdo Shin-shū 净土真宗, and Ajitsu Jitsuzen 蘆津實全 of Tendai-shū 天台宗.

11. Shaku Sōen published a report on the Parliament of Religions immediately following its conclusion. (Shaku 1894)

12. Merwin-Marie Schnell seems to have given Shaku Sōen the strategy beforehand. She advised him to befriend Carus. See Henderson (1993: 68-69)
Dharmapala at the Parliament, subsequently continued corresponding with both of them.

Preceding the Parliament of Religions, Shaku Sōen had stayed in Ceylon between 1887 and 1890. Akamatsu Renjō 赤松連城 (1841-1919), a Jōdo Shin-shū priest, and Shaku Kōnen 釋興然 (1848-1924) from Shingon-shū were also staying there during this period. These three differed from each other in their denominations. But they belonged to a broader movement in Japan to restore Buddhism after the destruction of temples and Buddhist images called haibutsu kishaku 廃仏毀釈 occurred from 1868 to 1871. It was a time when the Buddhist denominations presented a united front against such a hōnan 法難 (hardship for Buddhists), and young priests took this occasion to attempt renewal of their denominations.

In Ceylon, on the other hand, the British colonial rule underprivileged Buddhism while treating the Christian mission favorably. In such a situation, Buddhists under the leadership of Colonel Henry Olcott (1832-1907) and Anagārika Dharmapala were trying to rally against the Christian mission and to strengthen Buddhism in Ceylon. Subsequently, both were invited by Nishi Hongan-ji 西本願寺 to visit Japan in 1889 (cf. Yoshinaga et al. 2007), since Ceylonese and Japanese Buddhists shared a common interest in warding off Western Christian influence and modernizing Buddhism according to the challenges of the age. Hence, in such mutual exchange Buddhists in Ceylon and Japan stimulated and supported each other in a time of rapid transformations.

When the Shingon-shū priest Shaku Kōnen stayed in Ceylon, he was admitted to the sangha (community of monks) by the monk Sumangala. Shaku Kōnen was the first Japanese to become a Theravāda monk. He also joined Dharmapala in his endeavor to restore the Buddhist sacred place Buddhagaya in India. It may seems to us difficult that Shaku Kōnen befriended Shaku Sōen because the latter was an open-hearted Mahāyāna supremeist. However, the joy of seeing a fellow countryman in a foreign land was overwhelming (Inoue 2001: 79), and both maintained their friendship thereafter. After Shaku Kōnen returned to Japan in 1893, he continued to observe the Theravāda rules and led a simple life. Until the February of 1897, he had taught Pāli to Kawaguchi Ekai 河口慧海 (1868-1945), who became well known for his later exploration of Tibet, for about one year at Kamakura. Shaku Kōnen himself had learnt Sanskrit from Nanjō Bun’yū in Japan when he was a Mahāyāna Buddhist before going to Ceylon. After coming back from Ceylon, introduced by Shaku Sōen, he also taught Pāli to Suzuki Daisetsu before the latter went to meet Carus in America.

Carus and Hasegawa’s Crêpe Paper Books

Hasegawa Takejirō 長谷川武次郎 (1853-1937) was born in a merchant family dealing with imported goods. He began to study English at the age of sixteen in a
Presbyterian school. The Presbyterian missionary David Thompson taught him English in this school and baptized him in the church. Hasegawa became a publisher, and many people cooperated with him in his publishing business. He built up connections among foreign residents in Tokyo, such as missionaries like Thompson (who translated the first six books of the Japanese Fairy Tale Series for Hasegawa into English), or foreign professors of the Imperial University like Lafcadio Hearn (1850-1904), Chamberlain and Florenz. Painters in Japanese style illustrated the books, like Kobayashi Eiyō (1843-1890), who was close to Ernest Fenollosa (1853-1908) of the Imperial University.

Hasegawa seems to have been caught by the idea of Chirimen bon ちりめん本, or crinkled books. (Ishizawa 2004: 8) He published books in English which were colorfully illustrated and printed on crinkled Japanese paper. In 1893, he exhibited twenty publications at the World Columbian Exhibition in Chicago. (Sharf 1994: 20) They were small books of Japanese old tales translated into European languages. When Carus saw these books on exhibition, he felt attracted by the Japanese style. Hence, he wished to have his own books printed on such “crêpe paper” and gave an order to Hasegawa. This order was accepted and Hasegawa published the book Karma by Carus. Two years later Hasegawa printed one more Chirimen bon for Carus titled Nirvāṇa. (Carus 1897a)

Hasegawa also published Poetical Greetings from the Far East by Arthur Lloyd (1852-1911) of Keiō-gijuku 慶應義塾. This is a Chirimen bon compiled on the basis of the German translation of the Man'yōshū 萬葉集 by Karl Florenz titled Dichtergrüße aus dem Osten. Shaku Sōen, who introduced Suzuki Daisetsu to Carus and was the chief editor of the Japanese version of Karma, had criticized Lloyd for propagating Christianity in Japan. 15 Lloyd was also one of the chief
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13. As for these “crêpe-paper” books, see Ishizawa 2004. Hasegawa published many books in this form from 1885 to 1938.
14. As Carus had appointed Shaku Sōen to supervise the publication of the Japanese edition of Karma, Hasegawa went to the Tōkei-ji Temple 東慶寺 to see the latter in August of 1896. Here he met also Suzuki Daisetsu. (Shaku Sōen’s letter to Carus dated 10 August 1896). In the next year, Hasegawa printed one more “crêpe paper book” for Carus, Nirvāṇa.
15. “Such hired teachers of our School as Lloyd and Kichen are all Christian missionaries, and great scholars graduated from universities of so-called civilized countries such as England and America. Equipped with belief and scholarship, they have come far to a corner of the Orient. While selling their academic goods, they are eager to expound on their religions. Their means are foul and their courage is reckless. This is why I am so furious with them.” (Shaku’s letter to Hasegawa Keitoku 長谷川惠徳 dated 9 October 1885). (Nagao 1921: 20) Lloyd was born in India, studied first at Cambridge University and later learned Sanskrit at Tübingen University. He had studied
members of the Asiatic Society of Japan.  

**Carus, Shaku Sōen and Suzuki Daisetsu**

In 1894, one year after the World’s Parliament of Religions, Carus published his new book *The Gospel of Buddha*. This is a collection of words gathered from forty-five Buddhist scriptures which previously had been translated into German, French and English. The whole book consists of 100 “chapters,” of which the first and last three are Carus’ own compositions.

This ambitious attempt was severely criticized by J. Estlin Carpenter (1895: 157-158) from Oxford for the lack of historical consideration. From the philological viewpoint, Buddhism had developed from the earliest stage to its most advanced form. In Carus’ compendium of Buddhism, however, early descriptions in Pāli scriptures were mixed up with complicated arguments in Sanskrit texts. *The Gospel of Buddha* was indeed an inscrutable book for serious scholars of Buddhist studies.

Carus retorted that his work was “historical in a higher sense of the word, while I remained faithful to the spirit of the founder of Buddhism. I introduced certain changes with a definite purpose. They are purifications, pointing out the way of reform in the line of a higher development of Buddhism. *The Gospel of Buddha* represents ‘Buddhism up to date’ in its nobler possibilities.” (Carus 1895b: 4436)

In the bibliography at the end of *The Gospel of Buddha*, we find the title *A Brief Account of Shin-Shū* (Kyoto, 1893) by Akamatsu Renjō. It gives the quaint impression that a manual for a Japanese form of Buddhism is mingled with translations of Indian Buddhist scriptures. This is, however, quite natural for Carus who was sympathetic to the Ceylonese as well as to the Japanese. And Carus’ motive was not inscrutable to the Ceylonese or Japanese of those days, who were engaged in the restoration of Buddhism.

Contrary to the scholar Carpenter, the believer Dharmapāla from Ceylon evaluated *The Gospel of Buddha* highly. In a letter to Carus, he wrote, “I believe among European scholars you are the only one who have [has?] properly interpreted the Buddhism under Max Müller. People said about him that “Few know Buddhist texts better than Lloyd does.” He became an important member of The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. As a missionary he tried to use the doctrines of Japanese Buddhism to convert Japanese to Christianity. (Cf. Shirai 1999: 61-211, 249-273)

16. When the Royal Asiatic Society intended to set up a branch in Tokyo, American residents in Japan did not welcome the idea, because they disliked the adjective “royal.” Hence, the Asiatic Society of Japan was established in 1872. Two years later Basil Hall Chamberlain joined the society and began to contribute many important papers. (Kusuya 1986: 111-140)
Buddhist doctrine.” He also reported that several chapters of the book were reprinted in his *Mahā-Bodhi Journal*, and that this book was used as an English reader.17

Shaku Sōen from Japan also supported Carus’ new book. In a letter of 1894, he wrote that Carus described the *nirvāna* correctly “as relating to this life and as real, positive, altruistic, and rather optimistic.”18 And in another letter he wrote that “The sacred books of Buddhism are so numerous that its beginners are at [a] loss how to begin their study. Your book just fills the place.”19

Suzuki Daisetsu, Shaku Sōen’s disciple in Zen, sent his first letter to Carus also in 1894. Introducing himself as the translator of *The Gospel of Buddha* into Japanese (cf. Carus 1895b), he wrote “We are very glad that you as a Western thinker have… rightly comprehended the principles of Buddhism while most of them are prejudiced to look at Buddhism as nihilism or pessimism, as you know.”20

In a letter sent in January 1896, Shaku Sōen recommended Suzuki to Carus as follows: “He tells me that he has been so greatly inspired by your sound faith which is perceptible in your various works, that he earnestly desires to go abroad and to study under your personal guidance.”21 Carus accepted his recommendation and decided to hire Suzuki.

Suzuki arrived in 1897 in La Salle and started to work for Carus and his family. He helped him translate the *Lōzī-dàode-jīng* 老子道徳經 (Carus 1898), contributed a short article to *The Open Court* (Suzuki 1900a: 51-53), and translated the *Dàchéng-qīxīn-lùn* 大乘起信論 (Suzuki 1900b). Just after his departure from La Salle, he published his *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*. (Suzuki 1907) This book was severely criticized by Louis de la Vallée Poussin (1869-1938) from the philological point of view. (Poussin 1908: 885-894)

Suzuki often made mistakes in writing Buddhist terms, thereby exposing his lack of basic knowledge of Buddhist texts. He did not intend to understand Buddhist scriptures as they were, instead he read texts in a way that pleased him. He did not care much about what exactly was written in the scriptures handed down from ancient times. Poussin was aware of this when he pointed out that Suzuki’s understanding of Buddhism was tinged with Vedānta and German philosophy. (Poussin 1908: 886) But more important is his indication that “Suzuki’s book seems to be inspired by the viewpoint of the Shingon-shū [of Japan],” which transmits the cardinal axiom that ‘every one is a Buddha in disguise, and can easily ‘realize’ Buddhahood by means of a theurgical process.” (Poussin 1908: 893-894) According to my opinion, this notion is not necessarily confined to Shingon-shū, but can be
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widely observed in Japanese culture. What Suzuki called “Mahāyāna Buddhism” was in fact nothing but a reflection of Japanese culture.

On the other hand, Shaku Sōen and Suzuki were Mahāyāna supremacists. Since their notion of Mahāyāna referred to Japanese Buddhism, they were in fact supremacists of Japanese culture. From his belief in “Japanese Buddhism,” Shaku Sōen insisted that his original idea to permit the killing of enemies was “Mahāyāna” in order to win the war against Russia in 1904. Suzuki had often written in his essays in Japanese that only Easterners who believe in Mahāyāna could understand Buddhism. He insisted that Westerners who study Buddhism through “text books” could not understand Buddhism. It is difficult to understand why such authors made the effort to supply practical believers with so many books. They seemed to say that the Great Japanese Empire equipped with a great religion should be a world power. Carus cooperated with these nationalistic Japanese Buddhists unconsciously in spite of his own universal convictions. His intention was religious, he wanted to “bring out a nobler faith which aspires to be the cosmic religion of universal truth.” (Carus 1894: xv) For this purpose he tried to “purify Christianity by means of Buddhism, and purify Buddhism by means of Christianity.” (Carus 1894: x) He never converted to Buddhism.

Later Developments

The publication business of Carus went well in cooperation with his Japanese partners up to a certain point. His book Karma went through several editions. However, Carus terminated his partnership with Hasegawa after the crêpe paper edition of his book Nirvāṇa was published in 1897.22

On the other hand, the Open Court Company continued to publish books by Japanese authors. For example, it published the Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot (Shaku 1900), a collection of Shaku Sōen’s letters and lectures, which was edited by Suzuki Daisetsu. In 1910, in his capacity as editor Carus rejected a manuscript of Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1855-1944) of Tokyo Imperial University.23 When he received a book from Miyazaki Toranosuke 宮崎虎之助 (1872-1929), he asked Suzuki about the book and its author.

Carus’ activities in the Open Court Company were on a very high level, involving many learned experts from Europe and America. His publications were adopted as textbooks in Japanese educational institutions such as Tokyo Imperial University.

---

22. In a letter to Suzuki (dated 11.9.1913), Carus wrote critically: “You remember that I had bad experiences with business men of Japan, and I would certainly have had more additions to Karma, and perhaps other books made in Japanese and in Japanese style if I had better experiences with the business methods of Japanese publishers.”

Aiming to modernize Japan, Japanese intellectuals were then groping for reformation in education and religion. For them, Carus’ activities were very significant.

**Conclusion**

When Paul Carus met Kitabatake Dōryū, who referred to himself as the first Japanese Buddhist monk to enter Europe (1882), he felt attracted by Buddhism as a religion claiming to be without dogma, but at the same time being philosophical. After his emigration to America, he met outstanding Buddhists such as Angārika Dharmapāla from Ceylon and Shaku Sōen from Japan at the World’s Parliament of Religions in 1893. Shaku Sōen later introduced his Zen disciple Suzuki Daisetsu to work with Carus at the Open Court Publishing Company.

The early Meiji Period was one of the most critical times for Japanese Buddhists, who experienced severe public criticism as being out-dated or corrupted as well as suppression by state authorities. Furthermore, they had to face the challenges of Westernization, modernization and the Christian mission. When Western individuals like Carus studied and presented Buddhism as a world religion for modern times, this provided self-confidence for Buddhist reformers not only in Japan, but also in Ceylon, where native religions faced similar challenges through British colonialism and the Christian mission.

The case of Carus also throws new light on another important exchange between Japanese Buddhists and Westerners, namely early European scholars of Eastern Studies or Linguistics. Whereas there were some Japanese Buddhists who studied under them in order to acquire an academic approach to Buddhism, others tried to make their way to reconstruction of an original “Japanese Buddhism.” Scholars such as Carpenter and Poussin criticized Carus’ or Suzuki’s religious and philosophical perceptions of Buddhism for historical and philological reasons, however they did not care about that at all. Moreover, even though Carus and Suzuki cooperated for a long time in the promulgation of Buddhism in the West, in the end their understanding of Buddhism differed considerably. Whereas Carus pursued a “cosmic religion of universal truth,” Shaku Sōen and Suzuki not only claimed supremacy of Mahāyāna (Larger vehicle) Buddhism over ‘Hinayāna’ (Smaller vehicle), but also a cultural nationalism according to which Japan—equipped with Buddhism as a world religion—would eventually win global power. In the end, Carus, like other Western supporters of Buddhism such as Olcott, only played a significant role in the modernization and internationalization of Japanese Buddhism for a certain limited time. Finally their influence evaporated due to the confidence that Japanese Buddhists had acquired in the meantime.
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