Hayashi Makoto 林淳*

The Birth of Buddhist Universities

The Japanese university system was established in earnest during the Taishō era (1912-1926). The 1918 University Ordinance gave legal recognition to private universities as one element of the nation's education system. Many Buddhist sectarian educational institutions gained official recognition at this time. My research aims to explore the effects the birth of these institutions had on modern Buddhism in Japan. I will highlight three key developments that took place in the Taishō era. Firstly, institutional changes led to an increase in the number of university positions for scholars of Buddhism, a development that led to the recognition of Buddhist studies as a regular discipline in the Japanese academic world. Secondly, Buddhist universities functioned as a means to preserve historical materials and shape memories regarding "Meiji Buddhism." Thirdly, a new field of sectarian theology, which was to be identified as "Buddhist studies," took its place alongside related aspects of the study of Buddhism, such as Western Buddhology and Buddhist History.

Keywords: education – Buddhist studies – university system – Taishō Japan

The history of religiously-affiliated schools in Japan prior to the Second World War can be divided into three periods.[1] The first period, from the Meiji restoration (1868) onwards, began with American missionaries from various Protestant sects coming to Japan and creating small private schools at which they engaged in the education of women and English language education. The American missions sent female missionaries to Japan who had considerable experience in education, and came to focus their efforts on the education of women. English language schools were opened because there were requests to learn English not only from

* Professor, Aichi Gakuin University

1. My main concern in this paper is to clarify the history of the humanities and social sciences within the framework of the university system, rather than focus on the history of the Japanese university system itself. For one such previous attempt see, for instance, Hayashi 2011.

women, but also from men. Missionaries were always seeking opportunities for propagation of the Christian faith, and there were many cases of both Japanese men and women converting under the influence of these missionaries. Schools for women that emerged include, for instance, Ferris Japanese-English Girls' School (*Ferisu waei jogakkō* フェリス和英女学校), St. Agnes' School (*Heian jogakuin* 平安女学院), St. Margaret's School (*Rikkyō jogakkō* 立教女学校), Baika Girls' School (*Baika jogakkō* 梅花女学校) and Kwassui Girls' School (*Kassui jogakkō* 活水女学校). English language schools established included those that later became Aoyama Gakuin 青山学院, Meiji Gakuin 明治学院, Rikkyō Gakuin 立教学院 and Tōhoku Gakuin 東北学院.

At the time, in accordance with the government's foreign policy, Westernization had come into vogue and the "civilization and enlightenment" project (*bunmei kaika* 文明開化) was moving forward. Christian schools developed upon this tide of Westernization. This was an era in which government run schools were not yet adequately maintained. However, from 1887 onwards, critiques of Westernization arose and nationalist trends grew stronger, with the Imperial Rescript on Education (*Kyōiku Chokugo* 教育勅語) being promulgated in 1890. As symbolized by the Uchimura Kanzō 内村鑑三 (1861-1930) Lèse Majesté Incident (*Fukei jiken* 不敬事件) in the following year, the power of a conservative nationalism that made use of the Imperial Rescript on Education to criticize Christianity was increasing. With public schools also growing in number, the formerly vibrant Christian schools were forced to gradually recede into the background.

Buddhism during this period was undergoing a transition that was filled with troubles and difficulties. With the forced separation of Shinto and Buddhism (*shinbutsu bunri* 神仏分離) in 1868 and subsequent persecution of Buddhism (*haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈), along with the promulgation of the *nikujiki saitai* 肉食妻帯 edict which allowed priests to marry, and their appointment to a new role as doctrinal instructors (*kyōdōshoku* 教導職) in 1872, the environment surrounding the Buddhist clergy was changing at a dizzying pace (Tanigawa 2011). The abolishment of doctrinal instructors in 1884 was an opportunity for Buddhist organizations to begin educating priests. Schools for educating priests were established one after the other, particularly from 1886 to 1888. The Shingon 真言 sect seminaries of the Shingi 新義 and Kogi 古義 branches of Shingon (*Shingi shingonshū daigakurin* 新義真言宗大学林 and *Kogi shingonshū daigakurin* 古義真言宗大学林, respectively) and the higher division of the Rinzai 臨済 sect's Hanazono Gakuin (*Hanazono gakuin kōtōbu* 花園学院高等部) were founded in 1886, the Main School of Jōdo Sectarian Studies (*Jōdoshūgaku honkō* 浄土宗学本校) and Inoue Enryō's 井上円了 (1858-1919) Philosophy Hall (*Tetsugakukan* 哲学館) in 1887, and the seminaries of the Ōtani and Honganji branches of the Jōdo Shinshū 浄土真宗 school in 1888. With the exception of Enryō's Philosophy Hall, these institutions were established to educate priests of their respective sects; they did not aim to provide education for ordinary people. There was a clear difference in the educational objectives of the Christian and Buddhist schools. The Christian schools had been focusing on women's and English language education, along with general education for the average person. In contrast, the goal of the Buddhist schools was to educate priests.

The turning point which marked the beginning of the second period of religious education in pre-World War II Japan was the issuance of Directive Number Twelve of the Ministry of Education (*Monbushō kunrei dai jūni gō* 文部省訓令第十二号) in 1899 and the Specialized Schools Ordinance (*Senmon gakkō rei* 專門学校令) in 1903. In addition to granting official state recognition to private education, Directive Number Twelve prohibited religious education in Ministry of Education-approved schools, regardless of whether they were public or private. This was a substantial blow to the Christian schools (Ōe 2014). This meant that in order to become officially recognized by the Ministry of Education, they would have to do away with religious education. Those institutions already recognized would lose official recognition from the Japanese government should they continue to provide religious education. At mission schools, there was the danger that support from the missions that backed them would be lost if religious education was brought to an end. Official recognition by the Ministry of Education meant that students at an institution would be able to enjoy the special privileges of eligibility to advance to higher-level schools and exemption from military service. If students were unable to receive these special privileges, enrollment at an institution would decrease markedly.

In the official histories of Buddhist-affiliated educational institutions, there is almost no mention of Directive Number Twelve. It was directed towards Christian schools and aimed to stop their preaching and propagation of the faith. Buddhist schools aimed to educate priests of their respective sects, and did not carry out preaching or propagation activities directed towards ordinary people. It was with the Specialized Schools Ordinance in 1903 that they for the first time fell into the law's purview, coming under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education as officially recognized institutions.

With the Specialized Schools Ordinance, schools teaching medical science, politics, law, economics, music, art and religion came, after receiving the necessary recognition, to be located within the Ministry of Education's school education structure. The Specialized Schools Ordinance extended official recognition as specialized schools to private schools, thus leading to a rapid increase in the number of private specialized schools. The proportion of religious schools among private specialized schools was quite high (Ejima 2014).

Table 1: Increasing Numbers of Specialized Schools after the Specialized Schools Ordinance

		1903	1907	1912
National	Medical Science, Pharmacy	5	5	5
National	Foreign Language, Art, Music	3	3	3
Public	Medical Science, Pharmacy	3	3	4
Public	Art			1
Private	Medical Science, Pharmacy	2	3	7
Private	Politics and Law, Economics	11	11	11
Private	Literature	8	9	11
Private	**Religion**	**7**	**16**	**23**
Private	Athletics			1

(Nakura 1984 p.135)

The third period for religious education in pre-World War II Japan began with the promulgation of the University Ordinance (*Daigaku rei* 大学令) in 1918. This brought considerable change to higher education in Japan, and led to progress. Imperial universities increased in number. Science and economics departments and research institutes were established (Hayashi 2002). Private specialized schools were given the opportunity to rise to the rank of a university officially recognized by the Ministry of Education. Specialized schools had prior to this point called themselves "universities." This had, however, only been an unofficial use of the term. Some religious specialized schools actively aimed to advance to the level of universities. Among the Christian institutions, Dōshisha University (*Dōshisha daigaku* 同志社大学), Rikkyō University (*Rikkyō daigaku* 立教大学), Kwansei Gakuin University (*Kansei gakuin daigaku* 関西学院大学), and Sophia University (*Jōchi daigaku* 上智大学) succeeded in doing so. On the Buddhist side, Ryūkoku University (*Ryūkoku daigaku* 龍谷大学), Ōtani University (*Ōtani daigaku* 大谷大学), Komazawa University (*Komazawa daigaku* 駒沢大学), and Risshō University (*Risshō daigaku* 立正大学) emerged. In order to become a university, it was necessary to create an incorporated foundation (*zaidan hōjin* 財団法人) and have considerable financial resources. This, then, was an era in which sects and religious organizations with the necessary financial power were able to have affiliated universities and researchers.

This overview of the three periods in religious education in pre-World War II Japan shows that in the first two periods, while Buddhist and Christian schools were similar in that they were religiously affiliated, they found themselves in different social environments. In the third period however, with the 1918 Ordinance presenting the opportunity of promotion to university status, both Buddhist and Christian schools aimed to receive permission to advance in this way based on the standardized criteria determined by the Ministry of Education (Hayashi 2014). This was the juncture at which "religious universities" came into existence.

1. Imperial Universities and Private Universities

The first university of modern Japan was Tokyo University, founded in 1877. Public and private specialized schools were created one after another from this point on. In 1886 the Imperial University Ordinance (*Teikoku daigaku rei* 帝国大学令) was issued and Tokyo University became the only imperial university in Japan, with colleges teaching a range of different subjects later added to it. The founding of Kyoto Imperial University in 1897 increased the number of imperial universities to two. In this section, I would like to consider the development of imperial universities.

Table 2: Imperial Universities and Buddhist Studies

Year	Founded University	Buddhist Studies / Religious Studies Courses
1886	Tokyo Imperial University	1905: Religious Studies course 1917: Indian Philosophy course
1897	Kyoto Imperial University	1906: History of Indian Philosophy course 1907: Religious Studies course
1907	Tohoku Imperial University	1924: Indian Studies course, Religious Studies course
1910	Kyushū Imperial University	1924: History of Indian Philosophy course, Religious Studies course
1918	Hokkaidō Imperial University	X
1924	Keijō Imperial University	1926: Religious Studies course
1928	Taipei Imperial University	X
1931	Ōsaka Imperial University	X
1939	Nagoya Imperial University	X

From early in the 1880's, Hara Tanzan 原坦山 (1819-1892), Nanjō Bunyū 南條文雄 (1849-1927) and Murakami Senshō 村上専精 (1851-1929) conducted courses in Buddhist studies at Tokyo Imperial University (Tōkyo teikoku daigaku 1942: 339-340). With the arrival of Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 (1866-1945) in the late 1890s, Buddhist studies also came to be conducted within the Sanskrit program, but it was not until 1917 that Buddhism, under the rubric of "Indian Philosophy," became an independent chair at the university. From an early point there were courses in Indian Philosophy and an Indian Philosophy department, but a full program with its own full-time professors was not to be so easily established. The first chair in Indian philosophy was created in 1917 and the second in 1921, but these were established on the basis of external financial contributions. The first chair was created with funding solicited by Murakami Senshō from the founder of the Yasuda Financial Combine (*Yasuda zaibatsu* 安田財閥), Yasuda Zenjirō 安田善次郎 (1838-1921). The second chair was created with funding received from Shaku Sōen 釈宗演 (1860-1919), who is well-known as one of the mentors of Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴

木大拙 (1870-1966). In 1926, a program was finally established which was funded from the national education budget. The fact that the Buddhist studies program at Tokyo Imperial University was created on the basis of outside funding is important to note.

In 1906 Kyoto Imperial University set up its School of Arts and Literature. This school hosted a History of Philosophy program, which included the study of the History of Indian Philosophy (Kyōto daigaku bungakubu 1956: 64-72). Then, in 1910, a Sanskrit Language and Literature program was established. At the imperial universities of Tohoku and Kyushu, Buddhist studies programs were established in the Departments of Law and Literature. These were single departments that integrated the disciplines of language and literature. Originally, the government's intention had been only to establish departments of law at these two universities. The House of Peers, however, had a different opinion and a process began which led to these departments being reconfigured as departments of law *and* literature. The government aimed to emphasize practical studies, while the House of Peers heeded contemporary intellectual currents which stressed comprehensive education. However, the four imperial universities of Osaka, Hokkaido, Taipei and Nagoya, established later, did not have departments of literature at the time of their opening, and thus did not include programs in either Buddhist studies or religious studies. This was probably due to the fact that, from World War I onwards, the Japanese government adopted an approach that promoted the kind of scientific learning which could be made immediately useful in the development of technology and in military matters.

At imperial universities, European-style Buddhology was taught by professors who had studied in the West. As the disciplines had a special focus on Indian Buddhism, the departments were named "Indian Philosophy" (*Indo tetsugaku* 印度哲学) or "Indian Studies" (*Indogaku* 印度学). Had this not been the point at which Buddhist universities were created, the discipline of Buddhist studies in Japan would certainly have had a much narrower scope (Hayashi 2002).

2. The Process of the Establishment of Buddhist Universities

After the 1918 University Ordinance, the government began to confer degrees upon graduates of private universities that were equal in value to those received by graduates of imperial universities. Furthermore, private specialized schools were at this point given the opportunity to rise to the level of a university officially recognized by the Ministry of Education. The government decided to incorporate private schools into public education in order to accommodate the growing number of university applicants. However, for private universities to establish themselves as an officially recognized university, they had to create an incorporated foundation, possess the necessary funds, and give part of these funds to the government as a deposit. The government sought five hundred thousand yen; the equivalent of approximately four billion yen (or forty million US dollars) today. For smaller sects that did not have a great capacity to raise funds, it was quite difficult to produce the capital for the requisite financial base and deposit. Only a limited number of schools could provide that amount.

In 1922 Ryūkoku University and Ōtani University (of the Honganji and Ōtani branches of Jōdo Shinshū, respectively) became the first private Buddhist universities to be authorized by the government. It appears that other sects' specialized schools were unable to immediately put plans in place for rising to the rank of university. The view arose in Buddhist circles that it would be better to create a joint university instead of each sect attempting to create their own. In October 1922, interested parties from the Sōtō 曹洞, Nichiren 日蓮, Tendai 天台, Shingon Kogi, Shingon Buzan 豊山, Jōdo 浄土宗, and Shingon Chisan 智山 schools came together and started an association that aimed to establish a joint Buddhist university. This idea was eventually realized by the joint university plan of the Tendai, Jōdo, and Buzan schools, which established Taishō University (*Taishō daigaku* 大正大学). Since university faculties were centered on research, institutions for the sectarian education of priests had to be established in divisions parallel to the university's main body.

In 1924 Risshō University received recognition from the government, followed by Komazawa University in the following year. Taishō University and Kōyasan University (*Kōyasan daigaku* 高野山大学) received recognition in 1926. However, the original names of these universities were not approved, and they were forced to change them: from "Buddhist University" (*Bukkyō daigaku* 仏教大学) to "Ryūkoku University"; from "Nichiren Sect University" (*Nichirenshū daigaku* 日蓮宗大学) to "Risshō University"; from "Sōtō Sect University" (*Sōtōshū daigaku* 曹洞宗大学) to "Komazawa University"; and from "Buddhist Joint University" (*Bukkyō rengō daigaku* 仏教連合大学) to "Taishō University." The Ministry of Education was of the opinion that though these were private universities, insofar as they were under its jurisdiction, their names should not include words with a sectarian or Buddhist flavor (Hayashi 2014).

In an interview with the Buddhist newspaper *Chūgai Nippō* 中外日報, the director of the Specialized Learning Bureau (*Senmon gakujutsu kyoku* 専門学術局) at that time, Matsuura Shizujirō 松浦鎮次郎 (1872-1945), expressed the opinion that religious universities should be managed in the same way as humanities colleges (*bunka daigaku* 文科大学) – later called faculties of literature (*bungakubu* 文学部) – at imperial universities. They were thus to incorporate not only academic research on religion, but also carry out research on philosophy and literature. His statement was as follows:

> Not only will research on religion not be the root of universities in our country, but just as free research with regard to all fields of study is central to the approach of our universities, there will be an attitude of free research with regard to religious research, and thus in our country people will be unable to establish departments of theology that have the same nature as those in foreign countries. Furthermore, we do not recognize their necessity. Though the problem then arises of whether it is necessary to create faculties specifically for research in religious studies, the way I see it is that if research on religion is not carried out in connection with research in other fields, it is difficult to reach this goal of having an attitude of free research. Thus, if it is the case that it is difficult to fully carry out research on religion cut off from other fields because it is necessary to engage in such research via the various fields of philosophy, psychology, history, and so on, it is doubtful whether it is necessary to establish a religious research institution as an independent faculty. While there are people who hold the opposite opinion, this must, at any rate, remain an open question for research. Thus, because even when bound up with its foundation by religious groups, the object of a university is in producing the persons of vital necessity to the state via academic research; the training for religious priests and the provision of religious practices at universities, and also such things as the performance of religious ceremonies are all absolutely incompatible with this ordinance (Daigakurei to shūkyō kenkyū 1919).

According to Matsuura, research on religion should be free research that is connected to other fields. It was also something that may be carried out from the perspectives of other fields. Independent faculties for research on religion were not, therefore, desirable. Even for universities backed by religious organizations, the goal was to be academic research that generates capable individuals who will meet the needs of the state. Religious training and rituals within these universities are inconceivable because these would go against the aims of the University Ordinance. Matsuura's remarks, which emphasize that religious education is not allowed even in the case of religious universities, inherit the approach of Directive Number Twelve of the Ministry of Education.

Next, let us consider concrete examples of specialized schools rising to the rank of university. In the case of Ryūkoku University, its original name ("Buddhist University") was not given approval, and this was then modified to the present-day name. After the promulgation of the University Ordinance, the first article of the Ryūkoku University regulations was changed from: "This school will research Buddhism in detail and teach necessary related subjects" (*hongaku wa bukkyō o seikyū shi, kanete kore ni kan suru suyō naru gakka o kyōju suru* 本学は仏教を精究し、兼て之に関する須要なる学科を教授する), to: "This school will teach various subjects related to Buddhism as well as religion, philosophy, and literature." (*hongaku wa bukkyō oyobi shūkyō, tetsugaku, bungaku ni kan suru shogakka o kyōju* 本学は仏教及び宗教・哲学・文学に関する諸学科を教授). A specialized department for the sectarian education of priests was established separately in the university. Religious studies departments were often established at universities of this type. The creation of such departments for the carrying out of free research on religion were acts that were emblematic of and in accordance with the aim of the University Ordinance.

At the May 1922 Education Council (*Kyōiku hyōgikai* 教育評議会), when Ryūkoku University, Rikkyō University, and Ōtani University were screened, attendees showed concern about their having religious institutions as parent organizations. However, after it was confirmed that at these "universities religion will be the object of academic study," they received approval. The Ministry of Education itself showed almost no interest as to whether the organization behind the founding of a university was religious, let alone whether it was Buddhist or Christian. Under the condition that they carry out the same type of public education as imperial universities, a number of religious specialized schools were allowed to rise to the rank of university.

Table 3: Courses and Departments Related to Buddhist Studies at Buddhist Universities

Name	Year Established	Courses / Departments
Ōtani University	1922	Courses in Shin Sect Studies, Buddhist Studies, Philosophy, Indian Philosophy, Chinese Philosophy, Ethics, Pedagogy, Religious Studies, and Sociology
Ryūkoku University	1922	Six courses in Buddhist Studies, and one course in each of the following: Buddhist History, Religious Studies and the History of Religion, Philosophy, Psychology, Ethics, Pedagogy, Sociology, Indian Studies, Sinology, National Learning (*kokugaku* 国学), English Literature
Risshō University	1924	Religious Studies department, Philosophy department, Sociology department, History department, Literature department
Komazawa University	1925	Buddhist Studies department, Oriental Studies department, Humanities department
Taishō University	1926	Buddhist Studies department, Philosophy department, Religious Studies department, History department, Literature department
Kōyasan University	1926	Esoteric Studies department, General Buddhism department, Philosophy and Science department, Buddhist Art department

Applications to have Buddhist professional schools recognized as private universities were very difficult projects in terms of obtaining funds and hiring professors. Looking at the results of efforts to gain such recognition, we see that the Honganji and Ōtani branches of the Jōdo Shin school; along with the Nichiren, Sōtō, and Kogi Shingon schools were able to establish their own independent universities, while the Tendai and Jōdo schools, along with the Buzan branch of Shingi Shingon collectively founded Taishō University. Other sects maintained their professional schools without establishing universities. Only the large religious organizations had their own universities, because only they could raise the money for the government deposit and bring together a faculty of Buddhist scholars and professors in various areas of expertise. This led to a split and a status gap between those Buddhist sects that had universities and those sects that did not. As we will see in more detail below, those denominations to which universities were affiliated came to have a powerful voice not only in the Buddhist academic world but also in the religious world in general.

In the 1910s, courses on Indian studies and Indian philosophy were set up at the imperial universities and, in the following decade, the professional schools of powerful Buddhist sects were elevated to university status. As a result, research departments for the study of Buddhism were established around the same time at both sectarian and imperial universities. In imperial universities, departments of "Indian Philosophy" served to introduce to Japan the methods of Western Buddhology, though the primary goal of Buddhist universities was to train priests. While at imperial universities the study of Buddhism involved learning Pali and Sanskrit and most affiliated scholars focused on early Buddhism, research at sectarian universities was centered on Chinese translations of the Mahāyāna sutras and on the writings of their sect founders. One could say, then, that under the guise of "Buddhist Studies," the tradition of doctrinal studies gained a new lease on life.

3. Linguistic Problems

As stated above, departments of Buddhist studies at imperial universities prioritized, based on the Western model, the learning of classical languages such as Pali and Sanskrit, devoting their energies to scrupulous philological research of Buddhist texts. In contrast, sectarian universities focused on the writings of their respective founders, as well as on the reading and annotation of Mahāyāna texts. Therefore, in terms of linguistic training, there existed a dual pattern with Sanskrit and Pali being studied at the imperial universities, and classical Chinese being studied at Buddhist universities.

The reading of Japanese and Chinese classical texts had been essential for intellectuals since the Edo period (1600-1868). Both Buddhist priests and Confucian scholars were familiar with these classical languages, and intellectuals continued to be educated in them well into the Meiji period (1868-1912). With the adoption of Euro-American scholarship, however, increasing emphasis was placed instead on the learning of Western languages, a shift which was fully reflected in the world of Buddhist studies. At Tokyo University, Hara Tanzan, who was well-versed in the Chinese classics, was the first to lecture on Buddhist texts. In the course of the next two decades, however, Western languages also came to be taught by Nanjō Bun'yū and Takakusu Junjirō, both of whom had studied in Europe. Philosopher and educator Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1856-1944), reflecting on this point in time, stated the following:

> The situation in the Buddhist world today is quite different than it was in the early Meiji period. …Since that time there has been no one like Hara Tanzan. … Everyone at that time had basic proficiency with the Chinese classics. But times soon completely changed and so did research methods. There are now said to be scientific methods beyond the reach of scholars of the older generation. With Drs. Nanjō and Takakusu came the study of Sanskrit and now Pali must also be done. Consequently we now have specialists of Pali. The research methods have been totally transformed (Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai 1995: 60).

The methods of Buddhist studies research did completely change, just as Inoue recollected, due to the shift to research based on Western philology and linguistic studies. This did not mean, however, that the significance of reading Chinese classics and Chinese translations of Buddhist scriptures had completely vanished. In modern intellectual circles, while it was generally true that knowledge of classical Chinese texts did lose its authority and that preference was given to Western languages such as English, French and German, the situation was somewhat different in Buddhist studies. Even after the introduction of Sanskrit and Pali, classical Chinese texts continued to be read. In Buddhist studies the absolute priority given to Chinese works had indeed deteriorated, but Japanese scholars did use Sanskrit, Pali and classical Chinese in conjunction in order to decipher texts. In material terms, parts of the Buddhist canon (*Daizōkyō* 大蔵経) which had disappeared in other countries survived in Japan in good condition, and thus Japanese scholars who had not only the proper linguistic training, but also access to such works gained an advantage of sorts over Western scholars (See Hatani 1971).

We may relate this linguistic issue to the above-mentioned dual pattern that existed in the university system. In short, whether the language of study was Sanskrit or classical Chinese, it was part of a functional division of labor that existed in the dual system. This dual structure was not necessarily rigid, and many of the scholars who taught Indian philosophy at imperial universities were priests of, for instance, the Shin or Sōtō sects. Moreover, research on the Mahāyāna scriptures was also conducted at imperial universities, and courses on Chinese and Japanese Buddhism were taught. Likewise, sectarian universities offered courses on Sanskrit and Pali, and the Western-style discipline of "Indian philosophy" was practiced. Although their main focus was as described above, the structure was not as rigid, and there was indeed much exchange between imperial and sectarian universities. The Japanese Association of Buddhist Studies (*Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai* 日本仏教学会)

functioned as a mechanism that, while putting imperial universities on top, served to transcend sectarian affiliation and mobilize all of its affiliate scholars of Buddhism.

4. The Influence of Buddhist Universities

What changes did the birth of Buddhist universities during the Taishō period bring about in Japanese society? In order to answer this question, in the following section I will focus on three points.

First, there were a number of individuals that became scholars of Buddhism having assumed posts as professors at sectarian universities. While there were of course some Buddhist studies posts at imperial universities, they were very few in number. The birth of Buddhist universities increased the number of positions for scholars of Buddhism, and created the basis for the acceptance of Buddhist studies within the Japanese academic world. It should also be pointed out that not only did the number of people in the field increase, but very high-quality academic achievements came to be published in a visible form – namely, Buddhist canons. During the Taishō period, various versions of Buddhist canons were compiled and published. The person at the center of this trend was Max Müller's disciple and Tokyo Imperial University professor Takakusu Junjirō. His compilation of Buddhist canons was probably inspired by Müller's *Sacred Books of the East*. The *Taishō Tripiṭaka* (*Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大蔵経), published between 1924 and 1935, was compiled based on the *Tripiṭaka Koreana* (Kr. *Goryeo Daejanggyeong* 高麗大蔵経), making use of scriptures that were extant in Japan. In both collecting scriptures and creating critical editions of them, the assistance of researchers from the various sects was necessary. The *Southern Transmission Tripiṭaka* (*Nanden daizōkyō* 南伝大蔵経) contained Japanese translations of Pali scriptures, and could not have been published without scholars proficient in that language, such as Takakusu.

Furthermore, it goes without saying that the Buddhist canons published during the Taishō period were an accomplishment that contributed to Buddhist studies not only in Japan but throughout the world. And indeed, the scholars responsible for this monumental compilation enterprise were very much aware of their "global mission." For instance, in the introduction to the *Taishō Tripiṭaka*, we observe the following words:

> Outside, let us thereby spread and expand the generous and fair Great Way, promoting peace and increasing welfare. Who besides Japanese Buddhist students are able to elucidate and promulgate it? The duty to spread it widely lies entirely on our shoulders. (Taishō shinshū daizōkyō kankōkai 1969: introduction).

The above quotation is filled with an intense feeling of pride that only the Buddhist studies scholars of Japan can clearly show the truth of Buddhism and thereby contribute to world peace. In other words, they saw themselves as the representatives of Asian Buddhists who could present the truth of Buddhism to the world.

Table 4: Compilations of the Buddhist Canon[2]

Years	Title	Compilers
1912-22	*Dai nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書	Nanjō Bun'yū 南条文雄 , Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信享 , Takakusu Junjirō, Ōmura Seigai 大村西崖
1914-21	*Nihon daizōkyō* 日本大蔵経	Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧
1924-34	*Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*	Takakusu Junjirō, Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭
1935-41	*Nanden daizōkyō*	Takakusu Junjirō

In 1928, the Buddhism Association of Japan (*Nihon bukkyō kyōkai* 日本仏教協会) was established as an assembly in which Buddhist studies scholars could gather and collaborate. This was the earlier form of the above-mentioned Japanese Association of Buddhist Studies (*Nihon bukkyō gakkai*), which still exists today. It was the compilers of the *Taishō Tripiṭaka*, Takakusu Junjirō and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭 (1872-1933), who called out to Buddhist universities and specialized schools in Kyoto, and proposed the creation of a national academic association. Buddhist studies scholars from Tokyo, Tohoku, and Kyoto Imperial Universities, as well as of Buddhist universities and specialized schools, gathered here and gave research presentations (Nihon bukkyō gakkai 1995: 3-5). By this point, six Buddhist universities had been founded, scholars had joined forces to publish various Buddhist canons, and a national academic association had been organized. It can thus be said that the discipline of Buddhist studies had become fully established, in the Japanese context, as an academic field.

The second point I wish to address is that sectarian studies (*shūjō* 宗乗 or *shūgaku* 宗学) based on the teachings of the founder of each denomination came to be taught at Buddhist universities under the general heading of "Buddhist studies" (*Bukkyōgaku*). Such sectarian learning was called "Shin studies" (*Shinshūgaku* 真宗学) at Ōtani and Ryūkoku Universities, "Zen studies" (*Zengaku* 禅学) at Komazawa University, "Esoteric studies" (*Mikkyōgaku* 密教学) at Koyasan University and,

2. Prior to the Taishō period there were also attempts at compiling the Buddhist canon, the most notable of which is perhaps the *Dainihon Kōtei Daizōkyō* 大日本校訂大蔵経 (1881-1885), edited by, among others, Fukuda Gyōkai 福田行誡 (1806-1888). This version of the "Canon" is especially important as it served as a useful reference in the later enterprises of, for instance, Takakusu and Watanabe. For an overview of the topic, see Vita 2003.

due to the institution's supra-sectarian character, "Buddhist studies" at Taishō University. However, even before this type of sectarian learning was taught at the above universities, European-style Buddhology had already been introduced into the Japanese academic world by the likes of Nanjō and Takakusu, and adopted at imperial universities.

To what extent were these two different types of Buddhist studies related and integrated? There was too great a difference between the study of Buddhism as it was traditionally practiced in sectarian schools and the "universal" type of European-style Buddhist studies. Though both disciplines intended to discuss "Buddhism," no apparent points of contact between the two could be found. On one hand, sectarian studies tried to articulate the truth of Buddhism through Chinese translations of scriptures and the teachings of the sect founder. On the other hand, European-style Buddhist studies tried to articulate the true teachings of the historical Buddha by focusing on Pali and Sanskrit scriptures. European scholars in the latter half of the nineteenth century held Pali and Sanskrit scriptures in high esteem, and assumed the position that the Mahāyāna teachings had not been expounded by the Buddha. This gave rise to the notion that the Mahāyāna scriptures had less value than non-Mahāyāna scriptures. Logically speaking, sectarian studies were, from a European-style Buddhist studies perspective, problematic, as they sometimes had very little to do with the teachings of the historical Buddha. However, Nanjō and Takakusu, who brought such methods to Japan, did not reject the existence of sects; rather, they supported and defended them. Nanjō thought Max Müller's theory that Mahāyāna Buddhism had not been expounded by the Buddha was academically valid; however, from the perspective of faith, he believed that the Mahāyāna was, indeed, the Buddha's teaching (Nanjō 1886). European-style Buddhist studies was thus actively appropriated, although it remained, nevertheless, limited to the realm of academic research, and unable to enter the realm of belief. On the other hand, sectarian studies carried out from a faith-based perspective were not eliminated by the adoption of European-style Buddhist studies. I will discuss this coexistence of two types of Buddhist studies, each with different perspectives, in the last section.

The third point to consider is that libraries and other facilities housing research materials were created concurrently with the establishment of Buddhist universities. These became bases of academic knowledge. With the Jōdo School also being represented at Taishō University, five of the six Buddhist universities established in the Taishō period were connected to denominations that traced their origins back to the so-called "New Buddhism" of the Kamakura Period (1185-1333). As these universities provided the financial and intellectual support for sectarian scholars to focus on their respective school's founders, studies on Shinran 親鸞 (1173-1263), Nichiren 日蓮 (1222-1282), Dōgen 道元 (1200-1253) and their historical contexts flourished. This was the case especially in comparison with document-based research on Buddhism in the Nara (710-794) and Heian (794-1185) periods, to the point that the Kamakura period sect founders came to be recognized as important figures not only in the context of Buddhism, but also in the context of Japanese history as a whole.

It was not only materials and documents related to the respective sectarian founders that were gathered by Buddhist universities, but also documents relating to the struggles of Buddhist reformists of the Meiji era. There are several examples of people who were heavily involved in or influenced by the Buddhist reform movements of this period assuming posts at universities. There are too many such individuals to mention all of them, but some include Inoue Enryō, Ōuchi Seiran 大内青巒 (1845-1918), Sakaino Kōyō 境野黄洋 (1871-1933), Watanabe Kaikyoku, Takashima Beihō 高島米峰 (1875-1949), Soga Ryōjin 曽我量深 (1875-1971), Kaneko Daiei 金子大栄 (1881-1976),[3] and Suzuki Daisetsu. For example, while not strictly a Buddhist institution, Tōyō University (*Tōyō daigaku* 東洋大学) maintains deep ties with Buddhism to this day. Tōyō University hosts the Inoue Enryō Memorial Academic Center (*Inoue enryō kinen gakujutsu sentā* 井上円了記念学術センター), where materials related to Inoue Enryō are preserved and research on his ideas is carried out. The department of Shin Buddhism at Ōtani University, in turn, concentrates a large part of its resources on the study of Kiyozawa Manshi 清沢満之 (1863-1903).[4] If Tōyō and Ōtani Universities had not come into existence, it is doubtful whether materials relating to Inoue and Kiyozawa would have been fully passed down to later generations. There were, of course, many other personalities who were extremely important in their own lifetimes but are not topics of scholarship today due to the lack of extant materials relating to them.

There are certainly many people important to the history of Japanese Buddhism whose names remain largely unknown today. In terms of modern Japanese Buddhist history, however, the actors with whom we are most familiar are those individuals who were either themselves connected to Buddhist universities, or had disciples who, as members of such institutions, were able to properly collect their papers and other materials and thus make them the objects of study for later generations. It was arguably because the successors of the New Buddhism Movement (*Shinbukkyō undō* 新仏教運動) and of Kiyozawa Manshi's Spiritual Awareness Movement (*Seishinshugi* 精神主義) became university professors that these movements received attention and became highly acclaimed. Buddhist universities have been a means to preserve and reproduce historical documents and memories pertaining not only sectarian

---

3. For a recent study on Kaneko, see Schroeder 2014.
4. In recent years, many studies have appeared on Kiyozawa and his *Seishinshugi* movement, the most important of which is, in my opinion, Yamamoto 2011. For an overview of the field, see Ōmi Toshihiro's essay in this issue of *Japanese Religions*.

founders, but also to modern Buddhism. This mechanism, in turn, simultaneously functions in a way which makes us less likely to remember those who were, for whatever reason, active outside of the university context.

5. In Lieu of Conclusion: Three Types of Buddhist Studies

With the creation of religiously-affiliated universities, traditional sectarian learning was incorporated into the discipline of Buddhist studies. Sectarian scholars, too, came to embrace European-style scholarship, and restructured their studies in this context. These two worlds, different at first, came, in my view, to share common ground due to the efforts of individuals like Murakami Senshō, the first full professor of Buddhism at Tokyo Imperial University.

According to Orion Klautau, who in recent years has focused on Murakami's intellectual enterprises, Murakami wrote the history of Japanese Buddhism by depicting the lives of eminent priests and the main doctrines of each sect.[5] Besides his portrayal of "Japanese Buddhism" in history, Murakami was also one of the first to provide systematic narratives about the "distinctive features" of Buddhism in India, China, and Japan. Whereas "Indian Buddhism" was defined by its "disciplinary institutions" (*kiritsuteki seido* 規律的制度), and "Chinese Buddhism" was characterized mainly by its "philosophical doctrines" (*tetsugakuteki kyōri* 哲学的教理), "Japanese Buddhism" distinguished itself in terms of "religious faith" (*shūkyōteki shinkō* 宗教的信仰). What Murakami Senshō had in mind was an image of "Japanese Buddhism" as the final development in the Great Vehicle, and it was under this same rubric that he provided the biographies and doctrines of sectarian founders. Therefore, if we take into full consideration this historical enterprise undertaken by Murakami, then we can picture the relationship between not two but three types of Buddhist studies in the following manner:

a) Sectarian studies, focusing on the biographies of eminent priests (usually the sect founder) and the individual doctrines of each denomination.
b) European-style Buddhology, focusing on the reconstruction and understanding of the "universal" thought of the historical Buddha.
c) Buddhist historical studies, or the study of Buddhist history as it developed in specific national contexts. This would also encompass, in the case of Japan, the findings of sectarian studies. In this framework, "Japanese Buddhism" would, while maintaining a unique value, be equal to both its "Indian" and "Chinese" counterparts.

The above also indicates the order in which these different research-styles appeared. Sectarian learning, usually described as *shūjō* in the context of Tokugawa Japan,

5. See Klautau 2012b: 84-117. For analysis in English, see Klautau 2011 and 2012a.

was restyled as *shūgaku* in the course of the Meiji and Taishō periods, and taught at modern universities under different names such as *Shinshūgaku* and *Zengaku*. However, despite the difference in scope, these disciplines were also referred to as "Buddhist studies" (*Bukkyōgaku* 仏教学). As such, they were able to enter the academic company of other disciplines taught at sectarian universities. The field of Buddhist historical studies (*Bukkyō shigaku* 仏教史学), in turn, encompassed and synthesized into one great narrative the biographies and doctrines of various sectarian founders. It also transformed Japanese Buddhism, in terms of discourse, into a construct on a par with both Indian and Chinese Buddhism. This type of scholarship was, in my view, situated between traditional sectarian studies and the newly introduced field of European Buddhology, and served as a bridge connecting the two disciplines. The type of Buddhist history proposed by Murakami did not deny traditional sectarian teachings: on the contrary, it re-envisaged them in a national framework that, at the same time, responded to the "universalist" demands of scholarship founded in Pali and Sanskrit scriptures.

In this final section, I have hinted only briefly at how these disciplines came to co-operate, despite the fact that they focused on "Buddhism" from perspectives different in terms of their theoretical starting points. Sectarian studies had existed for a long time, and was an indispensable element in the traditional education of priests. European-style Buddhology and Murakami's historical studies followed in that order, and were developed in the context of imperial universities. Although these differed in terms of content, one reason why they were able to coexist was because they overlapped in terms of *personnel*. In institutions public and private, Buddhist studies in all its forms was carried out by people related to sectarian organizations. Furthermore, the framework of Buddhist national histories developed in this context would become increasingly important, as from a certain point onwards Japanese Buddhists would depict their stories as the culmination of Buddhist history as a whole. This was, in turn, taken as justification for their pan-Asian aspirations.

References

"Daigakurei to shūkyō kenkyū 大学令と宗教研究". 1919. *Chūgai nippō* 中外日報, 6-9 April.

Ejima Naotoshi 江島尚俊. 2014. "Kindai nihon no kōtō kyōiku ni okeru kyōiku to kyōka 近代日本の高等教育における教育と教化." In: *Kindai nihon no daigaku to shūkyō* 近代日本の大学と宗教, edited by Ejima Naotoshi. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 3-32.

Hatani Ryōtai 羽渓了諦. 1971. "Meiji bukkyō gakusha no kaigai shinshutsu 明治仏教学者の海外進出." In: *Hatani hakushi beiju shukuga kinen bukkyō ronsetsu senshū* 羽渓博士米寿記念仏教論説選集, edited by Hatani Hakushi Beiju Kinen Shukugakai 羽渓博士米寿記念祝賀会. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 41-55.

Hayashi Makoto 林淳. 2002. "Kindai nihon ni okeru bukkyōgaku to shūkyōgaku 近代日本における仏教学と宗教学." *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 333: 29-53

————. 2011. "Religious Studies in Japan: A Historical Perspective". *Pantheon* 6 (1): 4-14.

————. 2014. "Religious Studies and Religiously Affiliated Universities." In: *Modern Buddhism in Japan*, edited by Hayashi Makoto et al. Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, 163-193.

Kyōto Daigaku Bungakubu 京都大学文学部 (ed.). 1956. *Kyōto daigaku bungakubu gojūnen shi* 京都大学文学部五十年史. Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Bungakubu

Klautau, Orion. 2011. "(Re)inventing Japanese Buddhism: Sectarian Reconfiguration and Historical Writing in Meiji Japan." *The Eastern Buddhist* 42 (1): 75-99.

————. 2012a. "Revisiting the 'Three Nation' Discourse: Early Twentieth-Century Narratives on the Distinctive Features of 'Japanese Buddhism'." Unpublished paper read at the 2012 conference of the Association for Asian Studies. Toronto (Canada), March 15, 2012.

————. 2012b. *Kindai nihon shisō to shite no bukkyō shigaku* 近代日本思想としての仏教史学. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Nakura Eizaburō 名倉英三郎 et al. (eds.). 1984. *Nihon kyōiku shi* 日本教育史. Tokyo: Yachiyo Shuppansha

Nanjō Bun'yū 南條文雄. 1886. "Nanjō Bun'yū shi bonbun amidakyō kōgi taiyō 南條文雄師梵文阿弥陀経講義大要." *Meikyō shinshi* 明教新誌 2109: 6-7.

Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai 日本仏教学会 (ed.). 1995. *Nihon bukkyō gakkai rokujūnen no ayumi* 日本仏教学会六十年の歩み. Kyoto: Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai Seibu Jimukyoku.

Ōe Mitsuru 大江満. 2014. "Meiji kōki kirisuto kyō shugi gakkō no monbushō kunrei jūni gō e no taiō 明治後期キリスト教主義学校の文部省訓令一二号への対応." In: *Kindai nihon no daigaku to shūkyō*, edited by Ejima Naotoshi. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 33-71.

Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一. 2012. *Kindai bukkyō to iu shiza* 近代仏教という視座. Tokyo: Perikansha

Ryūkoku Daigaku Sanbyakugojūnenshi Hensan Iinkai 龍谷大学三百五十年編纂委員会 (ed.). 2000. Ryūkoku daigaku sanbyaku gojūnenshi tsūshihen jōkan 龍谷大学三百五十年史通史編 上巻 Kyoto: Ryūkoku University.

Schroeder, Jeff. 2014. "The Insect in the Lion's Body: Kaneko Daiei and the Question of Authority in Modern Buddhism." In: *Modern Buddhism in Japan*, edited by Hayashi Makoto et al. Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, 194-222.

Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 et al. (eds.). 2014. *Budda no henbō: Kōsaku suru kindai bukkyō* ブッダの変貌—交錯する近代仏教. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Taishō shinshū daizōkyō kankōkai 大正新脩大蔵経刊行会 (ed.). 1969. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō mokuroku kaitei shinpan* 大正新脩大蔵経目録改訂新版. Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai.

Tanigawa Yutaka 谷川穣. 2011. "No Separation, No Clashes: An Aspect of Buddhism and Education in the Meiji Period." *The Eastern Buddhist* 42 (1): 55-73.

Tokyo Teikoku Daigaku 東京帝国大学 (ed.). 1942. *Tōkyō teikoku daigaku gakujutsu taikan: Sōsetsu bungakubu* 東京帝国大学学術大観—総説 文学部. Tokyo: Tōkyō Teikoku Daigaku.

Vita, Silvio. 2003. "Printings of the Buddhist 'Canon' in Modern Japan." In: *Buddhist Asia 1: Papers from the First Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in May 2001*, edited by Giovanni Verardi and Silvio Vita, Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies, 217-245.

Yamamoto Nobuhiro 山本伸裕. 2011. *"Seishinshugi" wa dare no shisō ka* 「精神主義」は誰の思想か. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.