

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

Through the Creation of the Bibliography of Japanese Buddhist Texts

Nobuya DAKE

Ryukoku University

Part-time Lecturer

Abstract

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

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

Through the Creation of the Bibliography of Japanese Buddhist Texts *

Nobuya DAKE

Keywords: Translation, Strategic Occidentalism, Buddhism, Shin Buddhism

1. Introduction

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

Most previous studies focusing on the issue of Buddhist Westernization have

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

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

² Honganji Shiryōken, *Zōho kaiteiban honganji Shi* 3, 383.

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

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

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

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

⁵ See Dake, Yoshinaga, Ohmi (eds.), *Nihonbukkyō to seiyō Sekai*.

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

2. The Reception of Japanese Buddhism in the Western Context

2-1 Orientalism

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

⁶ McMahan, *The Making of Buddhist Modernism*.

⁷ Said, *Orientalism*, 51.

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

As Charles Hallisey has pointed out, “Orientalism makes it materialize and embody an absolute division between ‘the West’ and ‘the East,’ and rejects the voice of the ‘East.’”

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

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

⁸ Almond, *The British Discovery of Buddhism*.

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

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

¹¹ Lopez Jr, “Buddha,” 31–62.

¹² McMahan, *The Making of Buddhist Modernism*, 259–261.

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

2-2 Concept of Religion in Modern Japan

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 30.

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

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

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

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

¹⁸ Ibid., 66.

¹⁹ Hoshino, *Kindainihon no shūkyōgainen-shūkyōsha no kotoba to kindai*, 210.

²⁰ Krämer, *Shimaji Mokurai and the Reconception of Religion and the Secular in Modern Japan*, 3–9.

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

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

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

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

²¹ Klautau, *Kindainihonshisō toshite no bukkyōshigaku*, 26.

²² *Ibid.*, 85.

²³ Klautau, “Kindainihon no bukkyōugaku niokeru “Bukkyō Buddhism” no katarikata,” 68–86.

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

2-3 Circulation of Religious Concepts: Making Transnational Buddhism

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. History of Shin Buddhist Texts Translated into English

3-1. Previous Scholarship

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

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

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

²⁸ For example, Ishi, "Suzuki Daisetsu no 'ejaculation' wo megutte," 102–110, Dake, "Shinshū niokeru eigohonyaku no kenkyū—Suzuki Daisetsu no ei'yaku wo chūshinni—," 17–38, Tamura, "Ugokidasu Daihi: 'The Original Prayer' ni tsuitenno ichi kosatsu," 254–227, Ando, *Daisetsu*.

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

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

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

²⁹ D.T. Suzuki, Sasaki Shizuka trans., *Daijōbukkō gairon*, 490–491.

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

³¹ Shinran Bukkyō center (eds.), *Shinran Kyōgyōshinshō (gendaigoyaku)*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

³⁴ Olcott, *A Buddhist Catechism*.

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

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

³⁷ Akamatsu, “Shinshū Taii Ryakusetsu.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

³⁹ Akamatsu, “A Brief Account of Shinshū.”

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

⁴¹ See *Kinichi Shinpō*, “Eibun Shinshū taiino hyō.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁴⁵ Reed. *Japan: Its History, Traditions and Religions*, 86–89.

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

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

On October 21, 1885, James Troup, British Consul in Osaka and Kobe, presented a reading of “On The Tenets of the Shinshiu or ‘True Sect’ of Buddhists” at the Asiatic Society of Japan. This text is a direct translation of Ogurusu Kōchō’s *Shinshū Doctrine* (Chinese text, 真宗教旨), published in 1876.⁴⁷ This book was reviewed by Nanjō Bun’yū who had just returned from his study abroad at Oxford University, and Akamatsu Renjō.

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

At the time, the only text that gave an outline of Shinshū doctrines in English was the previously mentioned “A Brief Account of Shinshiu” by Akamatsu Renjō. Therefore, Troup’s translation contributed to the creation of some of the earliest English terminology for many Shinshū doctrinal terms. This translation received high praise in the press.⁴⁸ However, when seen from the perspective of our definition of English texts (reception) from an English-translated text (transmission), we can shed light on different aspects of this text. Troup’s translation was once on the list of books that the representatives of Japanese Buddhism were planning to bring to the World Parliaments of Religions of Chicago in 1893.⁴⁹ Nonetheless, it was decided not to include it in the list of items to bring to Chicago. Despite its great domestic reputation, this book was not used for dissemination to the Western world and was never brought to the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago. Moreover, it was not used as a missionary tool for the propagation

⁴⁶ Ibid., 89.

⁴⁷ Ogurusu, *Shinshu Kyōshi*.

⁴⁸ See “Osaka Tsushin.”

⁴⁹ Kaigai Senkyōkai (eds.), “Eigo Bussho Sehon,” 20.

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

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

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

Nanjō Bun'yū's English text *A Short History of The Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects*, and its Japanese edition *Bukkyō Jūnishū kōyō* 仏教十二宗綱要 appeared simultaneously in December 1886.⁵² The proposer of these books was the publisher Sano Shōdo 佐野正道 (?–1917), who wanted to publish a book offering an overview of the twelve sects of Japanese Buddhism. The most significant feature of this book is its use of Buddhist terminology in transliteration from Sanskrit rather than Chinese. This is due in large part to the involvement of Nanjō, who studied Sanskrit and worked as an editor of Buddhist texts under the guidance of Max Müller at Oxford University.

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

⁵¹ Ogurusu, *Shinshū Kyōshi*.

⁵² Japanese edition: Ogurusu (ed.), *Bukkyō Jūnishū Yōko*, English edition: Nanjō (ed.), *A Short History of the Japanese Buddhist Sects*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁵⁴ Katō, “A Shin Shu Catechism,” 753.

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Conclusion

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix

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

Bibliography

Aihua Zheng. “Buddhist Networks: The Japanese Preparation for the World’s Parliament of Religions, 1892-1893.” In *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 46 (2) 2019: 247-270.

Akamatsu, Renjio 赤松連城. “A Brief Account of //Shinshiu//” In *Kōryū-Zasshi* 興隆雑誌 3, 1879.

Ando Reiji 安藤礼二. *Daisetsu* 大拙. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2019.

Baba Norihisa 馬場紀寿. “Kindai ni okeru daijō Bukkyō to Jōzabu Bukkyō no Sōzo” In *Bukkyō no Seitō to Itan*, 仏教の正統と異端 Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai (2022) : 213-241.

Bird, Isabella L. *Unbeaten tracks in Japan; an account of travels in the interior including visits to the aborigines of Yezo and the shrine of Nikkō*, 2 New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1880.

Charles, Hallisey. “Roads Taken and Not Taken in the Study of Theravāda Buddhism.” In Lopez Jr., Donald (ed.), *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism Under Colonialism*, ed. Donald Lopez. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Dake Mitsuya 嵩満也. Yoshinaga Shin’ichi 吉永進一, Ohmi Toshihiro 碧海寿広 (eds.). *Nihon Bukkyō to seiyō Sekai* 日本仏教と西洋世界, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2020.

Dake Nobuya 嵩宣也. “Shinshū ni Okeru Eigohonyaku no Kenkyū—Suzuki Daisetsu no Eiyaku wo Chushinni—”真宗における英語翻訳の研究—鈴木大拙英訳を中心に—, In *Ryukoku Daigaku Daigakuin Bungaku Kenkyūka Kiyō* 龍谷大学大学院文学研究科紀要 38, (2016):17-38.

Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki 鈴木大拙. *Açvaghosha's Discourse on the awakening of faith in the Mahāyāna*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1900.

———. *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, London: Luzac Company, 1907.

Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki trans. *Kyōgyōshinshō: The Collection of Passage Expounding the True Teaching Living, Faith, and Realizing of the Pure Land*. Edited by Eastern

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

James C. Dobbins, Richard. M. Jaffe (eds.). *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume II: Pure Land*. California: University of California Press, 2015.

James, Troup. “On The Tenets of The Shinshiu or ‘True Sect’ of Buddhists”, In *The Asiatic Society of Japan* 14, Tokyo: The Hakubunsha 1886.

———. “The Gobunsho or Ofumi of Rennyo Shōnin”, In *The Asiatic Society of Japan* Vol.17, Tokyo: The Hakubunsha 1889.

Jørn, Borup. “Pizza curry skyr and whirlpool effects - religious circulations between East and West.” In Jørn Borup, Marianne Qvortrup Fibiger (eds.), *Eastspirit Transnational Spirituality and Religious Circulation in East and West*. Boston: Brill, (2017):13-35.

Judith, Snodgrass. *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism and the Columbian Exposition*, Chapel hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Kaigai Senkyōkai 海外宣教会 (eds.). “Eigo Bussho Sehon 英語仏書施本”, In *Kaigai Bukkyō Jijō* 海外仏教事情, Kyoto: Kaigai Senkyōkai, Vol.34, 1893.

Katō Shōkwaku 加藤正廓. “A Shinshu Catechism” In the *Theosophist*, 10(120) 1889.

Ketelaar, James Edward. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Lopez Jr., Donald. “Buddha” In Lopez Jr., Donald (ed.), *Donald Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, (2005):31-62.

Murakami Senshō 村上専精. *Bukkyō touitsuron taikō* 仏教統一論 大綱論 Kyoto: Kinkō-dō, 1901.

Nanjō Bunyū ed. *A Short History of the Japanese Buddhist Sects, Eibun Bukkyō Junishu Yoko* 英文仏教十二宗綱要、Bukkyō Sho Eiyaku Shuppankai, 1886.

Nakanishi Naoki 中西直樹, Nasu Eisho 那須英勝, Dake Mitsuya 嵩満也 (eds.). *Bukkyō Eisho Dendō no Akebono* 仏教英書伝道のあけぼの Kyoto:Hōzōkan, 2018.

Nakanishi Naoki 中西直樹, Yoshinaga Shin'ichi 吉永進一 (eds.). *Bukkyō Kokusai Nettowāku no Genryu—Kaigai Senkyōkai (1888~1893) no hikari to kage* 仏教

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

Higashi Honganji Shuppan, 2015.

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

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