

Bucknell University

Bucknell Digital Commons

Faculty Contributions to Books

Faculty Scholarship

Spring 3-1-2023

A Century of Critical Buddhism in Japan

James Mark Shields

Bucknell University, jms089@bucknell.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac_books



Part of the [Asian History Commons](#), [Buddhist Studies Commons](#), [Comparative Philosophy Commons](#), [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#), [Ethics in Religion Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), [History of Religions of Eastern Origins Commons](#), [Intellectual History Commons](#), [Japanese Studies Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shields, James Mark, "A Century of Critical Buddhism in Japan" (2023). *Faculty Contributions to Books*. 261.

https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac_books/261

This Contribution to Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Contributions to Books by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcadmin@bucknell.edu.

Introduction to Buddhist East Asia

Edited by

ROBERT H. SCOTT AND JAMES MCRAE

**SUNY
PRESS**

Published by State University of New York Press, Albany

© 2023 State University of New York

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission. No part of this book may be stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means including electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission in writing of the publisher.

For information, contact State University of New York Press, Albany, NY
www.sunypress.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data



10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1



Chapter 11

A Century of Critical Buddhism in Japan

JAMES MARK SHIELDS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

The question of Buddhist involvement—or collaboration, to use a more loaded term—in modern Japanese nationalism and militarism was reopened in the late twentieth century by a number of books, including the compilation *Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School, and the Question of Nationalism* (1994) and Brian Victoria’s *Zen at War* (1997).¹ In *Zen at War*, Victoria argues that Buddhism—especially Zen—was at least partly responsible for prewar and wartime Japanese militarism. To the surprise of those who see Buddhism as avowedly pacifist in nature, the attempt to justify and support the Japanese war effort in Buddhist terms was in fact a disturbingly common occurrence, and not simply the work of a few zealots and hard-liners. A fair number of Zen masters, as well as most prominent intellectuals of the 1930s and 1940s were, at one time or another, quite ready to express their support of the so-called Great East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere (Jpn. Dai Tōa Kyōei Ken 大東亜共栄圏) in terms that were often explicitly religious.² Yet for all the historical cases and incidents cited by Victoria, his work is limited, as he is quick to admit, by the fact that he is a historian, not an ethicist, philosopher, or religious critic. Thus, while the tone of the book expresses an undisguised evaluation of Buddhist betrayal, Victoria is reticent to pursue just *why* it happened in the first place. *Why* was Buddhism so easily manipulated—if that is the best way to phrase it—to suit militarism? And more generally, what is the relation, if any, between Buddhist doctrine, violence, warfare, and social ethics?

D. T. Suzuki (Suzuki Daisetsu, 1870–1966), whose writings from the 1930s through the 1960s were to have immense influence in shaping



1 Western attitudes toward Buddhism, seems to have answered this question
 2 decades ago, when he wrote that “Zen has sustained [the military classes]
 3 in two ways, morally and philosophically. Morally, because Zen is a religion
 4 which teaches us not to look backward once the course is decided upon;
 5 philosophically, because it treats life and death indifferently. . . . The military
 6 mind, being . . . comparatively simple and not at all addicted to philoso-
 7 phizing, finds a congenial spirit in Zen.”³ But is this a proper representation
 8 of Zen? Is this really the end-result of such a prominent strand of Buddhist
 9 tradition—that it is indifferent to pain, suffering, warfare, and genocide?

10 In the late 1980s, two Japanese Buddhist scholars—Hakamaya Noriaki
 11 and Matsumoto Shirō⁴—began to make their voices heard against this
 12 particular understanding of Buddhism and Buddhist ethics. Calling their
 13 movement Critical Buddhism (Jpn. *hiban bukkō* 批判仏教), they proceeded
 14 to attack—in a forthright and highly polemical manner virtually unheard of
 15 in modern Japanese scholarship—prominent Japanese philosophical figures
 16 such as Suzuki, Nishida Kitarō (1870–1945), and Nishitani Keiji (1900–1990)
 17 of the Kyoto School, specific Buddhist doctrines such as “Buddha-nature”
 18 (Jpn. *bushō* 仏性) and “original enlightenment” (Jpn. *hongaku* 本覚), and
 19 even entire sects of Buddhism, including the one to which they themselves
 20 belonged—Sōtō Zen.⁵

21 In this chapter, after a brief examination of the central arguments of
 22 Matsumoto and Hakamaya, I provide a genealogy for Critical Buddhism by
 23 looking at two progressive Buddhist movements in early-twentieth-century
 24 Japan: the New Buddhist Fellowship (1899–1916) and the Youth League
 25 for Revitalizing Buddhism (1931–36). I argue that these three waves of
 26 Critical Buddhism focus on distinct aspects of the “failings” of Buddhism
 27 in the context of modernity. Though disparate in tone, emphasis, and
 28 effects, taken together these three movements can be instructive in thinking
 29 through the problems and possibilities of Buddhist ethics and politics in
 30 the contemporary global context.

31

32

33

34

The Case against Zen

35 As if in agreement with Suzuki, in an essay entitled “The Meaning of Zen,”
 36 Matsumoto writes: “The essence of Zen thought is the denial of conceptual
 37 thinking, or, perhaps better, the cessation of conceptual thinking.” He goes
 38 on to add, however: “It is clear that any ‘Zen thought’ that teaches the
 39 ‘cessation of thinking’ is anti-Buddhist.”⁶ Thus, while Matsumoto does not
 40

deny the accuracy of Suzuki's portrayal of Zen, he argues that Zen, as it has developed (or "degenerated") over eight centuries in Japan, has become profoundly "anti-Buddhist." As such, the so-called Imperial Way Zen (Jpn. *kōdō zen* 皇道禅) that flourished in the first half of the twentieth century and supported Japanese militarism was less an *aberration* than the inevitable *culmination* of Zen ethics—or, we might, say, lack of such.

Here, Hakamaya and Matsumoto, having been trained in the Zen tradition, may be faulted for assuming, like Suzuki, that Zen somehow "completes" Buddhism. Although they seek to undercut the Chan/Zen line at its roots, there remains in their work an assumption that, at its best—i.e., as expressed in the writings of thirteenth-century Sōtō master Dōgen (1200–1253)—"Zen is the integrating storehouse of Buddha-dharma."⁷ And yet, while Zen clearly faces the brunt of Critical Buddhist attacks, it is not simply Zen that is being called into question, but Buddhism as it has been practiced (in India, South and West Asia, China, and Japan) for several thousand years. Perhaps the best way to understand this is to say that for Critical Buddhists, Zen represents an extreme of a tendency or set of characteristics that has existed in many forms of Buddhism from the classical Indian period up until today. In other words, they argue that Chan/Zen manifests both the best and worst possibilities of Buddhism—it is a storehouse, we might say, for Buddhist extremes.

According to Paul Swanson the Critical Buddhist analysis of Zen works on three distinct levels, as follows: (1) a *Buddhological* critique, which looks into the historical use—and abuse—of specific Buddhist doctrines such as Buddha-nature and *pratitya-samutpāda* or dependent origination; (2) a *sectarian* critique, which argues that modern and contemporary Sōtō Zen has misunderstood the teachings of the sect founder and philosopher Dōgen (1200–1253)—particularly with respect, once again, to the teaching of Buddha-nature; (3) a *social critique*, where an argument is made to the effect that both of the above have led to objectionable social structures and attitudes among Zen Buddhists—culminating in wartime apathy or collaboration with Japanese nationalism and imperialism, as best exemplified in statements like Suzuki's.⁸

What is this "true" Buddhism against which modern Zen fails to measure up? What criteria for "truth" do the Critical Buddhists employ to make their normative claims? Hakamaya provides the most straightforward answer in his declaration that "Buddhism is criticism . . . [and] only that which is critical is Buddhism,"⁹ which of course begs the question: What is *criticism*? For Hakamaya, criticism implies the ability to make distinctions,

1 to be, in a literal sense, “discriminating,” which in turn entails a reliance on
 2 reason, analysis, and clear language. He argues, in a fashion familiar to the
 3 rhetoric (if not always the reality) of the European Enlightenment and mod-
 4 ern liberalism, that it is *only* critical thinking in this sense that can combat
 5 socioethical or political discrimination. Another way to put this is that the
 6 central problem with Zen (and other forms of Buddhism) is the tendency
 7 toward a metaphysics and soteriology that prizes “holism” and “harmony”
 8 and thereby neglects the pragmatic, ethical—and even political—spirit that,
 9 according to the Critical Buddhists, is the core of Buddhism.

10 In extrapolating this thesis, Hakamaya employs an opposition with a
 11 three-hundred-year legacy in Western thought, between what he calls the
 12 *criticalism* of Enlightenment thinker René Descartes (1596–1650) and the
 13 *topicalism* of Neapolitan jurist and philosopher Giambattista Vico (1668–
 14 1744). As odd as it may sound, especially to Western philosophers who
 15 have battled the ghost of Descartes for more than a century, this paradigm
 16 French rationalist serves as the standard bearer for the Critical Buddhist
 17 Reformation.¹⁰ Vico, often called the father of historicism and a forefather
 18 of Romanticism, pointed out the ways in which Cartesian rationalism, and
 19 the critical method in particular, debilitated human thinking by obscuring
 20 the significance of the imagination and nonrational modes of experience.¹¹
 21 Vico posited an alternative to the Cartesian method rooted in the Latin term
 22 *topica* (place, field, locus; from Greek *topos*), connoting a sense of intuition
 23 and holism. For Critical Buddhists, however, this approach to meaning and
 24 truth—whether in philosophical or religious guise—amounts to “an aesthetic
 25 mysticism unconcerned with critical differentiation between truth and falsity
 26 and not in need of rational demonstration.”¹² Moreover, while they do not
 27 claim that Vico’s work had any direct effect, the Italian jurist’s turn away
 28 from Cartesian criticism gives expression to a mode that, Hakamaya and
 29 Matsumoto assert, has also come to infect the Mahāyāna Buddhist tradition
 30 as a whole and its Japanese offshoots (such as Zen) in particular.¹³

31 Elsewhere, Hakamaya suggests that in addition to a commitment to clear
 32 language and (discriminating, critical) reason, true Buddhism is rooted in an
 33 understanding and acceptance of the law of causation or dependent origina-
 34 tion (San. *pratītya-samutpāda*), which, at least according to some Mahāyāna
 35 thinkers, entails an understanding of the “emptiness” (San. *śūnyāta*) of all
 36 phenomena.¹⁴ Adherence to the doctrine of dependent origination counters
 37 the latterly derived—and, in their eyes, woefully misguided—doctrines of
 38 “Buddha nature” and “original enlightenment.” According to the Critical
 39 Buddhists, a deep and unrelenting commitment to dependent origination
 40

pushes the practitioner away from the “selfish” enlightenment experience and toward the Other, as a manifestation of *mahākaruṇa* or Great Compassion lauded by classical Mahāyāna texts but lost in the topicalist turn taken by later derivatives such as Chan/Zen.

As such, the Critical Buddhists were not simply importing Western rationalism as the new way of understanding Buddhism or being Buddhist. Rather, they claim that their assault on topicalism is one that would have the support of the Buddha himself.¹⁵ Indeed, they go so far as to suggest that Buddhism began as a revolt against topicalism in Indian thinking, and has ever since had to perform rearguard action against topical encroachments both within and outside the tradition, with varied success. Certainly, there has been a long tradition of criticism within Chinese and Japanese Buddhism. Whenever a new sect arose in China and Japan, the practice of *kyōsō-hanjaku* 競争半弱—the judgement and interpretation of the various facets of Buddhist teachings—was applied. According to Masao Abe, this practice was highly beneficial to Buddhist development, as it allowed for the application of new evaluative standards to various sutras and interpretations of texts and traditions.¹⁶

To summarize, the Critical Buddhist argument rests on a distinction between what they call “topicalism”—an understanding and experience of religion that stresses harmony, totality, and nondiscrimination—and “criticalism” founded upon certain key Buddhist tenets such as dependent origination and “discriminating wisdom” (San. *dharmā-pravicaya*), but also correlative to the practice of critical rationality exemplified by modern Western thinkers like René Descartes. While criticism—understood primarily in terms of discriminating knowledge—is the foundation of a truly Dharmic mode of being in the world, it is important to note that the goal of Critical Buddhism is very much in line with the traditional understanding of *awakening*: that is to say, “the realization of ‘wisdom’ (San. *bodhi*) for the practice of ‘great compassion’ (San. *mahākaruṇa*).”¹⁷

From Doctrine to Society

As we have seen, according to the Critical Buddhists, the Mahāyāna Buddhist tradition as a whole, and Zen Buddhism in particular, has, by and large, denied the possibility of talking about truth: “The denigration of language and rational thought implicit in much of the Buddhist tradition has led to an erasure of the critical discrimination of truth that is the heart of Buddhist

1 realization and of social justice.”¹⁸ One important issue at stake in this last
 2 assertion is the precise relationship between these two things: “Buddhist
 3 realization” and “social justice.” Are they coextensive? If they are not, what
 4 exactly is the relation between Buddhist “truth” and “ethics” and “justice?”
 5 Here we are led back, once again, to the case of *Zen at War*—as well as to
 6 even earlier attempts within Japanese Buddhism to confront the failures of
 7 Buddhist ideas and institutions in the face of social problems, particularly
 8 those associated with modernity.

9 After publishing a monograph on Critical Buddhism in 2011, I
 10 became interested in finding a pedigree, as it were, for Critical Buddhism.¹⁹
 11 According to Hakamaya and Matsumoto, their precedents were solitary
 12 heroes such as Dōgen, whose work manifested a kind of radical humanism
 13 that was quickly lost on his followers (and thus to the Sōtō Zen sect). I
 14 discovered, however, that Japan had much more recently experienced several
 15 waves of what might be called “critical” Buddhism, some of which were,
 16 in fact, more radical, at least politically, than anything proposed by the
 17 Critical Buddhists. This research became the basis of my 2017 publication
 18 *Against Harmony: Progressive and Radical Buddhism in Modern Japan*.²⁰ In
 19 the following sections, I discuss two movements, in particular, that provide
 20 a different analysis of and approach to Buddhist criticism, one that begins
 21 with ethics and society and ends with economics and politics.

24 The New Buddhist Fellowship

26 The New Buddhist Fellowship (Jpn. Shin Bukkyō Dōshikai 新仏教同志会)
 27 which lasted from 1899 to 1915, was an attempt by several dozen young
 28 Japanese lay Buddhists to reform or reinvent Buddhism as a trans-sectar-
 29 ian, noninstitutional, and, perhaps most interestingly, *secular* (in the sense
 30 of this-worldly and even “materialistic”) set of ideas and practices relevant
 31 to the just-dawning twentieth century. In July 1900, a journal called *New*
 32 *Buddhism* (Jpn. *Shin Bukkyō* 新仏教) was launched as the new movement’s
 33 mouthpiece. The first edition of the first volume begins with the group’s
 34 “manifesto” (Jpn. *senzen* 宣言; lit. declaration). By turns inflammatory, sen-
 35 timental, and self-consciously poetic, this short piece opens with an apoca-
 36 lyptic call to arms: “Humanity,” it begins, “is in a state of decline. Society
 37 has been corrupted to its roots, and the rushing water of a great springtide
 38 threatens to drown us all, as at the time of the Great Flood. Moreover,
 39 religions, which are supposed to give light to darkness and provide solace,
 40

have been losing strength year by year.” This is immediately followed by a blistering attack on “old Buddhism” (Jpn. *kyū bukkyō* 旧仏教) as being little more than a rotting corpse, its adherents weeping “tears of joy” over their palatial buildings and fine brocades:

These people [i.e., “old Buddhists”] know how to worship wooden statues and sutras, how to stand before monks at a temple, and how to listen to the sermons. Earnestly holding to the embedded prejudices of their respective sect, they are mutually well versed in worthless matters. They can skillfully mouth the chants, and know how to take the prayer beads and sutras in their hands. Have they not already abandoned the life of faith? If these things make up what is called “Buddhism,” then it is an “old Buddhism” that is on the verge of death.²¹

Here, as elsewhere, the New Buddhists borrow from the discourse of Buddhist decadence (Jpn. *daraku bukkyō* 墮落仏教) that first arose with Neo-Confucians of the Edo period (1603–1868) and was adopted by a number of secularists and Shinto nativists in the early years of the Meiji (1868–1912), before being internalized by late-nineteenth-century Buddhist modernists who sought, in different ways, to “cleanse” Japanese Buddhism of its historical accretions, superstitions, and corruptions.²² That is to say, this line of argument was hardly new with the NBF. And yet, the New Buddhists occasionally pushed the envelope farther, beyond the rather straightforward (“Protestant”) critique of Buddhist ritualism, monastic corruption, and materialist hypocrisy.

At the end of the manifesto we find the New Buddhist Fellowship’s “Statement of General Principles” (Jpn. *kōryō* 綱領), summarized in the following six points:

1. We regard a sound Buddhist faith (Jpn. *kenzen naru shinkō* 健全なる信仰) as our fundamental principle.
2. We will endeavor to foster sound faith, knowledge, and moral principles in order to bring about fundamental improvements to society.
3. We advocate the free investigation of Buddhism in addition to other religions.

- 1 4. We resolve to destroy superstition.
- 2
- 3 5. We do not accept the necessity of preserving traditional
- 4 religious institutions and rituals.
- 5 6. We believe the government should refrain from favoring
- 6 religious groups or interfering in religious matters.²³
- 7

8 As the final point above shows, and as noted above, unlike some other
 9 reformers of the day, the New Buddhists were not looking for govern-
 10 ment support of Buddhism—in fact, they were highly critical of *any* state
 11 involvement in religious matters.²⁴ This was largely based on their analysis
 12 of Buddhism during the late Edo (1603–1868) and early Meiji (1868–1912)
 13 periods, which, in their estimation, had become corrupted by state support.

14 As evidence of the changing interpretations given to Buddhist reform
 15 in the Meiji period, we might compare the above NBF list of principles with
 16 that of the Association of Buddhist Sects (Jpn. Shoshū Dōtoku Kaimei 諸
 17 宗同徳会盟; hereafter ABS), a pan-sectarian organization founded in a very
 18 different context more than three decades earlier, in the first year of the
 19 Meiji period (1868). In that year the ABS pledged to advocate for:

- 20
- 21 1. The indivisibility of Imperial and Buddhist Law.
- 22 2. The study and refutation of Christianity.
- 23
- 24 3. The cooperation between and perfection of the three Japanese
- 25 faiths: Shinto, Confucianism, and Buddhism.
- 26 4. The study by each sect of its own doctrines and texts.
- 27 5. The expurgation of evil habits.
- 28 6. The establishment of a new type of school to produce men
- 29 of ability.
- 30 7. The discovery of new ways to use exceptionally qualified
- 31 priests.
- 32 8. The encouragement of popular education.²⁵
- 33
- 34
- 35

36 The differences between these two lists could hardly be starker. Whereas the
 37 ABS looked to bring together the modern (imperial) state and Buddhist
 38 law, based on the traditional notion of “royal law [together with] Buddha
 39 dharma” (Jpn. *ōbō buppō* 王法仏法), the NBF sought to establish separate
 40

spheres; where the ABS looked to defeat Christianity, the NBF, while not particularly sympathetic to orthodox Christianity, was in open collaboration with Unitarian thinkers of the day, as well as some Christian socialists; while the ABS sought to unify and harmonize the “three Japanese faiths,” the NBF was, if anything, hostile to “syncretism” with traditional religions, which were deemed superstitious and ritually obsessed; where the ABS advocated sectarian study, the NBF was explicitly non or trans-sectarian; where the ABS sought to find ways to “use” priests for the state, the NBF rejected the priestly and monastic traditions, at least as conventionally conceived and practiced. The only possible points of contact lie in the shared emphasis of the two groups on education for society and the expurgation of “evil habits”—though even here the “liberal” NBF would disagree with the ABS as to what, exactly constitutes both a productive education and good moral training. In the following section, I examine some of the doctrinal and philosophical roots for these discrepancies, beginning with the idea of *pantheism* (Jpn. *hanshinron* 汎神論).

According to co-founder Sakaino Kōyō (1871–1933), the NBF fully embraced the “new” aspect of New Buddhism, even as they rejected the charge that the movement is simply a form of Buddhist “liberalism.”²⁶ While New Buddhism is based on a return to foundational Buddhist principles, he argues, such a return will inevitably involve a certain measure of “reform” (Jpn. *kairyō* 改良). As such, he suggests, New Buddhists see no problem in calling their movement “new”—as opposed to “true” or “real.”²⁷ But what, Sakaino goes on to ask, is it that lies at the foundation of this “new” Buddhism? His answer, rather surprisingly, is “pantheism.”²⁸ “We New Buddhists wish to establish Buddhism on the basis of a pantheistic world view. A pantheistic perspective shall be the foundation of Buddhism. Upon this foundation, the Buddhism of the future can be continuously improved and purified. This is what we are calling New Buddhism.”²⁹ For Sakaino, pantheism provides a “this-worldly” and secure foundation for a holistic and inclusive perspective when it comes to the objects or focus of belief.³⁰ As he puts it: “Standing on a pantheistic foundation, we New Buddhists are a religious organization that seeks freedom of belief.”³¹ Indeed, we might conclude from these remarks that “pantheism” for Sakaino and the New Buddhists is less an ontological or metaphysical claim than it is a methodological and ethical stance: “We did not arrive at our pantheism by simply jumping on the fast lane to philosophical theory. We believe that pantheism harmonizes nicely with ethics, as well as the latest theories of moral philosophy.”³² And yet, it bears noting that even while aligning their

1 pantheism with modern science and ethics, the New Buddhists were unwilling
 2 to fully accept the “pantheistic materialism” (Jpn. *yuibutsuteki hanshinron* 唯
 3 物的汎神論) suggested by well-known socialist and occasional *Shin Bukkyō*
 4 contributor, Sakai Toshihiko (1871–1933).³³ In response to Sakai’s charge
 5 of their inconsistency and vagueness on this issue—that is, their refusal to
 6 extend their pantheism further toward a more rigorous philosophical mate-
 7 rialism—the NBF writers counter that they are merely looking for appro-
 8 priate ways, in line with twentieth-century scientific thinking, “to express
 9 the mysterious workings of matter and mind.”³⁴ This desire to explain the
 10 mysterious connection of matter and spirit is one that was picked up later
 11 by New Buddhist Takashima Beihō (1875–1949).³⁵

12 In addition to pantheism, “faith” (Jpn. *shinkō* 信仰) was another matter
 13 of great concern for the New Buddhists.³⁶ Despite their acknowledgment
 14 of significant differences between Buddhism and the monotheisms of the
 15 West, the New Buddhists followed the scholarly consensus of the day in
 16 affirming that “faith” or “belief” must be the foundation of *any* religion. As
 17 we have seen, the very first and arguably most significant of their six General
 18 Principles states: “We regard a *sound Buddhist faith* as our foundational prin-
 19 ciple.” Thus, it is no surprise to see a number of essays in the pages of *New*
 20 *Buddhism* (*Shin Bukkyō*) dedicated to this general theme. A good example
 21 is the third article in the inaugural issue of *Shin Bukkyō*, entitled “Time
 22 for a Change of Faith” (Jpn. “*Shinkō itten no ki*” 信仰一転の期), authored
 23 by Katō Genchi (1873–1965), who would go on to become professor of
 24 religion and Shintō studies at Tokyo Imperial University. Here, following
 25 on the heels of earlier Buddhist modernists, Katō begins by denouncing the
 26 “worldliness” and “degeneration” of the Buddhist monks and temples of his
 27 day, but then goes on to argue, against expectations, that “faith” is a prod-
 28 uct of religious and social evolution.³⁷ Thus, while the New Buddhists are
 29 adamant that “faith” must remain the foundation for New Buddhism, they
 30 are not necessarily calling for a return to the “stabilities” of traditional belief.

31
 32 While the root and foundation of religion is of certainty faith,
 33 the contents of this faith will depend on the particular period
 34 and circumstances. Thus, over time, religions have no choice but
 35 to gradually develop and evolve. Therefore it is clear that there
 36 will be differences between the faith that was necessary for the
 37 establishment of Buddhism as a religion during the ancient period
 38 of Śākyamuni, that of the period of Shinran and Nichiren, and
 39 that of our own (Meiji) times. . . . As such, when we see people
 40

trying to bring back the old faith of Śākyamuni, Shinran, or
 Nichiren today in the Meiji period, all we can do is laugh at
 such a stupid and worthless idea.³⁸

As Katō goes on to explain, while the contents of faith today cannot be
 fully specified, it is also not true that “anything goes.” Any faith suitable
 to the modern period must pass the test of reason and “natural, experien-
 tial knowledge.” Thus, “reliance on supernatural beings” is ruled out, as is
 anything that cannot be verified on the basis of information gleaned from
 our “ordinary, daily experience.”³⁹ Moreover, Katō insists that faith must be
 directly applicable to “practice” or “projects” (Jpn. *katsudō* 活動 or *jigyō* 事
 業), thus moving toward the Marxist concept of *praxis*—or, at least away
 from what we might call a “Protestant” separation between faith and works.

Sakaino clarifies his thinking on the question of “sound faith” in a
 special issue dedicated to elaborating the founding principles of the NBF
 published in May 1901. Here Sakaino argues that faith is not *solely* rooted
 in emotion; if it were, he argues, there would be no way of distinguishing
 “blind faith” (Jpn. *mōshin* 盲信) from “correct faith” (Jpn. *shōshin* 正信).
 While faith must surely have a foundation in “refined emotions” (Jpn. *kōshō*
no kanjō 交渉の感情), it must also be supported by “clear reason” (Jpn.
meiryō naru risei 明瞭なる理性).⁴⁰ At this point, Sakaino goes on to make
 the following, rather extraordinary claim: “‘To believe in Buddhism’ does
 not mean to blindly obey what is written in Buddhist scriptures. The true
 essence of Buddhism must be pursued through free investigation. However,
 New Buddhism does not explain what the essence of Buddhism is. Because
 we value the free employment of reason, we are unwilling to restrict a person’s
 faith.”⁴¹ Here “faith” seems to act as an umbrella term denoting a sincere
 and enthusiastic commitment to the rational, ethical, and social aspects of
 New Buddhism; that is, a combination of practical wisdom, personal moral
 cultivation, and social reform. On one level, especially when contrasted
 to its perceived lack within “old Buddhism,” New Buddhist faith means
 “sincerity.” Elsewhere, however, it becomes clear that for Sakaino and other
 New Buddhists, “faith” includes a commitment to fundamental Buddhist
 ethical principles regarding the elimination of suffering.⁴² A closer examina-
 tion of New Buddhist “sound faith” reveals that it comprises the following
 elements: (1) knowledge; (2) respect for emotions, including poetic feelings;
 (3) a focus on this world; that is, setting aside transcendence and concerns
 about the afterlife; (4) pro-active engagement; (5) ethics; and (6) a positive
 or optimistic outlook.⁴³ It is, in short, the name for a particular, Buddhist,

1 *style* of living; a commitment to fully investing in the *practice* of living a
2 flourishing life according to generic Buddhist principles.

3 Finally, as I have indicated, a characteristic feature of the work of
4 the New Buddhists is an unabashed, at times almost Nietzschean, affirma-
5 tion of “this world” (Jpn. *genseshugi* or *genseishugi* 現世主義). While the
6 modernistic emphasis on free inquiry and a rational, ethical, and scientific
7 outlook were also in evidence among the figures representing the earlier
8 Japanese Buddhist Enlightenment, such as Nakanishi Ushirō (1859–1930),
9 the New Buddhists—at least some of them—took things much farther in
10 this direction, to the point where it could be legitimately asked what was
11 left of “religion” (or “Buddhism”) as normally understood. For instance,
12 Nakanishi had contrasted the “materialism” of the “old” Buddhism with
13 the “spiritualism” of the new, and, in similar fashion, the “scholarship” of
14 traditional monastic Buddhism with the “faith” orientation of the new, lay
15 Buddhism. In contrast, the New Buddhists to some extent reverse these
16 positions, so that it is the “old” Buddhism that focuses on “spiritual” matters,
17 while New Buddhism is content with addressing “real,” “practical” issues of
18 this life: poverty, hunger, and so on.⁴⁴

19 Finally, although they began their movement as self-identified “puritans,”
20 some NBF members were hesitant to push this idea too far, lest it begin
21 to sound overly severe or pessimistic. Here, again, their “puritanism” was
22 of a different sort than the “passive” and “world-denying” asceticism (Jpn.
23 *kin'yokushugi* 禁欲主義) of the monks and priests. Rather, it denoted a sincere,
24 focused and “pro-active engagement” with the world (Jpn. *sekkyokuteki na*
25 *katsudō* 積極的な活動), one that was also not averse to seeking “pleasure”
26 (Jpn. *tanoshimi mo motomu* 楽しみも求む).⁴⁵ This creates a fascinating tension
27 played out in the pages of *New Buddhism*, between, on the one hand, a
28 renunciative impulse inherited not only from classical Buddhist monasticism
29 but also from nineteenth-century liberal Protestantism and, on the other,
30 an optimistic and this-worldly outlook emerging from Unitarianism, New
31 Thought, Transcendentalism, Nietzsche, and nineteenth-century progressivism.

32 Despite the fact that they might not have resolved the various prob-
33 lems associated with collapsing conventional distinctions—e.g., between
34 the “secular” and the “religious,” and between religion, philosophy, ethics,
35 politics, and society—I believe the New Buddhists should be given credit for
36 putting these categories into question, especially given the tendency among
37 Buddhists past and present to disassociate “awakening” from sociopolitical
38 or “material” concerns. Although the NBF formally disbanded in 1916,
39
40

their interest in promoting “social Buddhism” was picked up by others in the following decades, as we will see below.

The Youth League for Revitalizing Buddhism

On a rainy afternoon on the fifth day of April 1931, some fifteen years after the demise of the New Buddhist Fellowship, an extraordinary meeting was taking place in a small room on the third floor of the Young Men’s Buddhist Association dormitory at Tokyo Imperial University. With some thirty lay Buddhists in attendance, most in their twenties and early thirties, along with four watchful uniformed police officers, Seno’o Girō (1889–1961) inaugurated the Youth League for Revitalizing Buddhism (Jpn. *Shinkō Bukkyō Seinen Dōmei* 新興仏教青年同盟), an experiment in Buddhist social activism that set itself up as a vanguard of socialist protest against poverty, injustice, colonialism and imperialism.

The following are a few highlights from the League’s inaugural proclamation, read that afternoon:

The modern era is one of suffering. Brothers who want to share fellowship are engaged in conflict beyond their control, while the general public is forced to beg for scraps of bread. Whether you run or you fight, the present age is one of chaos and distress. In such an age, what do Buddhists see, and what contributions are they making? Drunk with their own peace of mind, the majority of Buddhists do not see a problem. . . . They say: “Religion is above this; religion values harmony.” And yet, the fact is that religion is playing the role of an opiate, imposed upon the people. Unless the righteous indignation of young Buddhists is aroused, nothing will be done about this. The present condition is not one that those of pure heart can endure. . . .

As for us, we cannot help but firmly call for a revitalized Buddhism. . . . Recognizing that most of the current suffering has its origins in the capitalist economic system, a revitalized Buddhism pledges to collaborate with the people to make fundamental reforms in the interest of social welfare. It is a Buddhism for the people—whose aim is to revolutionize the bourgeois Buddhism of the present. . . . While adhering to

1 necessary logic, the Buddhism in which we believe reveres the
 2 Buddha, who in his practice confirmed the principles of love,
 3 equality, and freedom. . . .

4 Young Buddhists! Now is the time for us to rise up! Let's
 5 throw all conventions aside at once and return to the Buddha.
 6 And, beginning with our own personal experience of the Buddhist
 7 spirit of love and equality, let's boldly turn to a restructuring of
 8 the capitalist system. Let's make every effort to construct our
 9 ideal Buddhist society!⁴⁶

10

11 With its relative openness, the Taishō period (1912–1925) had witnessed
 12 a blossoming of Marxism and left-wing activism in Japan—in philosophical,
 13 political, and literary forms. Within this broader wave, the movement most
 14 closely connected to Buddhism was the *Muga-ai* 無我愛 or “Selfless Love”
 15 society, founded by former Shin Buddhist priest Itō Shōshin (1876–1963).
 16 Its mission was to promote and engage in compassionate action toward
 17 the poor and oppressed. Another figure associated with this movement
 18 was economist and writer Kawakami Hajime (1879–1946), author of the
 19 socialist classic *Bimbō monogatari* 貧乏物語 (*Tales of Poverty*, 1916). Despite
 20 these Taishō developments, by the early Shōwa period (1926–1989) tides
 21 had begun to turn decisively against progressive politics, religious or other-
 22 wise. By the late 1920s, Buddhist “factory evangelists” began to parrot the
 23 nationalist and imperialist mottos about strength, harmony and unity, while
 24 denouncing “socialist agitators.”⁴⁷

25

26 It was in this context that Seno'o Girō established the Youth League for
 27 Revitalizing Buddhism, based on the simple but disarming premise that the
 28 capitalist system (and, by extension, the imperialist state) generates suffering
 29 and, as a result, violates the spirit of Buddhism. As with the New Buddhists
 30 of the late Meiji period, Seno'o and the Youth League were fighting a war on
 31 two fronts: against conservative, co-opted Buddhist institutions and so-called
 32 Imperial Way Buddhism, on the one hand, and against secular anti-Buddhist
 33 and antireligious forces on the other. This would require a delicate balance
 34 of apologetics and criticism. The League's Manifesto presents the following
 35 three foundational principles:

36

- 37 1. We resolve to realize the implementation of a Buddha Land
 38 in this world, based on the highest character of humanity
 39 as revealed in the teachings of Sākyamuni Buddha and in
 40 accordance with the principle of brotherly love.

2. We accept that all existing sects, having profaned the Buddhist spirit, exist as mere corpses. We reject these forms, and pledge to enhance Buddhism in the spirit of the new age.
3. We acknowledge that the present capitalist economic system is in contradiction with the spirit of Buddhism and inhibits the social welfare of the general public. We resolve to reform this system in order to implement a more natural society.⁴⁸

Seno'o's Youth League interpreted Buddhism as an atheistic, humanistic and ethical tradition. In this they followed a number of their Buddhist Enlightenment and New Buddhist forebears. Yet while the rejection of preceding and existent forms of Buddhism is also reminiscent of these earlier movements, the language regarding the problems of the capitalist system—and the more explicit emphasis on social justice and material well-being—is new. According to Seno'o, the League was established for three principle reasons, which are largely reflected in the three governing principles mentioned above: (1) to overhaul or replace the decadent Buddhist institutions of the day with a form of Buddhism more suited to the modern age; (2) to put an end to the ugly conflict between Buddhist sects; and (3) to engage in a reconstruction of the capitalist economic system—which, again, is in contradiction to the Buddhist spirit.

Throughout his various writings, Seno'o insists on a proper understanding of the causes and conditions of poverty. Since, he believed, these causes and conditions are both material *and* "spiritual" (or perhaps, emotional/psychic), then naturally the solution to poverty must also, against the secular Marxists, include aspects of the nonmaterial realm.⁴⁹ It is worth noting here Seno'o and the League's understanding of Buddhism as being *both* a "religion" (i.e., dealing with nonmaterial issues) *and* "atheistic" (i.e., not relying on belief in God or gods). In point of fact, Seno's atheism is not far removed from the NBF understanding of pantheism; both movements assert that a strict or reductive materialism misses much of importance, while simultaneously noting the "danger" of relying on faith in unseen forces.⁵⁰ Thus, both the NBF and Seno'o's Youth League were committed to a "secular" but also "humanistic" form of Buddhism.

Also like the New Buddhists before him, Seno'o strongly denounces the Buddhist establishment for utilizing Buddhist doctrines such as *karma* and the wheel of rebirth as explanations—and *ex post facto* justifications—for social inequalities.⁵¹ Along similar lines, he criticizes the oft-employed Buddhist

1 expression of “differentiation is equality” (Jpn. *sabetsu soku byōdō* 差別即平
 2 等) as a vague concept that cannot and should not be applied to the social
 3 realm.⁵² In addition, Seno’o rejected the metaphysics of harmony—what
 4 Critical Buddhists would later call “topicalism”—as a construct that perpetu-
 5 ates the status quo and thus the suffering entailed by social, economic, and
 6 political structures. It is perhaps more accurate to say that Seno’o came to
 7 see *harmony* and the overarching vision of totality presented in Mahāyāna
 8 thought and works such as the *Lotus Sutra* as a goal to be reached through
 9 historical transformation, including economic and political reforms, rather
 10 than as a given state of things that must simply be recognized and accepted.
 11 In similar fashion, suffering was for Seno’o an existential condition to be
 12 analyzed and eliminated, rather than—as within some East Asian Buddhist
 13 traditions—an illusory concept to be transcended via the dialectics of emp-
 14 tiness or a deeper, meditative realization of Buddha-nature.

15 In addition to its journal entitled *Under the Banner of Revitalized*
 16 *Buddhism*, the Youth League held an annual national conference, “Revitalized
 17 Buddhist Youth,” where various positions were proclaimed and debated.
 18 For example, at the third conference, held in 1933, the League asserted its
 19 opposition to nationalism, militarism, warfare, and the annexation of Man-
 20 churia; the fourth conference (1934) stated their commitment to building
 21 a “cooperative society,” promoting internationalism, and bringing about a
 22 mutually productive unification of all Buddhist sects; while the fifth conference
 23 (1935) announced the League’s intent to restructure the capitalist system,
 24 vigorously challenge “reactionary religious sects,” and encourage each and
 25 every individual to pursue a state of perfection.⁵³ Most if not all of these
 26 positions were in conflict with the trends and the views of the political elite
 27 of the times. In fact, they would seem to be framed in a way as to draw
 28 attention to the movement.

29 In April 1935, at the invitation of Katō Kanjū (1892–1978) and
 30 Takano Minoru (1901–1974), leaders of the National Council of Trade
 31 Unions, Seno’o took up a position as editor of the *Journal of Manual Labor*
 32 (Jpn. *Rōdō zasshi* 労働雑誌). In 1936, he participated in Katō’s Convention
 33 of Proletarian Workers—later known as the Proletarian Party of Japan (Jpn.
 34 *Nihon Musantō* 日本無産等). He also stood as that party’s candidate in
 35 the Tokyo municipal elections; although the party campaigned under the
 36 banner of “an anti-fascist and anti-bureaucratic popular front,” Seno’o lost
 37 the election.

38 During this same period, the government began to increase its pressure
 39 against left-wing groups and liberal writers. By 1936 membership in the
 40

Youth League had reached nearly three thousand, and although this made it an object of concern for the government, it was Seno'o's active involvement with the broader left-wing popular front that would lead to his eventual arrest. Under the auspices of the Peace Preservation Act of 1925, Seno'o was arrested on December 7, 1936, and charged with treason, when hundreds of members of all these organizations were rounded up, including Proletarian Party Chairman Katō Kanjū. After five months of relentless interrogation, Seno'o would confess his "crimes" and pledge his loyalty to the emperor in 1937. Sentenced to five years in prison, he was released due to ill health in 1942. After the war, he resumed his work for peace and social justice, though in a much quieter vein.

As with the New Buddhist Fellowship, it is important to examine Seno'o and the Youth League's work in relation to the broader traditions of Buddhist doctrinal interpretation, the Japanese historical tradition of reform and social criticism, and post-1868 movements in Buddhist and Japanese thought (including the Kyoto School, Critical Buddhism, and Engaged Buddhism). Only then can we see the lingering tensions within Buddhist ethics perhaps from the tradition's origins: between the "materialist" desire to create a more just society and the "spiritual" quest for personal liberation. For Seno'o Girō, this tension was acutely felt and a central thread in his biography:

For us, religion is life itself. Society is our concern. That is to say, society is what we are made of. Politics, economics, education, the military as well as the arts and so on, are all subsumed under religion. All aspects of social life must be subject to critique and reform in light of the spirit of the Buddha. Thus aspiring to change society, to know ourselves, to sincerely repent and to simultaneously repay with gratitude the grace [Jpn. *on* 恩] we have received—all these are part of the life of faith. At that level, there is no difference between the movement to better society conducted in faith and the same call to action from those believers in historical materialism, whether socialist or communist.⁵⁴

Conclusion

As with the New Buddhist Fellowship, Seno'o and his fellow Youth League Buddhists saw social activism—and even, in the latter case, economic and

1 political revolution—as inseparable from “spiritual” activity. While this
 2 allowed them to engage wholeheartedly in “secular” activities in a way that
 3 would have been impossible for monks and priests, it also meant that they
 4 had difficulty justifying or explaining why they held onto “Buddhism” at all.
 5 Their work was decidedly *not* framed, as John Nelson puts it in speaking
 6 of early Japanese precedents for socially active Buddhism, by “a discourse of
 7 salvation”—unless salvation is understood in terms of “this-worldly” release.
 8 Along these lines, Seno’o certainly, and perhaps the New Buddhists too, would
 9 likely not have understood the distinction made by Raoul Birnbaum in his
 10 2009 critique of Engaged Buddhism. Birnbaum argues: “A bodhisattva vow
 11 to confront the suffering of others must be coupled with an intention to
 12 lead sentient beings to liberation and awakening.”⁵⁵ For Seno’o, it is *not* the
 13 case that social and political activism is a *means* of leading sentient beings to
 14 awakening, but rather—echoing Marx’s famous remarks on the interdepen-
 15 dence of consciousness and material conditions, but also Zen master Dōgen
 16 on the unity of theory and practice—the process of liberating the oppressed
 17 from suffering is *nothing other than Buddhist awakening*. In other words,
 18 from this radical Buddhist perspective, awakening of consciousness (and
 19 subsequent liberation from suffering) is a process that emerges from direct
 20 engagement with social, economic, and political (structural) transformation.
 21 Here we see an extension of the Buddhist logic of interdependence—and
 22 dependent origination—to enclose the social, political, and economic spheres.

23 In his 2013 monograph on recent movements within Japanese Bud-
 24 dhism, Nelson argues that whereas *conventional* Buddhism involves following
 25 “well-worn routes emphasizing religious faith and belief, sacred images and
 26 icons, the Buddhist precepts or dharma, foundational scriptures, and so
 27 forth,” *experimental* Buddhism is a “differently focused endeavor to *domes-*
 28 *ticate* an understanding of Buddhism so that it responds to and privileges
 29 the patterns, preferences, and concerns of a person’s life.”⁵⁶ While the latter
 30 certainly strikes us as a more “modern” way of practicing religion, the notion
 31 of domesticating or “privatizing” Buddhism to fit one’s a priori preferences
 32 and concerns seems—from a Critical Buddhist perspective—highly problem-
 33 atic, if not dangerous. Neither the New Buddhist Fellowship nor Seno’o’s
 34 Youth League would opt for either of these choices: while the first reflects
 35 the “dead” Buddhism they sought to escape, the second is a form of Bud-
 36 dhism that only serves to perpetuate ego and thus increase inequality and
 37 social suffering. The point, after all, is not simply to *interpret* the world of
 38 suffering, but to *change* it.

39
 40

Notes

1. This chapter contains material—revised and redacted—previously published in James Mark Shields, *Critical Buddhism: Engaging with Modern Japanese Buddhist Thought* (London: Ashgate, 2011) and James Mark Shields, *Against Harmony: Progressive and Radical Buddhism in Modern Japan* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).

2. To cite one example, from an article called “The One Road of Zen and War,” published in 1939 by Zen master Daiun Harada Roshi: “[If ordered to] march: tramp, tramp, or shoot: bang, bang. This is the manifestation of the highest Wisdom [of Enlightenment]. The unity of Zen and war of which I speak extends to the furthest reaches of holy way [now under way]” (Brian Victoria, *Zen at War* [New York: Weatherhill, 1997], 137).

3. D. T. Suzuki, *Zen and Japanese Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), 61.

4. Throughout this essay, Japanese names are presented in accordance with Japanese conventions, i.e., first the family name, then the personal.

5. The ferment reached a peak in the early 1990s, with the publication of Hakamaya Noriaki, *Hongaku shisō hihan* (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1989), Hakamaya Noriaki, *Hihan Bukkyō* (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1990), and Matsumoto Shirō, *Zen shisō no hihanteki kenkyū* (Tokyo: Daizō, 1993), and the subsequent session at the American Academy of Religion’s 1993 meeting in Washington, DC, entitled “Critical Buddhism: Issues and Responses to a New Methodological Movement,” which resulted in the English-language compendium: Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, eds., *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1997).

6. Matsumoto Shirō. “The Meaning of ‘Zen,’” in *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*, edited by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, 242–50 (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1997), 250.

7. Abe Masao, *Zen and Comparative Studies* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1997), 3. The importance of Dōgen to contemporary Japanese Zen studies can hardly be overestimated. In addition to founding the Sōtō sect, Dōgen is generally considered Japan’s most significant premodern “philosopher.”

8. Paul Swanson, “Why They Say Zen Is Not Buddhism: Recent Japanese Critiques of Buddha-Nature,” in *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*, edited by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, 3–29 (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1997), 27–28.

9. Hakamaya Noriaki, “Critical Philosophy versus Topical Philosophy,” in *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*, edited by Paul L. Swanson, and Jamie Hubbard, 56–80 (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1997), 56.

1 10. Important to note here is the universal claim of Critical Buddhism: they
2 reject simplistic East-West dichotomies and argue that the battle they are waging lies
3 at the heart of philosophical and religious traditions East and West. As Hakamaya
4 explains in his essay “Critical Philosophy versus Topical Philosophy”: “The heart of
5 the intellectual question . . . lies not in the different ways of thought of East and
6 West, but rather in the confrontation between *topica* and *critica*” (58).

7 11. See Ernesto Grassi, “Critical Philosophy or Topical Philosophy? Meditations
8 on the *De nostri temporis studiorum ratione*,” in *Giambattista Vico: An International
9 Symposium*, edited by G. Tagliacozzo and H. V. White (Baltimore: John Hopkins,
10 1969).

11 12. Hubbard, Jamie, “Introduction,” in *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm
12 over Critical Buddhism*, edited by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, vii–xxii
(Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1997), vii.

13 13. See Matsumoto Shirōm “The Doctrine of *Tathāgata-garbhā* Is Not Bud-
14 dhist,” in *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*, edited by Jamie
15 Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, 165–73 (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press,
16 1997, 171; Hakamaya, “Critical Philosophy,” 56.

17 14. “Dependent origination” is an idea with deep roots in classical Buddhist
18 texts, and while there are a variety of formulations (and even more interpretations),
19 the basic teaching is that all things and all events arise from a chain of interlocking
20 causes and conditions. More specifically, early Buddhist texts indicate a “12-link
21 chain” of dependent origination that helps explain the origins and persistence of
22 *duḥkha* (“suffering”). The soteriological claim associated with this doctrine is—as
23 stated in the third “Noble Truth”—that eliminating these conditions will lead to
24 liberation from suffering; thus, the goal of all Buddhist practice.

25 15. Hakamaya (“Critical Philosophy,” 64) calls Śākyamuni Buddha “the first
26 such criticalist in India,” though he goes on to laud Confucius (“China’s Christ”)
27 over Laozi and Śākyamuni himself (67), for his superior humanism.

28 16. Abe, *Zen and Comparative Studies*, 16.

29 17. Yamaguchi Zuiho, cited in Hubbard, “Introduction,” xvi.

30 18. Hubbard, “Introduction,” vii.

31 19. See Shields, *Critical Buddhism*.

32 20. See Shields, *Against Harmony*.

33 21. SB 1, 1 (July 1900), 3; unless otherwise indicated, all translations are
34 mine. The NBF journal, *Shin Bukkyō* (SB), is cited by volume and issue numbers,
35 followed by date of initial publication and page numbers in Akamatsu Tesshin and
36 Fukushima Hiroataka, eds. *Shin Bukkyō*, 4 vols. (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 1982).

37 22. Along with Buddhism, traditional forms of Shintō reverence and folk
38 worship also come under attack in the NBF *sengen*. Though “superstition” is the
39 primary locus of critique, other terms used to describe the “old Buddhism” are
40 “pessimistic” (Jpn. *enseiteki* 厭世的), for its denial of this-worldly happiness, and
“imaginary” (Jpn. *kūsōteki* 空想的), for its elaborate cosmology.

23. SB 1, 1 (July 1900), 3.

24. Klautau, Orion. “Against the Ghosts of Recent Past: Meiji Scholarship and the Discourse on Edo-Period Buddhist Decadence,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 35, no. 2 (2008): 263–303.
25. Kishimoto Hideo, *Japanese Religion in the Meiji Era* (Tokyo: Ōbunsha, 1956), 128.
26. SB 2, 9 (August 1901), 325.
27. SB 2, 9 (August 1901), 325.
28. Although neither Sakaino nor other New Buddhists are forthcoming as to their reason for choosing pantheism as a foundation for their New Buddhism, it likely has to do with both the fact that pantheism (and vitalism) played a significant role in late-nineteenth-century European thought and that early Buddhist modernists in Japan (including D. T. Suzuki) had already noted the close correlation between at least some versions of pantheism and traditional Asian cosmologies. Moreover, pantheism in their view provides a “middle way” between theistic religions and materialistic science.
29. SB 2, 9 (August 1901), 325.
30. See in this regard, Gilles Deleuze, *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* (San Francisco: City Lights, 1988), 122–30; also Najita Tetsuo on pantheism and “freedom” in the work of Andō Shoeki (Najita Tetsuo. “Andō Shōeki—The ‘Forgotten Thinker’ in Japanese History,” in *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*, edited by Masao Miyoshi and Harry D. Harootunian, 61–79 (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), 74.
31. SB 2, 9 (August 1901), 329; for more on pantheism, see SB 1, 5 (November 1900), 140; SB 2, 6 (May 1901), 89–95; SB 2, 12 (November 1901), 386–90; SB 4, 12 (December 1903), 916–19; SB 8, 2 (February 1907), 371–81; SB 8, 7 (July 1907), 454–61. D. T. Suzuki had written on the importance of a pantheistic foundation for contemporary religion as early as 1896, in his *Shin Shūkyōron* (D. T. Suzuki, *Suzuki Daisetsu zenshū*, 23 vols. [Tokyo: Iwanami, 1969], 23, 38). Suzuki argued that pantheism might be conceived as the “positive” or “pro-active” aspect (Jpn. *sekkyōkuteki hōmen* 積極の方面) of atheism—or perhaps as a middle way between theism and atheism.
32. SB 8, 2 (February 1907), 381; also see SB 2, 6 (May 1901), 289–95.
33. SB 12, 8 (August 1911), 1313–14.
34. SB 12, 8 (August 1911), 1315–16.
35. See, e.g., Takashima Beihō. *Bukkyō nyūmon—Bukkyō to wa donna mono no ka* (Tokyo: Gakufū shoin, 1956).
36. See Hoshino Seiji, “Reconfiguring Buddhism as a Religion: Nakanishi Ushirō and his Shin Bukkyō,” *Japanese Religions* 34, no. 2 (July 2009): 133–54; also see the lead piece of the December 1901 issue for a useful summary of thoughts from various contributors on the “faith question” (Jpn. *shinkō mondai* 信仰問題); SB 2, 13, 398–404.
37. SB 1, 1 (July 1900), 8–9.
38. SB 1, 1 (July 1900), 9.
39. SB 1, 1 (July 1900), 9.

1 40. In a later work on Buddhist history, frustrated by being unable to reconcile
 2 the chronology surrounding the founder of Buddhism's life, Sakaino would go so
 3 far as to wonder whether Śākyamuni Buddha might be a "figment of the collective
 4 oriental imagination"; see James Edward Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji*
 5 *Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 73.

6 41. SB 2, 5 (May 1901), 279–80.

7 42. See Yoshinaga Shin'ichi, ed., *Kindai Nihon ni okeru chishikijin shūkyō undō*
 8 *no gensetsu kūkan: "Shin Bukkyō" no shisōshi, bunkashiteki kenkyū*, 1–6 (Grants-in-Aid
 for Scientific Research, no. 20320016, 2011), 30.

9 43. See, for example, Sakaino's "Confession of Practical Faith" (*Jissai shinkō*
 10 *no hyōbaku*), SB 1, 3 (September 1900), 82–89.

11 44. According to the results of a survey recorded in the July 1905 edition of
 12 *Shin Bukkyō*, more than half of the leading NBF figures expressed their disbelief in
 13 any sort of afterlife; see Yoshida Kyūichi, *Nihon kindai bukkuyōshi kenkyū* (Tokyo:
 14 Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1992), 331.

15 45. SB 1, 5 (November 1900), 159; see Yoshida, *Nihon kindai*, 331.

16 46. Inagaki Masami, *Budda o seoite gaito e: Seno'o Girō to Shinkō Bukkyō*
 17 *Seinen Dōmei* (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1997), 3–6, my translation.

18 47. Winston Davis, *Japanese Religion and Society: Paradigms of Structure and*
 19 *Change* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 177.

20 48. Kashiwahara Yūsen, *Nihon bukkuyōshi: kindai* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan,
 21 1990), 214; Hayashi Reihō, *Seno'o Girō to Shinkō Bukkyō Seinen Dōmei: shakaishugi*
 22 *to bukkuyō no tachiba* (Tokyo: Hyakkaen, 1976), 26–29; my translation.

23 49. Seno'o Girō, *Seno'o Girō shūkyō ronshu* (Tokyo: Daizō, 1975), 312–13, 386.

24 50. Complicating the issue further is the fact that by the late 1920s, Marxist
 25 (and Soviet) orthodoxy had become more explicitly antireligious, such that socialists
 26 like Seno'o may have felt more pressure to openly avow their "atheist" credentials.

27 51. Seno'o, *Shūkyō ronshu*, 275.

28 52. See Inagaki, *Budda o seoite*, 16.

29 53. Kashiwahara, *Nihon bukkuyōshi*, 215.

30 54. Seno'o, *Shūkyō ronshu*, 253; my translation.

31 55. Birnbaum, Raoul Birnbaum, "In Search of an Engaged Buddhism," *Religion*
 32 *East and West* 9 (2009): 25–39.

33 56. John Nelson, *Experimental Buddhism: Innovation and Activism in Contem-*
 34 *porary Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013), 27.

Bibliography

36 Abe, Masao. *Zen and Comparative Studies*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 1997.

37 Akamatsu, Teshin, and Hirota Fukushima, eds. *Shin bukkuyō* [New Buddhism].

38 4 vols. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 1982. Cited as SB, by volume and date
 39 of original publication.

40

- Birnbaum, Raoul. 2009. "In Search of an Engaged Buddhism." *Religion East and West* 9 (2009): 25–39. 1
2
- Davis, Winston. *Japanese Religion and Society: Paradigms of Structure and Change*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. 3
4
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. San Francisco: City Lights, 1988. 5
- Grassi, Ernesto. "Critical Philosophy or Topical Philosophy? Meditations on the *De nostri temporis studiorum ratione*." In *Giambattista Vico: An International Symposium*, edited by G. Tagliacozzo and H. V. White. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1969. 6
7
8
- Hakamaya, Noriaki. *Hongaku shisō hihan* [Critiques of the doctrine of original enlightenment]. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1989. 9
10
- . *Hihan Bukkyō* [Critical Buddhism]. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1990. 11
- . "Critical Philosophy versus Topical Philosophy." In *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*, edited by Paul L. Swanson, and Jamie Hubbard, 56–80. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997. 12
13
14
- Hayashi, Reihō. *Seno'o Girō to Shinkō Bukkyō Seinen Dōmei: shakaishugi to bukkuyō no tachiba* [Seno'o Girō and the Youth League for Revitalizing Buddhism: The Buddhist Socialist Standpoint]. Tokyo: Hyakkaen, 1976. 15
16
17
- Heisig, James, and John Maraldo, eds. *Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School, and the Question of Nationalism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994. 18
19
- Hoshino, Seiji. "Reconfiguring Buddhism as a Religion: Nakanishi Ushirō and his Shin Bukkyō." *Japanese Religions* 34, no. 2 (July 2009): 133–54. 20
- Hubbard, Jamie. "Introduction." In *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*, edited by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, vii–xxii. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997. 21
22
23
- Inagaki Masami. *Budda o seoite gaito e: Seno'o Girō to Shinkō Bukkyō Seinen Dōmei* [Taking the Buddha on their backs and going to the streets: Seno'o Girō and the Youth League for Revitalizing Buddhism]. Tokyo: Iwanami, 1997. 24
25
26
- Kashiwahara, Yūsen. *Nihon bukkuyōshi: kindai* [Japanese Buddhist history: modernity]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1990. 27
28
- Ketelaar, James Edward. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990. 29
30
- Kishimoto, Hideo. *Japanese Religion in the Meiji Era*. Translated by John F. Howes. Tokyo: Ōbunsha, 1956. 31
32
- Klautau, Orion. "Against the Ghosts of Recent Past: Meiji Scholarship and the Discourse on Edo-Period Buddhist Decadence." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 35, no. 2 (2008): 263–303. 33
34
- Matsumoto, Shirō. *Zen shisō no hihanteki kenkyū* [Critical studies on Zen thought]. Tokyo: Daizō, 1993. 35
36
- . "The Doctrine of *Tathāgata-garbha* Is Not Buddhist." In *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*, edited by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, 165–73. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997. 37
38
39
40

- 1 ———. “The Meaning of ‘Zen.’” In *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical*
 2 *Buddhism*, edited by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, 242–50. Honolulu:
 3 University of Hawai’i Press, 1997.
- 4 Najita Tetsuo. “Andō Shōeki—The ‘Forgotten Thinker’ in Japanese History.” In
 5 *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*, edited by Masao Miyoshi and
 6 Harry D. Harootunian, 61–79. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.
- 7 Nelson, John. *Experimental Buddhism: Innovation and Activism in Contemporary*
 8 *Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2013.
- 9 Seno’o, Girō. *Senō’o Girō shūkyō ronshū* [The religious thought of Seno’o Girō].
 Tokyo: Daizō, 1975.
- 10 Shields, James Mark. *Critical Buddhism: Engaging with Modern Japanese Buddhist*
 11 *Thought*. London: Ashgate, 2011.
- 12 ———. *Against Harmony: Progressive and Radical Buddhism in Modern Japan*. London
 13 and New York: Oxford University, 2017.
- 14 Suzuki, D[aisetsu]. T[etarō]. *Zen and Japanese Culture*. Princeton: Princeton Uni-
 15 versity Press, 1970.
- 16 ———. *Suzuki Daisetsu Zenshū* (Complete works of Suzuki Daisetsu). 23 vols.
 17 Tokyo: Iwanami, 1969. Cited as SDZ, by volume.
- 18 Swanson, Paul. “Why They Say Zen Is Not Buddhism: Recent Japanese Critiques of
 19 Buddha-Nature.” In *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm over Critical Buddhism*,
 20 edited by Jamie Hubbard and Paul L. Swanson, 3–29. Honolulu: University
 of Hawai’i Press, 1997.
- 21 Takashima Beihō. *Bukkyō nyūmon—Bukkyō to wa donna mono no ka* [An introduction
 22 to Buddhism: What is Buddhism?]. Tokyo: Gakufū shoin, 1956.
- 23 Victoria, Brian. *Zen at War*. New York: Weatherhill, 1997.
- 24 Yoshida, Kyūichi. *Nihon kindai bukkyōshi kenkyū* [A study of modern Japanese
 25 Buddhist history]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1992.
- 26 Yoshinaga, Shin’ichi, ed. *Kindai Nihon ni okeru chishikijin shūkyō undō no gensetsu*
 27 *kūkan: “Shin Bukkyō” no shisōshi, bunkashiteki kenkyū* [The discursive space of
 28 an intellectual religious movement in modern Japan: A study of the journal
 29 New Buddhism from the viewpoint of the history of culture and thought],
 30 1–6. Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research, no. 20320016, 2011.
- 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40

Glossary

Terms are organized alphabetically by their most commonly used English translation, with their equivalents in Sanskrit, Pāli, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese in the adjacent columns. Chinese characters are provided only in the column for the Chinese term unless different characters are used in Japan, in which case the alternative characters are provided after the Japanese term. Chinese terms are Romanized using the current Pinyin system with the older Wade-Giles system in parentheses after the Chinese characters. Korean terms are provided in the current Revised Romanization system with alternative spellings using the older McCune-Reischauer system in parentheses (on those occasions where they differ from RR). Diacritical marks are included for all terms according to the Romanization conventions of each language. Some entries include “N/A” because terms that developed later do not have direct analogues in the earlier traditions (e.g., terms coined in Japan might not have equivalents in the other languages).

English Term	Sanskrit	Pāli	Chinese	Korean	Japanese
action, moral cause and effect	<i>karma</i>	<i>kamma</i>	yè 業 (<i>yeh</i>)	<i>eob</i> (<i>ōp</i>)	<i>gō</i>
aggregate (of craving)	<i>skandha</i>	<i>khandha</i>	yùn 蘊 (<i>yün</i>)	<i>on</i>	<i>un</i>
arhat (enlightened person)	<i>arhat</i> or <i>arhant</i>	<i>arahant</i>	āluóhàn 阿羅漢 (<i>a lo han</i>)	<i>arahan</i>	<i>arakan</i>
asceticism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>kin'yokushugi</i> 禁欲主義

continued on next page

English Term	Sanskrit	Pāli	Chinese	Korean	Japanese
Association of Buddhist Sects	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Shoshū</i> <i>Dōtoku</i> <i>Kaimei</i> 諸宗 同徳会盟
awakening (initial insight)	N/A	N/A	<i>jiàn xìng</i> 見性 (<i>chien hsing</i>)	<i>gyeon seong</i> (<i>gyōn sōng</i>)	<i>kenshō</i>
awakening (lasting understanding)	N/A	N/A	<i>wú</i> 悟 (<i>wu</i>)	<i>o</i>	<i>satori</i>
blind faith	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>mōshin</i> 盲信
bodhisattva (one who has vowed to attain buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings)	<i>bodhisattva</i>	<i>bodhisatta</i>	<i>pūsà</i> 菩薩 (<i>p'ū sa</i>)	<i>bosal</i>	<i>bosatsu</i>
Buddha (awakened one)	<i>Buddha</i>	<i>Buddha</i>	<i>Fó</i> 佛 (<i>fo</i>)	<i>Bul</i>	仏 <i>Butsu</i>
Buddha-nature	<i>tathāgata- garbha</i> or <i>buddha- dhātu</i>	<i>tathāgata- garbha</i> or <i>buddha- dhātu</i>	<i>fōxìng</i> 佛性 (<i>fo hsing</i>)	<i>bulseong</i> (<i>bulsōng</i>)	<i>busshō</i> 仏性
Buddhist decadence	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>daraku</i> <i>bukkyō</i> 墮落仏教
compassion	<i>karuṇā</i>	<i>karuṇā</i>	<i>cībēi</i> 慈悲 (<i>tz'u pei</i>)	<i>jabi</i>	<i>jibi</i>
consciousness	<i>viññāna</i>	<i>viññāna</i>	<i>shí</i> 識 (<i>shih</i>)	<i>sik</i> (<i>shik</i>)	<i>shiki</i>
correct faith	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>shōshin</i> 正信
craving, thirst	<i>trṣṇā</i>	<i>taṇhā</i>	<i>tānài</i> 貪愛 (<i>t'an ai</i>)	<i>gal-ae</i>	<i>katsuai</i> 渴愛
critical Buddhism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>hiban</i> <i>bukkyō</i> 批判仏教

English Term	Sanskrit	Pāli	Chinese	Korean	Japanese
cultivation; training	N/A	N/A	<i>xiūxíng</i> 修行 (<i>hsiu hsing</i>)	<i>subaeng</i>	<i>shugyō</i>
degenerate age of the dharma	N/A	N/A	<i>mòfǎ</i> 末法 (<i>mo fa</i>)	<i>malbóp</i>	<i>mappō</i>
dependent origination, interdependent arising	<i>pratītya- samutpāda</i>	<i>paṭicca- samuppāda</i>	<i>yuánqǐ</i> 緣起 (<i>yüan ch'i</i>)	<i>yeonggi</i> (<i>yōnggi</i>)	<i>engi</i> 緣起
differentiation is equality	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>sabetsu soku</i> <i>byōdō</i> 差別 即平等
dimension of the dharma	<i>dharmā- dhātu</i>	<i>dhamma- dhātu</i>	<i>fǎjiè</i> 法界 (<i>fa chieh</i>)	<i>beopgye</i> (<i>bōpkye</i>)	<i>hokkai</i>
empathetic joy	<i>muditā</i>	<i>muditā</i>	<i>xī</i> 喜 (<i>hsi</i>)	<i>hŭi</i>	<i>ki</i>
emptiness	<i>śūnyatā</i>	<i>suññatā</i>	<i>kōng</i> 空 (<i>k'ung</i>)	<i>gong</i>	<i>kū</i>
ethics, morals, right conduct	<i>śīla</i>	<i>sīla</i>	<i>jiè</i> 戒 (<i>chieh</i>)	<i>gye</i>	<i>kai</i>
faith	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>shinkō</i> 信仰
Faxiang (Buddhist sect)	N/A	N/A	<i>Fǎxiàng</i> 法相 (<i>Fa Hsiang</i>)	<i>Beopsang</i> (<i>Bōpsang</i>)	<i>Hossō</i>
Four Noble Truths, Noble Fourfold Truth	<i>catvāri āryasatyāni</i>	<i>cattāri ariyasaccāni</i>	<i>sìshèngdì</i> 四 聖諦 (<i>ssu sheng ti</i>)	<i>sa-seong-je</i> (<i>sa-sōng-je</i>)	<i>shitai</i> 四諦
grace	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>on</i> 恩
Great East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Dai Tōa</i> <i>Kyōei Ken</i> 大東亞 共榮圈
heart-mind	N/A	N/A	<i>xīn</i> 心 (<i>hsin</i>)	<i>sim</i>	<i>shin; kokoro</i>
Huayan (Buddhist sect)	N/A	N/A	<i>Huáyán</i> 華嚴 (<i>Hua Yen</i>)	<i>Hwaeom</i> (<i>Hwaōm</i>)	<i>Kegon</i>
ignorance	<i>avidyā</i>	<i>avijjā</i>	<i>wú míng</i> 無明 (<i>wu ming</i>)	<i>mumyeong</i> (<i>mumyōng</i>)	<i>mumyō</i>

continued on next page

	English Term	Sanskrit	Pāli	Chinese	Korean	Japanese
1						
2						
3	Imperial Way Zen	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Dōdō Zen</i> 皇道禪
4						
5	impermanence	<i>anitya</i>	<i>anicca</i>	<i>wúcháng</i> 無常 (<i>wu ch'ang</i>)	<i>musang</i>	<i>mujō</i>
6						
7	judgement and interpretation of Buddhist teachings	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>kyōsō- hanjaku</i> 競争半弱
8						
9						
10						
11	just sitting, simply sitting (in meditation)	<i>utkuṭuka- stha</i>	<i>ukkuṭika- stha</i>	<i>zhīguǎn</i> <i>dǎzuò</i> 只管 打坐 (<i>chih kuan ta zuò</i>)	<i>jigwantajwa</i> (<i>jigwant' ajwa</i>)	<i>shikantaza</i>
12						
13						
14						
15	koan (problem that defies rational solutions)	N/A	N/A	<i>gōng'àn</i> 公案 (<i>kung an</i>)	<i>gong-an</i>	<i>kōan</i>
16						
17						
18						
19	live release (of captive animals)	N/A	N/A	<i>fàngshēng</i> 放生 (<i>fang sheng</i>)	<i>bangsaeng</i>	<i>hōjōe</i> 放生会
20						
21						
22	loving-kindness	<i>maitrī</i>	<i>mettā</i>	<i>cí</i> 慈 (<i>tz'u</i>)	<i>ja</i>	<i>ji</i> 慈
23						
24	martial hero (literary and film genre)	N/A	N/A	<i>wúxiá</i> 武俠 (<i>wu hsia</i>)	N/A	N/A
25						
26						
27	meditation	<i>dhyāna</i>	<i>jhāna</i>	<i>chán</i> 禪 (<i>ch'an</i>)	<i>seon (sōn)</i>	<i>zen</i>
28						
29	meditative concentration/ discipline	<i>samādhi</i>	<i>samādhi</i>	<i>sān mèi</i> 三昧 (<i>san mei</i>)	<i>sammae</i>	<i>sanmai</i>
30						
31						
32	motivation of a bodhisattva	<i>bodhicitta</i>	<i>bodhicitta</i>	<i>pútíxīn</i> 菩提心 (<i>p'u t'i hsin</i>)	<i>borisim</i> (<i>borishim</i>)	<i>bodaishin</i>
33						
34						
35	New Buddhism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Shin Bukkyō</i> 新仏教
36						
37	New Buddhist Fellowship	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Shin Bukkyō</i> <i>Dōshikai</i> 新仏教同 志会
38						
39						
40						

English Term	Sanskrit	Pāli	Chinese	Korean	Japanese
nirvana (extinguishing of karma)	<i>nirvāṇa</i>	<i>nibbana</i>	<i>nièpán</i> 涅槃 (<i>nieh p'an</i>)	<i>yeolban</i> (<i>yōlban</i>)	<i>nehan</i>
no-mind	N/A	N/A	<i>wúxīn</i> 無心 (<i>wu hsin</i>)	<i>musim</i> (<i>mushim</i>)	<i>mushin</i>
no-self, non-self	<i>anātman</i>	<i>anattā</i>	<i>wúwǒ</i> 無我 (<i>wu wo</i>)	<i>mua</i>	<i>muga</i>
non-violence, non-injury	<i>ahiṃsā</i>	<i>avihimsā</i>	<i>bù hài</i> 不害 (<i>pu hai</i>)	<i>bulhae</i> (<i>burhae</i>)	<i>fugai</i>
Old Buddhism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Kyū Bukkyō</i> 旧仏教
original enlightenment	N/A	N/A	<i>běnjué</i> 本覺 (<i>pen chüeh</i>)	<i>bongak</i>	<i>hongaku</i>
other-power	N/A	N/A	<i>tāli</i> 他力 (<i>t'a li</i>)	<i>taryeok</i> (<i>t'aryōk</i>)	<i>tarikī</i>
pantheism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>hanshinron</i> 汎神論
pantheistic materialism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>yuibutsuteki</i> <i>hanshinron</i> 唯物的汎 神論
point below the navel (meditative focus)	N/A	N/A	<i>dantian</i> 丹田 (<i>tan tien</i>)	<i>danjeon</i> (<i>danjōn</i>)	<i>tanden</i>
praise chant to Amida Buddha	N/A	N/A	<i>niànfó</i> 念佛 (<i>nien fo</i>)	<i>yeombul</i> (<i>yōmbul</i>)	<i>nembutsu</i>
Proletarian Party of Japan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Nibon</i> <i>Musantō</i> 日本無産等
Pure Land (Buddhist sect)	N/A	N/A	<i>Jìngtǔzōng</i> 淨土宗 (<i>Ching T'u</i> <i>Tsung</i>)	<i>Jeongtojong</i> (<i>Jōngt'ojong</i>)	<i>Jōdo Shū</i>

continued on next page

English Term	Sanskrit	Pāli	Chinese	Korean	Japanese
rebirth (the cycle of rebirth)	<i>samsāra</i>	<i>samsāra</i>	<i>lúnhuí</i> 輪迴 (<i>lun hui</i>)	<i>ryunhoe</i>	<i>rinne</i>
royal law [together with] Buddha dharma	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>ōbō buppō</i> 王法佛法
Sanlun (Buddhist sect)	N/A	N/A	<i>Sānlùn</i> 三論 (<i>San Lun</i>)	<i>Samnon</i>	<i>Sanron</i>
scriptural texts	<i>sūtra</i>	<i>sutta</i>	<i>jīng</i> 經 (<i>ching</i>)	<i>gyeong</i> (<i>gyōng</i>)	<i>kyō</i>
sea-state meditative concentration	<i>sāgara- mudrā samādhi</i>	<i>sāgara- mudrā samādhi</i>	<i>hǎi yìn sān mèi</i> 海印三昧 (<i>hai yin san mei</i>)	<i>haeinsammae</i>	<i>kaiin sanmai</i>
self-power	N/A	N/A	<i>zìlì</i> 自力 (<i>tau li</i>)	<i>jaryeok</i> (<i>jaryōk</i>)	<i>jiriki</i>
selfless love	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>muga-ai</i> 無我愛
skillful means, useful means	<i>upāya</i>	<i>upaya</i>	<i>fāngbiàn</i> 方便 (<i>fang pien</i>)	<i>bangpyeon</i> (<i>bangp'yōn</i>)	<i>hōben</i>
special transmission outside the scriptures	N/A	N/A	<i>jiāo wài bié zhuàn</i> 教外別傳 (<i>chiao wai pieh ch'uan</i>)	<i>kyooe pyolchon</i> (<i>k'yooe p'yolch'on</i>)	<i>kyōge betsuden</i>
storehouse consciousness	<i>ālāya- vijñāna</i>	<i>ālaya- vijñāna</i>	<i>ālāiyēshí</i> 阿 賴耶識 (<i>a lai yeh shih</i>)	<i>aroeyasik</i> (<i>aroeyashik</i>)	<i>araya-shiki</i>
suchness	<i>tathātā</i>	<i>tathatā</i>	<i>zhēnrú</i> 真如 (<i>chen ju</i>)	<i>jinyeo</i> (<i>jinyō</i>)	<i>shinnyo</i>
suffering, sorrow, unsatisfactoriness, stress	<i>duḥkha</i>	<i>dukkha</i>	<i>kǔ</i> 苦 (<i>k'u</i>)	<i>go</i>	<i>ku</i>

English Term	Sanskrit	Pāli	Chinese	Korean	Japanese	
symbiosis	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>kyōsei/ tomoiki</i> 共生	1 2 3 4 5
<i>Tales of Poverty</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Bimbō Monogatari</i> 貧乏物語	6 7 8
teachings of Buddhism (sometimes refers to phenomeno- logical constituents of reality)	<i>dharma</i>	<i>dhamma</i>	<i>fōfǎ</i> 佛法 (<i>fō fǎ</i>)	<i>bulbeop</i> (<i>bulbōp</i>)	<i>buppō</i> 仏法	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
techniques of the sword	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>kenjutsu</i> 劍術	17 18
this world	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>gense[i]shugi</i> 現世主義	19 20
three-thousand realms in an instant of thought	N/A	N/A	<i>yī niàn sān qiān</i> 一念三千 (<i>i nien san ch'ien</i>)	<i>ilnyeom samcheon</i> (<i>ilnyōm samch'ōn</i>)	<i>ichinen sanzen</i>	21 22 23 24 25
threefold contemplation in a single mind	N/A	N/A	<i>yīxīn sān guān</i> 一心三觀 (<i>i hsin san tang</i>)	<i>ilsim samgwan</i> (<i>ilshim samgwan</i>)	<i>isshin sangan</i>	26 27 28 29
Tiantai (Buddhist sect)	N/A	N/A	<i>Tiāntāi</i> 天台 (<i>T'ien Tai</i>)	<i>Cheontae</i> (<i>Ch'ōn'ŕae</i>)	<i>Tendai</i>	30 31
unfettered mind; immovable mind	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>fudōshin</i> 不 動心	32 33 34 35
Way	N/A	N/A	<i>dào</i> 道 (tao)	<i>do</i>	<i>dō; michi</i>	36 37
way of the sword	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>kendō</i> 劍道	38 39 40

continued on next page

English Term	Sanskrit	Pāli	Chinese	Korean	Japanese
way of the warrior	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>bushidō</i> 武士道
wisdom, insight	<i>prajñā</i>	<i>Paññā</i>	<i>zhìhuì</i> 知惠 (<i>chìh huì</i>)	<i>jihye</i>	<i>chie</i>
Youth League for Revitalizing Buddhism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Shinkō</i> <i>Bukkyō</i> <i>Seinen</i> <i>Dōmei</i> 新興 仏教青年 同盟
Zhenyan (Buddhist sect)	N/A	N/A	<i>Zhēnyán</i> 真言 (<i>Chen Yen</i>)	N/A	<i>Shingon</i>