The Other as Reflected in Sino-Japanese Buddhism: Through the Prism of Modernity

CHEN JIDONG

THROUGHOUT the long history of Sino-Japanese Buddhism, it has been believed that the Buddhism of both countries shares a common origin and holds identical teachings. However, in the modern period, their mutual differences have been gradually recognized, so much so that it has become apparent that they bear little resemblance to each other. The differences among them are not limited to their traditional aspects or doctrine, but are also closely related to the experience of the establishment of self-identity during the modern period. Understanding the process of change from the perspective that they shared a common Buddhism, and then to the recognition that their relationship was one of "others" is important in highlighting the vicissitudes of Sino-Japanese Buddhist exchange, and is crucial for any discussion of Buddhist modernity in East Asia. In this paper we will investigate this issue by looking at Ogurusu Kōchō 小栗栖香頂 (1831–1905), the pioneer in spreading the True Pure Land School (Jōdo Shinshū 浄土真宗) teachings in China.

Discovery of the Other and the Re-establishment of Identity

The historical understanding of Japanese Buddhists was that Buddhism originated in India, was transmitted to China, and further spread to Korea and Japan. The thirteenth-century Japanese monk Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321) in his works *Sangoku buppō denzū engi* 三国仏法伝通縁起 (History of the Transmission and Propagation of Buddhism in the Three Countries) and *Hasshū kōyō* 八宗綱要 (The Essentials of the Eight Sects) unequivocally stated that the same stream of Buddhism flowed through India, China, and

The Eastern Buddhist 43/1&2: 57–79
©2012 The Eastern Buddhist Society

Japan, and that no disparity existed among them.[1] This view can be termed the "Three Country Buddhist Historiographical Perspective." This view of Buddhist history did not manifest in China, although one may suppose that the Chinese understanding was that Buddhism in Korea and Japan was merely an extension of Chinese Buddhism.

From the latter half of the seventeenth century, due to the new dynasty and the introspective policies of the government, exchange among Chinese and Japanese Buddhists gradually decreased, for a period even stopping altogether. In March of 1873, after the conclusion of the Sino-Japanese Friendship Treaty, renewed exchange became possible again. The pioneer of such exchange was Ogurusu Kōchō, who was sent to China by the Higashi Honganji 東本願寺 branch of the True Pure Land School. His objective was to form an alliance with Chinese Buddhists and to halt the spread of Christianity in East Asia. Other objectives were to investigate the possibility of missionary work in China, reverse the weakening of Buddhism due to the *haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈 (abolish Buddhism and destroy Śākyamuni) policies, and to seek new opportunities on the Asian continent.[2]

On 20 July 1873, Ogurusu departed from Nagasaki, later arriving in Shanghai. After staying there for a short time, he traveled to Beijing via Yantai 煙台 and Tianjin 天津. The monk Benran 本然 (n.d.) of the Longquansi 龍泉寺 temple took Ogurusu in. After staying roughly a year in Beijing, he returned to Japan via Shanghai. During his year in China, Ogurusu visited numerous temples, had considerable interaction and exchange with Chinese monks and literati, and with the help of a Tibetan monk from Yonghegong 雍和宮 in Beijing, he was able to make a pilgrimage to Wutaishan 五台山 (Jp. Godaisan). Also, he left many letters, diaries, communications, and other works that closely record his experiences and perceptions of China.

At first, Ogurusu imagined that the Dharma lineage of Chinese Buddhism, the source of Japanese Buddhism, had continued to the present day and that Indian, Chinese, and Japanese Buddhism were essentially the same. In the *Pekin kiji* 北京紀事 (1873), which he produced in Beijing with the help of a Chinese monk, there is a passage which directly reveals this perspective of Ogurusu's:

> Japanese Buddhist scriptures came from China, and are written in Chinese. Bodhidharma [n.d.–530?], Kumārajīva [344–413], Zhiyi

[1] Ketelaar 1990, pp. 177–84.

[2] See Kashiwahara 1974, p. 835; Kiba 1992, pp. 31–34; Kiba 1995, p. 223; Kitanishi 1994, p. 335; Chen 2002a, p. 89.

> 智顗 [538–597], Xuanzang 玄奘 [602–664], and the Great Teacher Xianshou 賢首 [643–712] translated the scriptures from Sanskrit, taught them to monastics, performed Buddhist rituals, and instructed the populace. In addition, Godaisan, Tendaisan 天台山, and Fudasan 普陀山 are all places where bodhisattvas manifest and reside.[3]

As seen in the above passage, during the long period when exchange halted between China and Japan, people within the two countries were unable to respectively verify the state of Buddhism in the other country, thus contributing to the shared misconception of the existence of a single, monolithic Buddhism. However, as soon as Ogurusu saw the actual state of Buddhism in China, he realized the enormous difference between their respective traditions of Buddhism. Since the reality of the situation was so vastly different from his former image, his understanding of commonality was shaken to the core, eventually to completely disintegrate.

It should be mentioned that what Ogurusu witnessed was the weakened state of Chinese Buddhism, which was vastly different from Buddhism as it had existed during its period of flourishing. Within the Buddhist world at that time there were few with substantial Buddhist learning, little cooperation among temples existed, and Buddhism had already lost the vitality to revive on its own. Ogurusu severely criticized Chinese Buddhism in the following terms.[4] Taking Beijing as an example, he argued that although there were over a hundred temples and monasteries, only monks from Longquansi (where Ogurusu was studying) were engaged in scholarship, while the rest were foolish monks who advanced the idea of "no reliance on the written word" (*furyū monji* 不立文字). Also, following old customs, lay believers carry coffins, conduct funerals, and only pray for good fortune in this world, and monks have no idea why they intone the Buddha's name. Indeed, Chinese Buddhism during this period was plagued by events such as the destruction from the Taiping 太平 Rebellion, the stress of Christianity's expansion, as well as the alienation caused by the Qing dynasty's favoring of Tibetan Buddhism. For these reasons Chinese Buddhism had sunk to its nadir and had already started groping for a way to revitalize. We should understand Ogurusu's criticisms as reflecting those conditions.

Through interactions with Benran and other Chinese Buddhists, the differences between Chinese and Japanese Buddhism gradually became apparent. In the written record *Nicchū daisōrin nikka nijūsan mon* 日中大叢林日課

[3] Ogurusu 2008, p. 7.
[4] Ogurusu 1893.

二十三問 (Twenty-three Questions about the Daily Rituals in Sino-Japanese Monasteries), the differences regarding the scriptures employed, funerals, the relation between monks and households, and the relationship to the ruling house are clearly expressed.[5] In addition, a fierce debate erupted between Ogurusu and Chinese monks over the place of precepts. The Chinese monks could not understand nor accept the True Pure Land School's practice of eating meat and marrying. Also, Ogurusu concretely recorded the doctrinal differences among the various schools in China and Japan. For example, the Japanese Tendai 天台 School includes esoteric practices in its curriculum while the Chinese equivalent (Tientai) does not. He also saw the Japanese Shingon 真言 School as being no different from Tibetan Buddhism, and encouraged monks from the Shingon headquarters on Mt. Kōya 高野 to travel and study in Tibet. Chinese Zen is of the Linji 臨済 (Jp. Rinzai) lineage, although the Japanese Zen schools' conception of "satori" (enlightenment) is completely different from the Chinese concept. Chinese Zen includes elements of Buddha recitation practice (*nianfo* 念仏; Jp. *nenbutsu*), and the Tendai practice of mind-only *nenbutsu* is carried out before an image of Bodhidharma. In regard to the practical aspects of the Pure Land teaching, the Japanese True Pure Land School's teaching of the "way of easy practice" is not found in China. Based on these observations, Ogurusu arrived at the following conclusion:

> Although it is said that Buddhism came from China, not one of the seven schools [of Japan] exists in China. Truly, it has become the Japanese Teaching (*Nihonkyō* 日本教), not the Chinese Teaching (*Shinakyō* 支那教). How much more so is Shinto?[6]

By coining the new concept of a "Japanese Teaching," or "Japanese Buddhism," and a "Chinese Teaching," or "Chinese Buddhism," he brought the differences between the two forms of Buddhism into sharp relief. Within this strategic rhetoric, he clearly distinguished Japanese Buddhism from Chinese Buddhism, through which he intended to display the differences and inferiority of the latter.

However, Ogurusu's ideas did not include putting distance between Chinese Buddhism as a foreign "other" divorced from its historical relationship, nor did he gain satisfaction from establishing the superiority of Japanese Buddhism. Rather, for Ogurusu, the more pressing issue was to erase the differences and find a way to return to a single uniform Buddhism. The

[5] Chen 2001, pp. 836–39; Chen 2002b, pp. 52–71.
[6] Ogurusu 1874.

reason for his concern can be discerned in Ogurusu's understanding as revealed below:

> Although there are [plenty of] human resources there is no clear teaching. This reveals the true worth of the Chinese monks. The temples simply exist as [repositories of] rural customs. If there is not a reform soon, everyone will eventually become a Christian.[7]

In other words, in face of the threat from Christianity, urging the reform of Chinese Buddhism was the most pressing matter. In that case, help from Japan was necessary.

The *Pekin gohōron* 北京護法論 (Discussion of Protecting the Dharma in Beijing) laid out a course for reform. This document is comprised of three varieties of text: in addition to the formally published version of 1903, there is a manuscript copy from 1901 as well as a draft recorded in the *Hasshū nikki* 八洲日記 (Bazhou Diary). The manuscript is a re-recording of an 1874 text which has yet to be discovered. The contents of the draft text are included in the thirty-fourth fascicle of the *Hasshū nikki* (covering the period of February to April, 1874) and in the thirty-seventh fascicle (from April to July of the same year). Comparing the three texts, the published version was apparently significantly revised from the manuscript of 1901, while the manuscript itself has been ascertained to diverge widely in content from the draft copy. While an investigation of the textual differences is outside the scope of this paper, in conclusion, it is beyond all reasonable doubt that the manuscript copy is the closest to the original text that was sent to Benran of the Longquansi temple in Beijing. Therefore, in the following, our overview of the work's content will be based on the manuscript copy. The *Pekin gohōron* introduces the fourteen schools of Japanese Buddhism, the Three Doctrinal Tenets (*sankyōsoku* 三教則) of the Ministry of Religious Education (Kyōbushō 教部省), and the discourse record of the True Pure Land School chief abbot, Gennyo 現如 (1852–1923), and also includes Ogurusu's plans for bolstering Buddhism. The document presents all fourteen schools of Japanese Buddhism, and systematically traces the Dharma lineage and doctrines from Buddhism's origin to the present in an attempt to appeal to Chinese Buddhists. This text represents the first instance of such a document within the long history of Sino-Japanese Buddhist exchange. Comparing Japanese Buddhism with Chinese Buddhism, it becomes apparent that there are more than a few schools and lineages that died out over time. For example, the esoteric Shingon (Ch. Zhenyan)

[7] Ogurusu 1893.

School completely disappeared in China, the Hossō 法相 (Ch. Faxiang) School was extremely weakened, and the writings of the patriarchs of the Pure Land School—Tanluan 曇鸞 (Jp. Donran; 476–542?), Daochuo 道綽 (Jp. Dōshaku; 562–645), and Shandao 善導 (Jp. Zendō; 613–681)—had all but vanished. It is easy to imagine the shock that Chinese Buddhists must have experienced in the face of such great disparity. The introduction of the Three Doctrinal Tenets showcased the new relationship between Buddhism and the state based on the ideology of the Meiji government. An important point of that ideology was for Buddhists to love the state and to work for the benefit of the nation. This amounted to veiled criticism of the condition of Chinese Buddhism which had become alienated from the state and society. Gennyo was introduced in order to explain the idea in the True Pure Land School that the "sovereign law is most fundamental." Ogurusu laid special emphasis on meat-eating and marrying among the clergy as he endeavored to resolve the issues raised by the gap between Chinese Buddhism's position on precepts and that of the True Pure Land School. That is to say, Ogurusu argues that in this age of the Latter Days of the Law, monks are unable to follow the precepts and thus precepts are unnecessary. What was required was only to earnestly intone the Buddha's name, desire to protect Buddhism, and to unceasingly study the teachings. This was an expression of Ogurusu's frustration and criticism of Chinese Buddhists who were content with their current circumstances, had no plan for reform, and were falling deeper and deeper into decadence. However, the Chinese Buddhists could not relate to his stance on precepts and thus rejected it. This conflict remains even today between Chinese and Japanese Buddhism.

It is in the last chapter, "Gohōsaku" 護法策 (Plan for the Protection of the Dharma), that Ogurusu exhibits his strongest polemic. It is a proposal for a complete reform of Chinese Buddhism. The thirteen items of the reform proposal can be roughly divided into two categories. That is, the coordination of an internal and external reform. The internal reform of Chinese Buddhism includes such concrete items as the laicization of ignorant or useless monks, a reformulation of the Buddhist organization, the establishment of Buddhist educational institutions, the expansion and strengthening of Buddhist missionary activities, the compiling of monks' histories, and the sending of monks abroad for teaching. Items external to Buddhism included the reconciliation of the Three Teachings of Buddhism, Confucianism, and Daoism, and the establishment of a Buddhist league among India, China, and Japan. Within these items, the establishment of the Buddhist league among the Three Countries formed the basis of the reform and was its ulti-

mate aim. All the other reforms were merely means to help achieve this end. Needless to say, the purpose of the league was not only to revive a single, ancient Buddhism among the Three Countries, but to install Japan at the head of the league and establish a new Buddhist order. In order to assert the necessity and achievability of this league, Ogurusu employed the shared Buddhist history of the Three Countries to establish that they were inseparably bound by Buddhism. He asserted that their relationship was not maintained only due to the repeated incursions of the Western powers, and that in order to stand up to this threat Buddhism in the Three Countries needed to unite.

In another instance, Ogurusu introduced the concept of modernization and argued that Japan, as it preceded India and China in its modernization, had the responsibility and duty to lead them in their own processes of modernizing. Also, Ogurusu advanced that since Buddhism had already disappeared in India and Christianity was making great headway in China where Buddhism was in a state of decline and Christianity was at the point of becoming dominant, it was only Japanese Buddhism that could restore vitality, and thus it was natural that Japan should stand in a position of leadership. Ogurusu's proposal for reform was basically a Chinese version of the process of modernization which Japanese Buddhism underwent at the beginning of the Meiji period (1868–1912). The present author has formerly commented on the idea of the Three Country Buddhist League as follows:

> The real motive behind Ogurusu's call for a Three Country Buddhist League was not to rescue Chinese Buddhism, but rather to turn it into a copy of Japanese Buddhism. Reviving and restoring Chinese Buddhism would stimulate Japanese Buddhism, which would ultimately allow Japan to establish a Buddhist sphere of influence among the Three Countries with Japan in the leadership role. He also held the view that doing so would serve as a buffer against the invasion of Christianity.[8]

There is one matter that requires further consideration here; namely, the modern character of Ogurusu's assertion. He placed national self-consciousness at the fore, and expressed Buddhism in Japan as "Japanese Buddhism" which is a manifestation of its modern identity. In distinction to Gyōnen's emphasis on the uniform character of Buddhist history in the Three Countries, Ogurusu's idea of a Three Country Buddhist League places emphasis on the

[8] Chen 2002a, p. 95.

national character of Buddhism, situating it within national boundaries. That is to say, before he could speak of a universal and uniform Buddhism, he was clearly aware of the individual character of Buddhism as it existed in each country. The identity and independence of Buddhism did not depend on the originality of its teachings, but rather on the nation itself. By perceiving Buddhism in this way, the distinctions of Indian Buddhism, Chinese Buddhism, and Japanese Buddhism are defined nationally. That is, in order for Buddhism to establish its identity and protect its independence, India and China needed first to establish themselves as modern sovereign nations.

Also, an alignment and cooperation that transcended national boundaries was emphasized for Buddhism in the Three Countries. In this sense, Ogurusu's idea of a Three Country Buddhist League can be considered an assertion of pan-Asianism. He argued for the necessity and realization of alignment and cooperation among the Three Countries by citing a history of close interaction and exchange, close racial ties, a common Buddhism, and a common threat and enemy—namely, Western Christianity. This idea was clearly laid out in a book Ogurusu published in 1903. Common terms expressive of pan-Asianism such as "Asian honor," "same scriptures, same kind," "mutual help," "brethren," and "blood relations," which are not found in the original manuscript, appear frequently throughout the book. The background can be traced to the period after the Russo-Japanese War when Japanese Buddhist missionary activities were expanding in China. Ogurusu was one of the central figures behind the thrust of that movement. In a lecture in June of 1898 he expressed this as follows:

> China, Korea, and Japan are Oriental countries that are as close to each other as lips and teeth, and I cannot bear to idly watch [the current situation]. However, what a religious person does to help is different from what a politician does.[9]

> China and Korea are intimately tied together with us, and now we are all facing a grave situation. It is the responsibility of our country [Japan] to help them attain independence. The government and people may not desire this, but we Buddhists cannot be allowed to just sit back and watch this happening.[10]

In the passage India has been replaced by Korea which shows a change in Ogurusu's Three Country Buddhist League concept, but the same stand-

[9] Ogurusu 1899, p. 6.
[10] Ibid., p. 29.

point of pan-Asianism pervades his writing. That is to say, he asserts that Japan should firmly hold to its role as leader in establishing a new Buddhist order in Asia. The published version of this work included a more developed exposition of this theory and a revision of the earlier texts.

In the final analysis, this plan for reform was essentially an overview of, and attempt to apply Japanese Buddhism's own experience of modernization, which highlights the universal nature of both Japanese Buddhism and the modernization process. The term "Japanese Teaching" (*Nihonkyō*) which Ogurusu used to proudly refer to Japanese Buddhism represented a self-conscious presentation of the Japanese model. His vision of an East Asian Buddhist fellowship that aimed at a "Japanization" of Buddhism, profoundly impacted Buddhism in the region, which ultimately led to a complex process of reception which included elements of both imposition and resistance that taken together can be seen as an important characteristic of modernity in East Asian Buddhism.

The Shinshū kyōshi *and Shinran*

Along with the establishment of the Meiji government, the various schools of Buddhism were officially recognized. At this time, the different schools were encouraged to produce easy-to-understand overviews of their school's history, doctrines, and rules. This was not only for the purpose of distinguishing among the different schools, but it was also necessary for expansion efforts. In 1876, Higashi Honganji founded its own editorial office which was responsible for planning publications pertaining to the school. The *Shinshū kyōshi* 真宗教旨 (The Essential Significance of the True Pure Land Teachings) was produced within this framework. This work, however, was not intended for Japanese readers, but as it was written in Chinese, it was in fact a pamphlet aimed at the Chinese. The author, of course, was Ogurusu. In August of the same year, the True Pure Land School, Honganji Sect Shanghai Branch Temple was established. The *Shinshū kyōshi* was distributed to the one thousand Chinese people who attended its opening ceremony, where Ogurusu reportedly lectured in Chinese. Needless to say, the *Shinshū kyōshi* was the first contact with Japanese Buddhist teachings for the Chinese present. Below, I will first introduce the content of the text, and then consider the relationship between the ideas presented there and those in the *Kyōgyōshinshō* 教行信証 by Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1262).

The *Shinshū kyōshi* is comprised of eleven chapters. The first chapter is entitled "Qizu" 七祖 (The Seven Patriarchs) in which the Seven Pure Land Patriarchs from Nāgārjuna (c. 150–250) to Genkū 源空 (1133–1212; more

commonly known as Hōnen 法然) are presented. In regards to the teachings of the Seven Patriarchs, the chapter shows which teachings were accepted and which were rejected in the True Pure Land School. For example, concerning Nāgārjuna it says "his teaching about the easy practice (*nianfo*) is transmitted with the True Pure Land School but his expositions on Huayan and Mādhyamika are not"; about the fifth patriarch, Shandao, it says "his teaching on the single-minded recitation of Amitābha's name is transmitted, but his teachings about holding to the precepts and meditation are not." In summary, there is an emphasis on rejecting the teachings of the Seven Patriarchs that seem to advance "self power" (*jiriki* 自力; Ch. *ziji*).

The second chapter is entitled "Chuandeng" 伝灯 (Transmission of the Torch). In this chapter the names of the fourteen schools of Japanese Buddhism are provided, after which the line of Dharma transmission—that is, from Shinran to the Meiji-period abbots Gonnyo 厳如 (1817–1894) and Gennyo—is presented, as well as a concise summary of their activities. In addition, a story is included that illustrates the True Pure Land School's acceptance of eating meat and marrying. This story is an anecdote about Shinran's marrying in response to Hōnen's recommendation to do so.

The third chapter is entitled "Jiaopan" 教判 (Classification of the Teachings). First of all, the teachings and scriptures of the Sagely Path (*shengdaomen* 聖道門; Jp. *shōdōmon*) and the Pure Land Path (*jingtumen* 浄土門; Jp. *jōdomon*) are explained, after which a summary of the True Pure Land School's Two-Pronged and Fourfold Classification of the Teaching (*nisō shijū kyōhan* 二双四重教判; Ch. *ershuang sichong jiaopan*) is presented. In particular, the Sagely Path is said to be the teaching of becoming a holy sage in this life, while the Pure Land teaching is one of being reborn in the Land of Ultimate Bliss.

In the fourth chapter the three periods of True Dharma, Imitation Dharma, and Latter Dharma are introduced, and it is impressed upon the reader that in the days of the Latter Law the Sagely Path is ineffectual, while only the Pure Land Path offers salvation. The fifth chapter is about the Four Dharmas (*shihō* 四法, Ch. *sifa*): teaching (*Wuliangshoujing* 無量寿経, hereafter *Sutra of Immeasurable Life*), practice (intoning the Buddha's name, or the seventeenth vow), faith (the three minds, or the eighteenth vow) and realization (the certain salvation of all, or the eleventh vow).

The sixth chapter is about the three vows, which refer to the eighteenth through the twentieth of the forty-eight vows that Amitābha Buddha made while he was still a bodhisattva as they are presented in the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life*. Shinran correlates these three vows with different Pure Lands,

Vow	Doctrine	Pure Land	Capacity	Scripture
Eighteenth Vow	True Teaching	True Reward Land	Rightly Settled	*Sutra of Immeasurable Life*
Nineteenth Vow	Expedient Teaching	Expedient Manifestation Land	Wrongly Settled	*Visualization Sutra*
Twentieth Vow	Expedient Teaching	Expedient Manifestation Land	Unsettled	*Amitābha Sutra*

Figure 1. Diagram of Shinran's correlation between vows, teaching, place of rebirth, capacity of sentient beings, and sutras

the capacities of sentient beings, and scriptures. His classification is diagrammatically expressed in figure 1.

The seventh chapter concerns the hidden (*on* 隠; Ch. *yin*) and apparent (*ken* 顕; Ch. *xian*). By means of the paradigm of the "hidden" and the "apparent," or the "front" and the "reverse" meanings, the assertion that the Three Pure Land Sutras share one meaning is expressed. In other words, the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life* is seen as the true teaching, where the "apparent" meaning is no different from the "hidden" one. In the *Guanwuliangshoujing* 観無量寿経 (Sutra on the Visualization of Infinite Life, hereafter, *Visualization Sutra*), the "apparent" teaching is practice of meditation, or visualization, while the "hidden" is said to be the visualization of the Buddha's primal vow. As for the *Amituojing* 阿弥陀経 (hereafter, *Amitābha Sutra*), the "apparent" is the expedient of the self-power *nenbutsu*, and the "hidden" is the true teaching (the other-power *nenbutsu*). That is to say, it teaches that the Three Pure Land Sutras are different on the surface, but are in accord with their practical insistence on the primal vow of other-power *nenbutsu*. This idea is expressed in the phrase: "although it was not taught in the ancient past, our patriarch Shinran was the first to teach this."

The eighth chapter is called "Benyuan chengming" 本願称名 (The Primal Vow and Recitation of the Name). It states that the ignorant person hears the eighteenth vow and develops faith in other power. The content of the chapter relates that by means of this, one attains rebirth in the Pure Land. Particular emphasis is placed on rebirth in the Pure Land for all who put faith in the primal vow and other power, regardless of whether one follows the precepts, is married or not, or whether they drink alcohol and eat meat.

The ninth chapter is on faith in other power. It details that one cannot attain rebirth in the true Pure Land by the *nenbutsu* alone, but only by faith

in the other-power *nenbutsu*, which itself is granted from other power. It is worth noting that many of Shinran's quotes are included, introduced by the phrase "the Patriarch says."

The tenth chapter is about the worldly truth (*sudi* 俗諦; Jp. *zokutai*). It expresses that in the True Pure Land School, the supreme truth is the teaching of faith in Amitābha while the worldly truth concerns mundane morality. The chapter also introduces in detail the content of the Confucian Five Relations (between father and son, ruler and minister, husband and wife, young and old, and compatriots) which are said to constitute the heart of the worldly truth. The emphasis of the chapter is placed on the teaching of loyalty and filial piety.

The eleventh chapter is called "Zhushi" 諸式 (Ceremonials). It introduces the fifty-eight different types of ceremonies, from the Jinki 晨起 (Ch. Chenqi) ceremony to the Wasanshiki 和讃式 (Ch. Hezanshi). Within the text it is explained that "the various ceremonies described above are directly transmitted after entering the order."[11]

The *Shinshū kyōshi* is a work under five thousand characters in length and is written in concise literary Chinese. In addition to introducing True Pure Land doctrines, it also promotes loyalty to the ruler and love of country, while at the same time placing a heavy emphasis on criticism of Chinese Buddhism and society. It is revealing that a central True Pure Land School teaching, *akunin shōki* 悪人正機 (evil ones are the benefactors of Amitābha's vow), is not clearly explained. Also, the crucial teaching of "faith as fundamental and the *nenbutsu* as an expression of gratitude" is explained, but it is merely presented as emphasizing the importance of faith. The text does not elucidate the unique True Pure Land teaching that faith is paramount and that the *nenbutsu* is neither a form of practice nor necessarily the cause for rebirth in the Pure Land.

In the *Shinshū kyōshi*, there is a strong emphasis on the importance of faith in patriotic matters, and it is also rigorously argued that patriotic action necessitates adjusting one's course of action according to the times. Also, considerable space is devoted to criticizing Chinese Buddhism and Chinese society. An example of one such criticism can be seen in the eighth chapter where Ogurusu describes monastics who reside in large monasteries and who are installed as high monks may appear to be engaged in good works but are actually seething with desire inside. He continues his scathing critique by adding that they merely wear fancy dress, sit on high seats,

[11] Chen 2003, pp. 206–16.

all the while acting in a pompous manner, deceiving not only others, but also themselves. The tenth chapter argues that such things as uncleanliness, foot binding, and the smoking of opium not only betray the teachings of Buddhism, but also those of Confucianism, and that the *nenbutsu* is the only way to remedy the situation. These observations were based on Ogurusu's own experience with Chinese Buddhism. And he held the conviction that the improvement of Chinese society and morals was connected to the spread of the True Pure Land School teachings.

Another characteristic of the text that deserves mentioning is that its organization is primarily based on Shinran's *Kyōgyōshinshō*. That is to say, the *Shinshū kyōshi* systematically summarizes the main points of the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, but differs significantly from other introductory works that were heavily influenced by the *Ofumi* 御文 (Letters) of Rennyo 蓮如 (1415–1499), such as the 1817 tract *Shinshū gohōhen* 真宗護法編 (On the Protection of the Dharma in True Pure Land Buddhism) by Kandō 観道 (1752–1822). The *Shinshū kyōshi*'s first chapter about the Seven Patriarchs is based on the *Shōshinge* 正信偈 (Verses on the Right Faith) which is found within the second chapter of the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, or "Gyō no maki" 行巻 (Chapter on Practice). The third chapter of the *Shinshū kyōshi*, on classification of the teachings is based on the third and sixth chapters of the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, those on faith and transformed Buddha bodies and lands, respectively. *Shinshū kyōshi*'s fourth chapter, on the three periods of Buddhist history, the sixth chapter on the three vows concerning sentient beings' rebirth, and the seventh chapter on the hidden and the apparent significance in the Three Pure Land Sutras, are all based on the themes from the chapter of the *Kyōgyōshinshō* on transformed Buddha bodies and lands. The four Dharmas taken up in the fifth chapter of the *Shinshū kyōshi* refer to the *kyō* 教 (teaching), *gyō* 行 (practice), *shin* 信 (faith), and *shō* 証 (realization) that Shinran designates as the theme in each of the first four chapters of the *Kyōgyōshinshō*. The eighth chapter, on the primal vow and recitation, and the ninth chapter, on faith in other power, are largely based on the "Practice" and "Faith" chapters of the *Kyōgyōshinshō*. The second chapter "Chuandeng" and the tenth chapter "Sudi" (Mundane Truth) contain parts that can be confirmed to have been inspired by the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, although fundamentally their content is based on developments in later True Pure Land thought. The various ceremonies described in the eleventh chapter, "Zhushi," are thought to have been standardized within the True Pure Land School in the early Meiji period. The section from the eighth to the tenth chapter is particularly long, occupying half of the work as a whole. That is

because this section contains the most idiosyncratic and difficult teachings of True Pure Land Buddhism, and Ogurusu must have anticipated resistance to these teachings, which needed to be presented as delicately as possible while making allowances for aspects of Chinese society. In the seventh and ninth chapters, the assertions about the hidden and apparent teachings in the Pure Land sutras and other-power faith are presented as the unique and creative ideas of Shinran. The work as a whole situates Shinran, the school founder, in an absolute position within True Pure Land faith and doctrine. This veneration of Shinran was later criticized by Chinese Buddhists as traducing Buddhism's founder, Śākyamuni. From this tension arose the conflict between faith in Shinran and faith in Śākyamuni.

What is True Buddhism?

The propagation of Japanese Buddhism in China was a reversal in roles and a first in the long history of Sino-Japanese relations, thus causing considerable repercussions in Chinese society. There were a signifcant number of Chinese Buddhists who actively associated with the True Pure Land School missionaries. There were even lay Chinese Buddhists who transcribed the *Shinshū kyōshi*. Yang Wenhui 楊文会 (1837–1911) was one such person. He established the Jinling Kejingchu 金陵刻経処 publication center in Nanjing and endeavored in ventures to publish the Buddhist canon. In 1881, through the introduction of a True Pure Land priest residing in Shanghai, while Yang was serving as a diplomat in London, he met Nanjō Bun'yū 南条文雄 (1849–1927) who was studying at Oxford University, and with whom he passionately discussed Buddhist studies and the future. From that time, the two became close friends, continuing to faithfully correspond over the next thirty years. During this period, through the offices of Nanjō, Yang was able to reintroduce over three hundred Buddhist scriptures that had already been lost in China. He set out to republish these at his publication office. These reintroduced works included the writings of Tanluan, Daochuo, and Shandao. With Japan's victory in the Sino-Japanese War, the True Pure Land School missionary activities in China were accelerated. In 1898 a True Pure Land priest who was in Nanjing requested that Yang publish a work on the Seven Patriarchs of the True Pure Land School. Through this occasion, Yang read Daochuo's *Anleji* 安楽集 (Collection of Passages on the Land of Peace and Bliss) and Hōnen's *Senjaku hongan nenbutsu shū* 選択本願念仏集 (Passages on the Selection of the *Nenbutsu* in the Primal Vow), through which he came to realize that much of the content of these works contradict the Buddhist scriptures. In addition, he reread the *Shinshū kyōshi*, confirm-

ing that it was contrary to his own Buddhist beliefs and understanding. From this point on, he embarked upon his criticism of Hōnen and Shinran. He not only wrote against the teachings of the *Senjaku hongan nenbutsu shū* and the *Shinshū kyōshi*, but he also attacked Ogurusu and other True Pure Land priests who objected to his criticism. There are ample resources that document this three-year debate, all of them of great interest.[12] Such an exchange was unprecedented in the long story of Chinese-Japanese Buddhist history, and something which was unavoidable in the process of Buddhist globalization. Through this episode, not only were the intellectual and doctrinal differences among Chinese and Japanese Buddhism laid apparent, but other essential questions, such as what constitutes true Buddhism, were brought to the fore. Contemporaneously in Europe, the discovery and study of texts in Pali and Sanskrit led to the quest to understand and present true Buddhism, and in Asia, where Chinese is the common scriptural language, it was not long before the same problem was faced by the Chinese and Japanese. The problem was presented differently, but the fundamental position of searching for the true face of Buddhism in the scriptures remained the same in both the East and the West. Certainly these two movements were not unconnected, and just as the meeting between Yang Wenhui and Nanjō Bun'yū symbolized, it was already the trend of the times to return to the scriptures, to the words of Śākyamuni. This aspect represents one more face of Buddhist modernity.

First, let us examine Yang Wenhui's treatment of the *Shinshū kyōshi*. One of his criticisms dealt with its first chapter which is on the Seven Pure Land Patriarchs. He took issue with the fact that the presentation deals with the thought of each patriarch only paying attention to their writings on the *nenbutsu*, to the exclusion of everything else. Yang indicated that this was a mistaken way of approaching Buddhism as it was fragmentary and partial, and required "discarding" other teachings. Concerning Shinran's views on marrying and eating meat as related in the second chapter, "Chuandeng," or transmission of the torch, Yang displayed a particularly negative opinion. He also took issue with the True Pure Land teaching that places the Pure Land Path and the Sagely Path in opposition, something that is not borne out in the scriptures. Yang argued that this presentation was fundamentally mistaken. Against the argument laid out in the fourth chapter which saw the Three Periods of True Dharma, Imitation Dharma, and Latter Dharma as a progression in linear time and asserted that the Sagely Path should be discarded because it was inappropriate in the period of Latter Dharma,

[12] Chen 2003, pp. 219–20.

Yang argued that the three periods exist simultaneously and that the Sagely Path is a necessary ingredient for rebirth in the Pure Land. In response to the fifth chapter, which describes the four Dharmas that structure the teachings in the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, he bluntly states that this entire chapter should be deleted completely. In the sixth chapter of the *Shinshū kyōshi*, the issues of the speed of realization of Buddhahood (sudden verses gradual awakening) and the capacities of sentient beings (whether rightly settled or wrongly settled) based on the teachings of the Three Pure Land Sutras are described in correlation with the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth vows that appear in the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life*. In response to this, Yang fervently asserts that discriminating in this manner traduces the scriptures, and that the *Visualization Sutra* and the *Amitābha Sutra* were not gradual teachings but rather teachings of perfect and sudden awakening. He further refutes Shinran's classification of the capacity of sentient beings into three types, saying that all beings born into the Pure Land are of the company of the rightly settled and that there is no such thing as birth there for beings belonging to the categories of wrongly settled or unsettled. Concerning the seventh chapter, "Yinxian" 隱顯, or "the hidden and apparent," Yang asserts that the *Visualization Sutra* clearly reveals the Land of Ultimate Bliss (or the Pure Land) and Amitābha's vows so that there is no need to distinguish between the "hidden" and "apparent" aspects of the teachings in this sutra. For the first time in Yang's work, he expresses agreement with the part of the eighth chapter that criticizes the state of Chinese Buddhism. Concerning the content of the ninth chapter "Tali xinxin" 他力信心, or "other-power faith," which discusses self power and other power, as well as the sharp distinction between rebirth in the Pure Land within an transitional womb state (for those who practiced self power) or a reward body (for those of other-power faith), Yang said that the eighteenth vow itself is self power, and that self power and other power existed in a non-divisible relationship. He also pointed out that in the nine types of birth in the Pure Land described in the *Visualization Sutra*, there are no sentient beings born in a transitional stage, but that all receive reward bodies. The tenth chapter on worldly truth, which discusses ethical practice, was criticized by Yang as convoluted and self-contradictory. In addition, Yang emphasized that the desire for enlightenment (*putixin* 菩提心; Jp. *bodaishin*)—deemed unnecessary by Hōnen—is a prerequisite for rebirth in the Pure Land. As for the eleventh chapter about True Pure Land ceremonies, Yang recommended that these rites be made public in all their details so as not to be confused with a heretical teaching.

In this way, Yang rebutted nearly all the assertions found in the *Shinshū kyōshi*. He and other Chinese Buddhists stringently criticized and thoroughly rejected the distinction between self power and other power made by the True Pure Land School, its understanding of the eighteenth vow, classification of the teachings, interpretation of the Three Pure Land Sutras, the distinction it makes between the nine types of rebirth described in the *Visualization Sutra* and rebirth by means of the *nenbutsu,* as well as all the other differences in Japanese Pure Land. Ogurusu could not idly accept these criticisms, so he in turn attempted to refute each one of Yang's objections. Thus, rebuttal invited rebuttal, and many ministers of the True Pure Land School joined the fray, which expanded into a major dispute that lasted three years.

Next, let us turn to one of the major themes in that debate: the confrontation between the participants' understanding of the position of Śākyamuni and Shinran. In a previous work, I summarized eight central issues of this conflict. They are: (1) fundamental differences between the basic stances of the participants (while the Chinese held to the ultimate non-distinction of all things, including the Buddhist teachings, the Japanese emphasized selection between distinct elements); (2) the relationship between the Sagely Path and the Pure Land Path; (3) the relationship between self power and other power; (4) the issue of the awakened mind; (5) the relation of the eighteenth vow to the other forty-eight vows; (6) the meaning of *nenbutsu* (recollection of the Buddha) and *shōmyō* 称名 (Ch. *chengming*; recitation of the name); (7) the problem of the nine types of rebirth in the *Visualization Sutra* and rebirth through the *nenbutsu*; (8) the issue of precepts.[13] These are all concrete doctrinal problems associated with Pure Land thought. It is beyond the scope of this paper to pursue each of them individually, so we will instead examine the modern characteristics of the debate, from the perspective of the roles of the scriptures and Shinran as the patriarch. One of the major points of contention between Ogurusu and Yang was the question of what would serve as the foundation when it came to assessing matters of doctrinal orthodoxy: would it be the scriptures or the words of Shinran? This was a point actively pursued by Yang, in response to which Ogurusu adopted a defensive posture.

First of all, Yang demanded the scriptural basis for the teaching of having to choose between the Sagely Path and the Pure Land Path. From his point of view, from Nāgārjuna all the way to Shandao, Pure Land was taught within the framework of the Sagely Path, thus the two were in no way in

[13] Chen 2003, pp. 260–62.

an opposing or exclusive relationship. The Pure Land Path was just one way within the Sagely Path. According to Yang, the true nature of this relationship can be described as "difference within sameness" and "sameness within difference." He also asserted that in no place in the scriptures does it say that one must choose one to the exclusion of the other. Yang's argument continued by saying that Hōnen and the True Pure Land School altered the meaning of the scriptures in order to make the sharp distinction between the Sagely Path and Pure Land Path in accordance with their school's teaching. Ogurusu responded to Yang's criticism by saying that, rather than seeking the basis in the scriptures, this school's assertion is based on the views of Daochuo and Hōnen.[14] In other words, Ogurusu advocated the validity of Hōnen's thought of "choosing" (*senjaku* 選択; Ch. *xuanze*) and "accepting [one] and disregarding [the other]" (*shusha* 取捨; Ch. *qushe*) from a hermeneutic standpoint.

On another front, their opposition regarding the issue of the True Pure Land School's classification of the teachings became increasingly heated. Yang adopted the tactic of attempting to debunk the entire True Pure Land School's classification of the teachings by attacking its view of the *Visualization Sutra* as a weak point. Namely, he argued that in the same way as the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life*, the *Visualization Sutra* is the true teaching (*zhenshijiao* 真実教; Jp. *shinjitsukyō*), and that both the individual (*ji* 機; Jp. *ki*) and the teaching (*jiao* 教; Jp. *kyō*) described there belong to the category of perfect, sudden awakening. He also refuted the True Pure Land School's teaching that only the eighteenth vow is necessary for rebirth in the Pure Land and the attainment of nirvana by asserting that this teaching is found nowhere throughout all the scriptures. In response to this, Ogurusu's counterargument went according to the following course of logic. He said that insofar as they distinguish themselves from other schools of Buddhism and interpret the Buddha's teachings according to their school's standpoint, it is no different from the other schools with their own systems of classification, and thus does not warrant censure. However, according to Yang, the teaching of choosing one path and discarding the other necessitates the fragmentation of the doctrinal framework laid out within a single scripture. For example, while Shinran considers the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life* to be the true teaching, he simultaneously advances that the practice of the three types of sentient beings born into the Pure Land described in that sutra is self power, and thus he disregards them. Also, Yang argued that as

[14] *Zhenzong jiaozhi yangbo yinzi ban* 真宗教旨陽駁陰資辨, included in the "Shiryōhen" 資料篇 (Resources) of Chen 2003, p. 613.

all forty-eight vows are true and have the same significance, to choose only the eighteenth vow as true and disregard the others as merely expedients is a mistaken view. He criticized these teachings by saying that they invite a biased and untrue reading of the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life*.[15]

In addition, Ogurusu and Yang also pursued the original meaning of the recitation of the Buddha's name (*chengming nianfo* 称名念仏; Jp. *shōmyō nenbutsu*). They argued regarding the meaning of *nian* 念 (Jp. *nen*)—whether it meant an oral recitation or to visualize the Buddha. Yang's position was that since both of these meanings are included within the Chinese Buddhist scriptures and to interpret it only as an oral recitation does not accord with those scriptures, the only way to ascertain the truth of the matter was to return to the original Sanskrit texts. In response, Ogurusu cited passages from the writings of Shandao as the foundation for his position, but Yang asserted that if that interpretation does not accord with the scriptures, there is no reason to follow Shandao.[16]

In a similar manner, the meaning of the terms "choose" (*shequ* 摂取; Jp. *sesshu*) and "select" (Ch. *xuanze*; Jp. *senjaku*) became a heated topic of debate. The contention of Ogurusu and the other representatives of the True Pure Land position was that "choose" as found in the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life* was interpreted as meaning Amitābha's choosing the eighteenth vow and the *nenbutsu* as the cause of birth, and furthermore, that "selecting" and "choosing" had the same meaning. In the *Kyōgyōshinshō* this is expressed as "chosen, selected primal vow" (*senjaku sesshu no hongan* 選択摂取の本願), which serves as the principal support for Shinran's teaching of other power. However, according to Yang's interpretation, "choosing" predominantly carries the meaning of "taking," and does not include the sense of "discarding" (*she* 捨; Jp. *sha*) a connotation emphasized by Hōnen and other Japanese Pure Land thinkers. On the other hand, from Yang's perspective, "selecting" expresses both meanings of "taking" and "discarding." Thus, for him, "choosing" and "selecting" have distinct meanings that should not be confused. In addition, Yang goes over the translation history of the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life* and argues that the fact that the term "select" (*xuanze*) used in the old translation was changed and became established as "choosing" (*shequ*) in the newer translations is evidence that this word choice correctly expresses the original meaning. He states that it is likely that his position will be borne out by the Sanskrit scriptures.[17]

[15] *Zhenzong jiaozhi yangbo yinzi ban*, Chen 2003, pp. 617–18.

[16] *Nianfo yuantong* 念仏円通, included in the "Shiryōhen" of Chen 2003, pp. 609–10.

[17] Ibid., pp. 601–3.

It is evident that this debate revolved around the difference of opinion about whether one places the foundation for faith on the scriptures or on the Pure Land patriarchs. Daochuo, who occupies such a central place in the doctrine of Hōnen and Shinran, was an object of Yang's criticism. For example, when discussing the eighteenth vow, he cites the passage from Daochuo that runs: "as it says in the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life*, even if one performs evil acts his whole life, at the end of his life if he recites my name ten times, if he is not born in the Pure Land I will not accept enlightenment." Yang points out that the phrase "even if one performs evil his whole life" does not appear in the *Sutra of Immeasurable Life*, and in fact is an addition by Daochuo. Yang therefore condemned Daochuo as freely interpreting the scriptures and starting a pernicious precedent. On this issue Yang pressed Ogurusu as to whether one should follow Daochuo or the scriptures themselves. In response, Ogurusu asserted that on the issue of the salvation of the evil man, even if Daochuo did add the six characters that refer to the performing of evil, from a philosophical perspective, following Daochuo is the same as following the scriptures.[18]

Yang's position as summarized by Ogurusu is that if Hōnen's *Senjaku hongan nenbutsu shū* and the *Shinshū kyōshi* go against the teachings of the scriptures, then the True Pure Land School cannot be considered to be "Śākyamuni's teaching" but rather "the teaching of Kurodani 黒谷," or Hōnen's teaching.[19] To Yang, the Pure Land patriarchs were figures that could be freely held up to questioning and investigation on a scriptural basis. For example, even with figures that Yang respected such as the Ming monks Yunqi Zhuhong 雲棲袾宏 (1535–1615) and Ouyi Zhixu 藕益智旭 (1599–1655) he adopted the same attitude. On the other hand, for Ogurusu, Shinran's teachings were absolute and not to be questioned, and furthermore, it was the interpretation of the scriptures of the Pure Land patriarchs based on Shinran's teachings that was the correct approach. Indeed, the central issue of the debate was the correct form of faith—whether it should be based on the teachings of Śākyamuni, or whether Śākyamuni's teachings should be subsumed within faith in Shinran.[20]

[18] *Nianfo yuantong*, Chen 2003, pp. 597–98.
[19] Ibid., p. 584.
[20] Sueki 2006, pp. 306–7.

Conclusion

It is no coincidence that the issue central to the debate was whether to return to the teachings of Śākyamuni or to consolidate faith around Shinran. This very issue is intimately connected with the experience of Buddhist modernism in both countries. Yang interpreted the state of Buddhism in China in the following way: in the modern world, which demands progress and reform, it is necessary for Chinese Buddhism, which has long been in decline, to flow with the current of reformation of the Dharma, for by not doing so China will not only become the laughingstock of its neighbors, but will be unable to avoid an eventual loss of sovereignty. To prevent this he saw it as incumbent to establish Buddhist schools where an education based on the principles of modern civilization and Buddhism ("Śākyamuni's true doctrine") should be implemented. By so doing, it was believed that Buddhism would be able to stand with the religions of the West and become a world religion.[21] Thus, Yang's position on Buddhist reform in China was that if it did not take the form of a reformation or preservation of the old ways, then it should be thought of as a "restoration." The meaning of "restoration" in this context is a revival of "the original teacher, Śākyamuni's bequeathed teachings." In addition to continuing his ceaseless publishing of Buddhist scriptures, Yang attempted to devise a doctrine that would unite the fragmented state of Chinese Buddhism. To these ends he founded a system of thought that he himself termed the "Aśvaghoṣa School" (*mamingzong* 馬鳴宗).[22] According to this system, which was based on the writings of Aśvaghoṣa and gleanings from Chinese Buddhist history, this school would serve as a synthesis of all of the teachings of Buddhism without assigning relative merit to them and thereby open up a way to make all of the teachings of the different schools eventuate in salvation. Yang especially emphasized that the Pure Land teachings should serve as the common basis for all of Buddhism. The framework for this common and comprehensive Buddhism became clearer through the debate with Ogurusu, eventually culminating in the creation of the Aśvaghoṣa School. This process illustrated the direction of modern Chinese Buddhism and exerted a strong influence on its subsequent history.

Japanese Buddhism, which from early in its history had developed along sectarian lines, became even more sectarian with the advent of the Meiji

[21] Zhou 2000, pp. 331–33.
[22] Ibid., p. 439.

Restoration and the official government recognition of the different schools. There was also a doctrinal restructuring of each school centered on their respective founders, which resulted in a cult of faith in the founder. The True Pure Land School was the earliest to sense the changing times and thus it restructured itself both institutionally and doctrinally around the founder, Shinran. Some of Ogurusu's activities during the early Meiji period, such as fighting to restore official use of the name "True Pure Land School" and petitioning the government to award the name "Great Teacher Seeing Truth" (Kenshin Daishi 見真大師) to Shinran, are indicative of this coalescing of faith around the founder. The *Shinshū kyōshi* was compiled against this background, and it is a summary and reconfiguration of Shinran's *Kyōgyōshinshō*. Also, in the various educational institutions established by the different schools, the courses in the subject of sectarian studies (*shūjō* 宗乗 or *shūgaku* 宗学) were created that revolved around introducing the school founder's doctrines and teachings. Actually, Ogurusu himself served as a teacher in such a school, and doubtlessly the numerous young priests who sided with him in the debate also studied at such schools. Just as it was earlier termed "The Kurodani Teaching" by Yang, the True Pure Land School came to be known as the "Shinran Teaching" which crossed over from Japan to China, where it sought to win over the Chinese populace. In this milieu, it is a natural course of events that it came into conflict with the universalist pretensions in Chinese Buddhism, represented by the term the "Teaching of Śākyamuni." The fact that both of these belief systems only became self-conscious reformulations in the modern era is worthy of attention.

The opposition did not stop there, however, but rather came to include issues such as the differences between Śākyamuni's renunciation and Shinran's self-proclaimed status as "neither monk nor layman," as well as what should be the nature of the relationship between Buddhism and the state. Within this dispute all sorts of doctrinal and political arguments were advanced, but the fundamental thread uniting it all was the question as to what constituted true Buddhism. Of course no definitive answer was offered, but it is safe to assume that the respective beliefs became even stronger.

Through contact with Japanese Buddhism, the teachings of Tanluan and Shandao were reintroduced and stirred the interest of Chinese Buddhists. Yang Wenhui himself came to strongly emphasize their teachings, a fact that cannot be considered outside of his contact with Ogurusu; in fact, it is the direct result of it.

(Translated by James Baskind)

REFERENCES

Chen Jidong 陳継東. 2001. "Ogurusu Kōchō to Honnen: Nicchū bukkyōsha no taiwa" 小栗栖香頂と本然：日中仏教者の対話. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 49, no. 2, pp. 836–39.

———. 2002a. "Kindai bukkyō no yoake: Shinmatsu, Meiji bukkyōkai no kōryū" 近代仏教の夜明け：清末・明治仏教界の交流. *Shisō* 思想 943, pp. 88–107.

———. 2002b. "Kindai ni okeru Nicchū bukkyō no saisekkin: Ogurusu Kōchō no Pekin nikki o chūshin toshite" 近代における日中仏教の再接近：小栗栖香頂の北京日記を中心として. *Kindai bukkyō* 近代仏教 9, pp. 52–71.

———. 2003. *Shinmatsu bukkyō no kenkyū: Yō Bunkai o chūshin toshite* 清末仏教の研究：楊文会を中心として. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

Kashiwahara Yūsen 柏原祐泉. 1975. "Meijiki shinshū no kaigai dendō" 明治期真宗の海外伝道. In *Bukkyō kenkyū ronshū* 仏教研究論集, ed. Hashimoto Hōkei Hakushi Taikan Kinen Bukkyō Kenkyū Ronshū Kankō Kai 橋本芳契博士退官記念仏教研究論集刊行会. Osaka: Seibundō. Reprinted in vol. 3 of *Shinshūshi bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 真宗史仏教史の研究 (Kindaihen 近代篇). Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 2000.

Ketelaar, James E. 1990. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and its Persecution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kiba Akeshi 木場明志. 1992. "Chūgoku ni okeru Shinshū Ōtaniha kaikyō" 中国における真宗大谷派開教. In *Ajia no kaikyō to kyōiku* アジアの開教と教育, vol. 3 of Ryūkoku daigaku bukkyō bunka kenkyū sōsho 龍谷大学仏教文化研究叢書, ed. Kojima Masaru 小島勝 and Kiba Akeshi. Kyoto: Ryūkoku Daigaku Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyūsho.

———. 1995. "Kindai ni okeru Nihon bukkyō no Ajia dendō" 近代における日本仏教のアジア伝道. In vol. 2 of *Nihon no bukkyō* 日本の仏教, ed. Nihon Bukkyō Kenkyūkai 日本仏教研究会. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Kitanishi Hiro 北西弘. 1994. "Meiji shoki ni okeru Higashi Honganji no Chūgoku kaikyō" 明治初期における東本願寺の中国開教. *Bukkyō daigaku sōgō kenkyūjo kiyō* 仏教大学総合研究所紀要 1, pp. 331–49.

Ogurusu Kōchō 小栗栖香頂. 1874. "Kyōbushō ni kengen itashitai kengen" 教部省に建言致度件々. In *Hasshū Pekin shojō* 八洲北京書状. Manuscript held by Myōshōji 妙正寺, Ōita, Ōita Prefecture, Japan.

———. 1893. *Shina kaikyō mikomi* 支那開教見込み. Excerpts from the letters of Ogurusu Kōchō, copied by Ogurusu Ken'ichi 小栗栖憲一, held at the Otani University Library.

———. 1899. *Bannen shigen* 晩年私言. Tokyo: Hakubundō.

———. 2008. *Pekin kiji* 北京紀事, ed. Chen Jidong 陳継東 and Chen Liwei 陳力衛. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.

Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士. 2006. *Nihon bukkyō no kanōsei* 日本仏教の可能性. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

Zhou Jizhi 周継旨, ed. 2000. *Yang Renshan quanji* 楊仁山全集. Hefei: Huangshan Shushe.