
Vol. 3: *Kindai to no kaiko* 近代との邂逅 [Encounter with the modern age]. 1973. 307 pp.+index. ¥1,200.

The first and second volumes in this series took up folk religion as a phenomenon forming the foundation of the religion of the Japanese people and considered the religious consciousness and religious rituals prior to their crystallization into particular forms of thought or institutions. The third volume, taking up from this point, comprises five essays concerned with the way religious thought and institutions have come into being within the current of modern and contemporary Japanese history (p. 305).

The title of this volume, "Encounter with the modern age," seems to have been chosen to show the orientation of these five essays. What is meant, then, by this expression? For present purposes, the conception of "religion and modernization" formulated by Suzuki Norihisa 鈴木範久, author of the fifth essay (esp. pp. 239-240), will be helpful. He states that there are three problem areas: first, the role of religion in the modernization of Japan, that is, whether religion has promoted or hindered modernization; second, the modernization of

REVIEWS

religion itself, or how religion has been forced to adapt itself to modernization in respect of doctrine, institutional organization, missionary work, etc.; and third, "counter-modernization" by committed religious people who assign a negative evaluation to modernization. Given this categorization, Suzuki's essay is particularly concerned with the third problem. The remaining essays focus on the second. The first problem, therefore, is not discussed at all in this volume. Moreover, whereas Suzuki qualifies the second problem, "modernization," as involving "economic, social, political, and spiritual" aspects, the authors of the remaining essays examine only the influences of political modernization on religion.

Though political modernization is generally taken to mean democratization, it is taken in this volume to mean the emergence of the modern imperial state. This type of national state, formed on the basis of economic modernization, that is, industrialization, was, as is well known, a political institution far removed from democracy.

The first essay, entitled "The separation of Buddhism from Shinto" and written by Tamamuro Fumio 圭室文雄, examines the relation between the imperial regime, Buddhism, and folk religion during the period of the Meiji Restoration. The second, "Shrine integration" by Kōmoto Mitsugi 孝本 貢, inquires into the relation between the imperial regime, village shrines, and folk religion in the late Meiji era. The third essay, "Veneration of 'heroic spirits' and the emperor system" by Ōhama Tetsuya 大濱徹也, deals with the relation between the imperial regime and institutionalized veneration of the spirits of fallen heroes (*eirei* 英靈), particularly during the Meiji era. Thus the first three essays, to put the matter another way, take up the question of the formation of State Shinto through studying these three important problems. The fourth essay, on the other hand, bearing the title "New religions" and written by Shimizu Masato 清水雅人, considers the relation between the imperial regime and newly arisen religious organizations. What is missing in this volume is a study of the relation between the imperial regime and Christianity. If Christianity in modern Japan had been discussed, some clues to the understanding not only of the second problem but also of the first might have been attained! It is true, however, that concentration on the second problem gives a certain uniqueness to this volume.

In the preceding paragraph I made repeated use of the expression "the relation between the imperial regime and..." for all the essays

show that with the exception of a few groups like Tenri Honmichi (pp. 206-207), which attempted to exercise influence on the regime from the side of religion, what we have to deal with is a one-sided history in which the imperial regime acted on religion. As a matter of convenience in the disposal of data, we frequently take the modern imperial state in its political dimension only, but the imperial state in its modern form is not merely a political principle or ideology but, proclaiming an authority alleged to have no equal, stands forth as itself a kind of religion. On this matter there is general agreement. Therein lies the necessity of religious control on the part of the imperial state.

Let us look at the several essays in more detail.

The first essay focuses on the policy of separating Buddhism and Shinto, a policy adopted by the Meiji Restoration regime that resulted in transferring from Buddhism to Shinto the status of state religion. Tamamuro, the author, first examines the Tenpō Reform of the Mito feudal domain, taking it as the fountainhead of the Meiji separation policy. He then analyzes the process by which the Meiji Restoration regime promoted the establishment of Shinto as the state religion, and finally describes the realities of the separation policy through a presentation of concrete cases as found in Ibaraki and Kanagawa prefectures. What is new and deserving of attention in this essay is Tamamuro's historical assessment of the religious reform as inaugurated by the Mito clan, but he does not offer sufficient proofs to support his assertion that it should be understood as the fountainhead of the separation policy. Thus, for example, the ideological background of the Mito Reform of shrines and temples, its continuation by the Meiji Restoration government, the backgrounds of the persons in and through whom both were joined, etc. are matters that call for clarification.

The second essay studies the formation of State Shinto at the village shrine level with particular reference to the matter of shrine integration. Kōmoto develops his arguments on the basis of two articles previously published by the present reviewer, supplemented by data from local records and newspapers. As the author of these articles, I could not help feeling that even though his arguments leave little room for criticism, Kōmoto was apparently unable to move beyond the original conceptual framework.

I found the third essay the most stimulating to read. The author begins by describing the establishment of the *shōkonsha* (a Shinto shrine dedicated to the spirits of the war dead) and the background to this development during the Restoration period. He then considers the transformation of the *shōkonsha* into Yasukuni Shrine, and of “loyal souls” (*chūkon* 忠魂) to “heroic spirits” (*eirei* 英靈), finally taking up the matter of state control over the enshrinement of heroic spirits and the structure of the Emperor Cult. Ōhama, well-known as the author of such useful works as *Nogi Maresuke* 乃木希典 and *Meiji no bohō* 明治の墓標 [Tombstone of the Meiji era], apparently found this one of his favorite themes, and offers us a characteristically versatile explication of data acquired in the course of exhaustive research.

The fourth essay has a tendency to become an introductory description, but it is well worth reading, for in it we occasionally come across observations unique to Shimizu, whose intellectual activities involve him in direct contact with the contemporary new religions. The author, after expressing his preference for the term “new religions” (*shin shūkyō* 新宗教), a value-free term, as over against “newly risen religions” (*shinkō shūkyō* 新興宗教), a term bound up with the image of base, pseudo-religions, proposes a distinction between “new religions” and “new religious movements.” He defines a “new religious movement” as one that seeks to reform an institutional parent religion, forming or reinterpreting doctrines and scriptures *vis-à-vis* an established religion. New religious movements are separation movements that split off from a mother body. They are exemplified by Honmon Butsuryūshū. “New religions,” on the other hand, are religions that have their own founders or are greatly transformed from established ones. Tenrikyō is cited as a typical example (p. 186). Some may disagree with this dichotomization, but it is unquestionably one way of categorizing the phenomena. Shimizu goes on to suggest that the term “new religion” be limited to groups that have come into existence since the founding of Ōmoto in 1892. Pre-1892 organizations, those founded in the late Tokugawa and Restoration periods, are considered precursors (p. 188). He holds that in its founding, a new religion owes much to the founder’s internal conditions, while its development depends greatly on external conditions such as social unrest. The development of the new religions he divides into four periods—the cluster of years on each side of 1920,

the bloc of years before and after 1935, and the two periods 1944-50 and 1960-70—making specific observations about each.

The four essays characterized above take the shrine, temple, or religious institution as the unit of observation and discuss it mainly in its relation to external conditions, particularly state control. The fifth essay, on the contrary, selects three men of religion who were free of institutional religious ties and traces their inner encounter with the modern age and the steps by which they sought to transcend it. The three are Uchimura Kanzō 内村鑑三, Kurata Hyakuzō 倉田百三, and Kamei Katsuichirō 亀井勝一郎. Relentlessly Suzuki pursues the development of their thought, showing that they were driven by anger against the “modern age” of Japan, a chaotic and egoistic age that followed from the importation of man-centered Western civilization forgetful of God.

It would be presumptuous to claim that everything unique about this volume has now been set forth, but space limitations require me to conclude this review with a few general observations. Since, as indicated above, the term “encounter with the modern age” is understood in this volume as the encounter of the modern imperial regime with religion, particularly state control of religion, it would have been better, in my view, to pursue this theme more intensively. Throwing light on the murky steps by which the state violated religious faith, on the arrogance, oppression, and tyranny of powers conceited enough to wish to control faith at will, indicating the kinds of resistance made by institutionalized and folk religions, people’s sense of betrayal, frustration, and submission to the powers that be—would not this have been the way to trace the encounter with the modern age? If this kind of problem-consciousness had been more to the fore, the author of the last essay would not have needed to express anxiety (p. 289) about the lack of balance between his essay and the preceding four.

MORIOKA Kiyomi

Professor of Sociology

Tokyo University of Education

Translated by NAKAMURA Kyōko