

KURITA Hidehiko

The Notion of *Shūyō* and Conceptualizing the Future of Religion at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

This article argues that the term *shūyō* was developed as a new conceptual category imbued with religious undertones, particularly in response to the views of Inoue Tetsujirō regarding the future of religion as expressed in his notion of “ethical religion” (*rinriteki shūkyō*), and specific critiques directed toward Inoue by contemporaneous religious reformers. There were two contradictory movements at the turn of the twentieth century: one that advocated the separation of “religion” and “education,” and the other that viewed religion as necessary to successfully construct an ethical education. It was in this dynamic that Inoue and other religious thinkers contemplated new possibilities for religion. Religious thinkers criticized the abstract nature of the “ethical religion” theory and attempted to construct a more practice-based form of “ethical religion” under the conceptual framework of *shūyō*, in which insights and ideals expressed by religious figures and founder figures, as well as concrete practices such as *zazen*, were emphasized. The notion of *shūyō* was used by various thinkers and had a wide range of influence in prewar Japan as a category that transcended the boundaries of “ethics” and “religion” and went beyond various forms of religion.

KEYWORDS: Inoue Tetsujirō—moral education—religious evolution—ethical religion—self cultivation—religious reformers

KURITA Hidehiko is a researcher at Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture and a JSPS Research Fellow. This work was supported by Japan Society for Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI Grant Number 15J12590.

A Survey of Previous Scholarship on Shūyō¹ and Remaining Issues

The purpose of this article is to examine the establishment of the notion of *shūyō* at the turn of the twentieth century by considering the connections it had to contemporaneous developments in the intellectual search for new forms of religion.

There has been notable research on *shūyō* theories by Kiyozawa Manshi 清沢満之 (1863–1903) and Nitobe Inazō 新渡戸稲造 (1862–1933), the youth organization (*seinen dan* 青年団) of Tazawa Yoshiharu 田澤義鋪 (1885–1944), and the *shūyō* organization (*shūyō dan* 修養団) of Hasunuma Monzō 蓮沼門三 (1882–1980) (see MIYAKAWA 1971; TAKEDA 1967; YASUTOMI 1994; SHIMAZONO 1997; TAKEDA 1964; MATSUMURA 1973; SEGAWA 2005). These studies analyzed the significance and limitations of the notion of *shūyō*, focusing on how they related to the construction of a modern self that was marked with independence and subjectivity. The critical successors to this form of study were studies that appraised discourses on *shūyō* as a form of peaceful ethics (*wagō rinri* 和合倫理) and harmonious thought (*chōwa shisō* 調和思想) (SHIMAZONO 1992; MORIKAMI 2004). There are also studies that analyzed popular views of *shūyō* thought as *shūyō*-ism (*shūyō shugi* 修養主義), presenting it as a Japanese form of “the capitalist spirit” (TSUTSUI 2009). While much focus has been placed on the relationship between *shūyō* and the modern period, due to too much emphasis on individual ideological movements and issues of modernization, there has been a tendency in scholarship to overlook broader historical shifts in *shūyō* discourse that neglect the vast constellation of other forms of ideological thought in the same period.

1. Studies in English have previously translated the term *shūyō* as “self-discipline” or “self-cultivation” and have emphasized that the term includes a specific Japanese nuance. Anthropologist Ruth BENEDICT, in the eleventh chapter of her book *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (1946), argued that it differed from the American idea of self-discipline in that it did not necessarily mean to imply “self-sacrifice” and “frustration,” but rather the ultimate liberation from the Japanese people’s own moral consciousness. She analyzed it from the anthropological viewpoint of “patterns of culture,” which has since often been the object of criticism by later scholars. By contrast, Janine Tasca SAWADA, in her book *Practical Pursuit* (2004), focused on the history of personal cultivation in nineteenth-century Japan, out of which *shūyō* discourse eventually appeared in modern Japan. In my article, rather than focus on its continuity, I consider the influence that social and institutional factors had on the transformation of self-cultivation in the modern period. In other words, I clarify how philosophies and practices of self-discipline or self-cultivation before the Meiji period were reconstructed in modern Japan, a period well-known for its promotion of “civilization.” The term *shūyō* is a key concept in this reconstruction.

In this regard, recent studies on the intellectual history of *shūyō* conducted since the beginning of the first decade of the twenty-first century have shown significant development. Wang Cheng 王成 conducted a detailed examination of Meiji period *shūyō* thought and clarified important transitions (WANG 2004). According to Wang, *shūyō* should not be understood in terms of classic Confucian moral philosophy (WANG 2004), but rather as a term that appeared in the early Meiji period that gestured toward self-cultivation and the making of the modern individual. However, after the Meiji 20s it started to be utilized as a term that could substitute or complement the formalized *shūshin kyōiku* 修身教育, a moral training education that emphasized loyalty and patriotism, and it was through this that the term took root as one that marked the advancement of an individual's spirit and character. After this, it was due to intellectuals who aimed to construct a new morality that *shūyō* came to be incorporated as a modern and new ethic ideal. Building upon Wang's work, Wasaki Kōtarō 和崎光太郎 focused on *shūyō* discourse after the Meiji 30s, and, through the lens of educational history, analyzed magazines such as *Kyōiku jiron* 教育時論, *Taiyō* 太陽, and *Chūgaku sekai* 中学世界 (WASAKI 2006; 2007). He concluded that the term *shūyō* functioned as a kind of "trump card" when criticizing existing forms of education as "formalized," "by rote," and "mechanical," and that it could be seen as the emergence of a critique toward the existing state of affairs, which eventually led to the New Education Movement of the Taishō period.

While I agree with the points made by these previous studies that have focused on intellectual history, it is problematic that there has yet to be a study that takes into account the context of religious history. Among those involved in *shūyō* discourse, many were religionists, and the influence of various religions on *shūyō* thought has been pointed out in previous studies. However, they have only been noted as individual cases or in a piecemeal manner, and there has yet to be a study that attempts to place *shūyō* discourse within the broader developments of religion in modern Japan. Specifically, movements seen in the Meiji 30s, when both Buddhist and Christian camps began to expound upon *shūyō* discourse, cannot be fully explained when the analysis is limited to an individual religion or only within the context of educational history. The modern period in Japan was a time when the conceptual categories of "Christianity," "Buddhism," and "Religion" were questioned and reconstructed (ISOMAE 2003; KETELAAR 1990; HOSHINO 2012a). As such, it is necessary to place *shūyō* discourse within the development of religious discourse of the modern period, and it is through this that we may start to see the more religious elements in the concept of *shūyō*.

With these points in mind, I will focus on the *shūyō* discourse of religionists and scholars of religion active in the Meiji 30s. I have employed three separate time frames to clarify the historical development of religious thought in modern Japan. The first period ranges from the Meiji Restoration (1868) to the issu-

ing of the Imperial Rescript on Education (1890). The second period continues from that point until the issuing of the permission for mixed residence (1899) and the prohibition order on religious education (August 1899), both connected to moves for treaty revision. The third period continues until 1905, just before the start of the *shūyō* boom (TAKEUCHI 1988, 176–77). At each juncture of these three time periods, there were debates on “Education and Religion” instigated by philosopher Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1856–1944) (SHIGETA 2007; 2008). As I will discuss in more detail below, it was in response to these debates that the framing and content of *shūyō* discourse took form.

1. *Shūyō in the First and Second Periods: Christianity, Independence, Morality*

The first appearance of the term *shūyō* in the modern period can be found in the 1871 (Meiji 4) publication of Nakamura Masano’s 中村正直 translation of Samuel Smiles’s *Self-Help*, the *Saikoku risshi hen* 西国立志編.² This book included specific examples of the conduct of well-recognized figures, and as it emphasized the importance of self-motivated efforts in achieving success, it gained a wide readership as a bible of early Meiji period careerism (MIKAWA 2009). Here, the term *shūyō* did not convey a specific form of knowledge that was to be gained by education through an institution, but rather was seen as a spiritual improvement that was nourished through one’s work within social surroundings and aimed toward achieving independence and success. This usage of the term *shūyō* is also seen in the discourse on women by Tokutomi Sohō 徳富蘇峰 that appeared in the first publication of *Kokumin no tomo* 国民之友 in 1887 (Meiji 20). He advocated women to nourish their basic spirit of “self-respect and self-love” through Christianity and to enter into society to participate in politics, referring to this as “religious *shūyō*,” “social *shūyō*,” and “political *shūyō*.”

The first period of *shūyō* can be viewed as a “*shūyō* of the independent mind,” in the same vein as the careerism of the early Meiji period. However, the term *shūyō* at this time did not have the cohesiveness to render it a concept.³ Until around Meiji 10, there was no consensus on the translation of the terms “religion” and “education” (ISOMAE 2003, 29–66; NIE 2013), and what Tanigawa Yutaka 谷川穰 has correctly referred to as the “period of teaching” (*kyō no jidai*

2. WANG (2004, 120–24). Although Wang does not address this, the term *shūyō* can be found in books on nourishing one’s life and health (*yōjō* 養生) from the early modern period, especially *Shūyōhen* 修養篇 (1662) by Noma Sanchiku 野間三竹 and *Yōjōkun* 養生訓 (1713) by Kaibara Ekiken. This is an interesting fact in relation to late Meiji notions of the cultivation of body and mind, but the notion of *shūyō* in early Meiji seems to have lost the meaning of *yōjō*.

3. WANG (2004, 122–24). Wang points out that the term *shūyō* was not in dictionaries during this time and that the first time it appeared in a dictionary was in the 1904 publication of *Shinpen kango jirin* 新編漢語辭林.

教の時代); it was a time when institutional overlap was seen between education (*kyōiku* 教育), edification (*kyōka* 教化), and religion (*shūkyō* 宗教) (TANIGAWA 2008, 6–10). Furthermore, Christianity was viewed as inseparable from the “civilization and enlightenment” (*bunmei kaika* 文明開化) that was being imported from the West and was understood as harmonious with scholarly learning and morality (HOSHINO 2012a, 24–44, 209–16). This understanding of Christianity can also be seen in the translator’s introduction to *Self-Help* written by Nakamura Masano in which he says, “The strength of Western countries comes from their people’s faith in Way of the Heavens (Christianity)” (SMILES 1859). In other words, the term *shūyō* was used in the context of Christianity, which was understood as inseparable from politics and morality, and was also closely associated with the notion that the independence of the individual would lead to the prosperity of the nation.

What caused this situation to shift were the first debates on “Education and Religion,” in other words, the debates on the clash between education and religion that appeared after the Incident of Disrespect by Uchimura Kanzō 内村鑑三 (SEKI 1893; INOUE 1893). At this time Inoue Tetsujirō, who had just taken a post as a professor at the Imperial University, argued that the monotheistic nature of Christianity was at odds with the basic purport of the Imperial Rescript on Education, which was “loyalty and filial piety” (*chūkō* 忠孝), and he viewed this as an opportunity to state that Christianity should be removed from education in schools.

Due to this provocation for debate that was initiated by Inoue, those within the Christian camp were pressured to find a way to express the social value of Christianity, while still affirming the importance of the Imperial Rescript on Education. Yokoi Tokio 横井時雄 (1857–1927) was one person who actively supported Uchimura’s position in this debate. He claimed that Christianity did not go against notions of loyalty and filial piety and argued that it is only after a *shūyō* of the “foundations of one’s mind-spirit” (*shinrei no konpon* 心靈の根本) that one is able to practice loyalty and filial piety. He claimed that the Christian church provided the “social meeting place for the *shūyō* of morals” (YOKOI and HARADA 1894, 26, 61–65).

Matsumura Kaiseki 松村介石 (1859–1939), in his *My Moral Education* (*Wagatō no tokuiku* 我党の徳育) published in 1893, also responded to the Uchimura Kanzō Incident. While praising the content of the Imperial Rescript on Education, Matsumura defends Uchimura’s actions by pointing out that he does not see anywhere in the Imperial Rescript on Education that specifically states that reverence or worship is required of its citizens, and argues that a “*shūyō* of practical morality” (*jitsu toku no shūyō* 実徳の修養) should be emphasized more than a show of respect as a formality. However, as for his proposed method, rather than relying on a religious education that only has an effect on the followers of a

specific tradition, he suggests a “normalized method of moral education” (*futsū no tokuiku hō* 普通の徳育法) that entails “spiritual lectures” (*seishin teki kōwa* 精神的講話) that teaches the conduct and words of saints from the East and West, and he encourages the teachers themselves to conduct *shūyō* and to act as the role model for students. With that said, the ideas he put forth were founded in Christian thought in that he viewed the ultimate goal of moral education to be in a “divinity” (*tendō* 天道) that transcended the matters of men (MATSU-MURA 1893, 1–10, 13–15).

As Wang and Wasaki have pointed out, *shūyō* in this period was a term used to imply a striving for an internal sense of morality that was in contraposition to formalism, and education in knowledge and practical techniques to get by in the world. The type of morality discussed in this period emphasized an internal virtue that was understood to supplement the virtues of “loyalty and filial piety” and were cut off from issues of social or political independence. In this sense, *shūyō* in this second period was a “*shūyō* of the virtuous mind” (*dōtoku shin no shūyo* 道德心の修養).

Matsumura Kaiseki went on to push forward the claims he made in *My Moral Education* and published the first *shūyō* text written by a religionist, the *Shūyō Record* (*Shūyō roku* 修養録) in 1899. As I will explain later, Yokoi Tokio also established the Teiyū Society (*Teiyū konwa kai* 丁酉懇話会), and continued to express the importance of an “ethical *shūyō*” (*rinri shūyō* 倫理修養) that transcended religious boundaries.

2. A Premonition of a New Form of “Religion”: Religious Reformation, Evolutions in Religion, and Ethical *Shūyō*

The first phase of the debates on “Education and Religion” had begun by the time of the second period. Order No. 12 of the Ministry of Education—which prohibited all schools, both private and public, from teaching religion in schools—had been promulgated and progress had been made in the institutionalization of the notion of “separation of education and religion” (HISAKI 1990, 80–81; HISAKI 1973–1976). It is in this period that the notion of religion, through its removal from the realm of politics and education, developed as a concept that was characterized by transcendence and internal faith (see HOSHINO 2012a). However, for those who continued to emphasize the importance of religion in educating citizens, they shifted their focus from education in schools to emphasizing the significance of religion within the realm of social education, and pushed to establish a form of teaching and practice that did not conflict with science and national morality. Furthermore, due to the issuing of permission for mixed residence (that is, the mixing of Japanese and foreigners), it was predicted that this would be the cause for religious chaos. While there were actions taken by some

groups that sought protection by the state, as seen in the “Movement for the Recognition of Buddhism as an Official Religion” (*Bukkyō kōnin kyō undō* 仏教公認教運動), there were also attempts to formulate a unifying religion. The second phase of the “Education and Religion” debates and the *shūyō* of the third period developed within the discussions regarding these religious reforms.

First I will clarify the developments of religious reforms. Specifically, I will look at both the activities of specific religious reformers in the various Buddhist schools and the writings and practices of academic scholars of religion who closely observed these developments.

1. THE REFORMIST RELIGIONISTS

From roughly the Meiji 20s, there were missionary efforts in Japan by a number of Christian denominations known as “New Theology” (*shin shingaku* 新神学), such as the General Evangelical Protestant Missionary Society (Fukyū Fukuon Kyōkai 普及福音教会), Unitarianism, and Universalism (SUZUKI 1979, 23–88). What these denominations shared in common was a liberal orientation through a reading of the Bible with the approach of higher criticism and a rationalization of traditional forms of authority and doctrine. As these liberal forms of interpretations allowed an understanding of Christianity that was fit for Japan (a “Japanese Christianity”), people mentioned above such as Yokoi Tokio and Matsumura Kaiseki, and Christians associated with Dōshisha such as Kanamori Michitomo 金森通倫 and Ebina Danjō 海老名弾正 were influenced by these teachings. It was also through a rejection of this movement that the evangelical stance of those such as Uemura Masahisa 植村正久 was formulated. In particular, due to the ideas in Unitarianism that rejected the trinity and the divine nature of Jesus, there were a number of notable converts from Buddhism, such as Saji Jitsunen 佐治実然, Hirai Kinza 平井金三 (YOSHINAGA and NOSAKI 2005), and Nakanishi Ushiro 中西牛郎 (1859–1930), who I will discuss in more detail in the next section.

Around the same time, there were also reform movements within Buddhist circles. The Shinshu Otani-ha reformist movements of the Shirakawa Group led by Kiyozawa Manshi and the *Seishin-shugi* 精神主義 associated with his religious circle *Kōkōdō* 浩々堂 is well known, but there were also movements for reform within the Shinshu Honganji-ha. Nakanishi Ushiro, who was both the assistant principle and professor at the Honganji-ha Daigakurin Bungakuryō (本願寺派大学林文学寮), advocated a series of reforms in Buddhism starting with his *Discourse on the Revolution of Religion* (*Shūkyō kakumei ron* 宗教革命論) in 1889, in which he expressed that in addition to an intellectual understanding of Buddhism, the teachings of Jesus should also be valued for his teachings on morality (HOSHINO 2012a, 112–30). His theories on reform called for further developments in the publication of Buddhist magazines and the Young Men’s Buddhist Associations at private schools, and received strong support from young Bud-

dhists (ŌTANI 2012). One of them was Furukawa Rōsen 古河老川, who established the *Keiikai* 経緯会 (that published the journal *Bukkyō*) and called for reforms that incorporated a trans-Buddhist perspective. Some members of the Shirakawa Group and Chikazumi Jōkan 近角常観 (1870–1941) (IWATA 2014; ŌMI 2014), who would later go on to establish the *Kyūdō gakusha* 求道学舎 that influenced many students and intellectuals, also joined the *Keiikai* group. In 1899, the *Keiikai* group disbanded, but most members reconvened to establish the *Bukkyō seito dōshi kai* 仏教清徒同志会 (in 1903, it was renamed *Shin bukkyōto dōshi kai* 新仏教清徒同志会, hereafter *Shin Bukkyō*, meaning New Buddhism).⁴ Katō Totsudō 加藤咄堂 (1870–1949), who would later become a prominent *shūyō* advocate, was an important member of *Shin Bukkyō*. *Shin Bukkyō* began the publication of a periodical of the same name, *Shin bukkyō*, that focused on themes such as a healthy form of religious faith, a search for freedom, an eradication of superstition, a rejection of institutions and rituals, and independence from political authority. The group sought to explore a new form of Buddhism and was involved in various forms of activities, also having links to Unitarian and socialist movements. Leading members such as Tanaka Jiroku 田中治六 and Sakaino Kōyō 境野黄洋 presented a teleological understanding of Buddhist thought based on the “phenomenon-as-reality” theory and in the periodical emphasized the importance of the *shūyō* of one’s character (HOSHINO 2012b, 430–37; TEDO 2000). The “phenomenon-as-reality” theory was a philosophical stance proposed by Inoue Tetsujirō that stated that the various forms of “phenomenon” in the world are in actuality the “reality” of equality and non-discrimination, and that the two are one and the same (INOUE 1900; WATABE 1998). This is the same notion that Inoue espoused in his article, “Thoughts on the Future of Religion” (*Shūkyō no shōrai ni kansuru iken* 宗教の将来に関する意見), which I will discuss in more detail later. It is for this reason that within the second phase of the “Education and Religion” debates, Inoue also expressed high expectations for the *Shin Bukkyō* group (*Critique*, 356).⁵

On the other hand, innovative individuals in Zen circles such as Imakita Kōsen 今北洪川 and Shaku Sōen 釈宗演 (1860–1919) had also begun proselytizing to intellectuals. In particular, Shaku Sōen is well known for his international activities at the World’s Parliament of Religions in Chicago (1893) and his proselytizing efforts in the U.S. (1905) (SHIN BUKKYŌ KENKYŪKAI, ed., 2012, 336–38; INOUE Zenjō 2000), but he was also active in trans-religious efforts. In 1896 (Meiji 29), Sōen suggested the establishment of the “Social Gathering for Religionists” (*Shūkyōka kondan kai* 宗教家懇談会), and became the

4. SHIN BUKKYŌ KENKYŪKAI, ed. (2012). Chikazumi, who held opposing views with regard to issues on the official recognition of Buddhism, did not take part in the *Shin Bukkyō* group.

5. See AKIYAMA (1902). Since I will be frequently quoting this text in this article, I have abbreviated it as (*Critique*, page number).

founder of the group along with Togawa Yasuie 戸川安宅 (chief editor of *Nihon Shūkyō* 日本宗教), Iwamoto Yoshiharu 巖本善治 (founder of *Jogaku zasshi* 女学雑誌), and Ōuchi Seiran 大内青巒 (founder of *Meikyō shin shi* 明教新誌). This group included innovative individuals from Shinto, Buddhist, and Christian circles, and there were also scholars of religion such as Kishimoto Nobuta 岸本能武太 (1866–1928, Unitarian) and Anesaki Masaharu 姉崎正治 (1873–1949). Katō Totsudō also served as the editorial director for the *Meikyō shin shi*. With regard to this social gathering, magazines such as *Hansei zasshi* (Buddhist) and *Fukuin shinpō* (Christian) wrote pieces that expressed high expectations in its potential to vitalize the study of comparative religions and even create a new form of religion.⁶ Anesaki, in his analysis of the motivations of group members, suggested that there were those who “hoped for the harmony and unification of differing religions” and those who viewed it as “a method to instigate a kind of religious ethical movement” and viewed Shaku Sōen, Katō Totsudō, and Matsumura Kaiseki as representing the former category and Yokoi and Matsumura as those in the latter category.⁷

Around this time, lay Buddhist and student of Sōen, Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (1870–1966), wrote *A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting* (*Seiza no susume* 静坐のすすめ, 1899) under the suggestion of Sōen. The intended audience for this book were young intellectual elites, and it stressed that the practice of zazen meditation as it appears in the *Manual of Zazen* (*Zazen gi* 坐禅儀) of the Rinzaï school can be utilized for nonreligious purposes—such as increasing concentration, the *shūyō* of one’s morals, and the relaxation of one’s mental state. Physiological and psychological thought is used for the basis of the claims he makes in this work, and by stating that similar forms of meditation can be found in Christian and Confucian practices, it attempts to universalize the practice of zazen. Furthermore, it suggests that the content of *koan* practice can be sought from the Bible or the *Analects*, and that it is not necessary for one to use a Zen meditation hall for practice. In this way, the book can be seen as a negation of the Zen tradition of the “transmission of Buddha’s Truth without words or writings” (*kyōge betsuden* 教外別伝) and “direct transmission from master to disciple” (*shishi sōshō* 師資相承), opening up zazen as a practice that could be followed by the general public (SHAKU and SUZUKI 1899).

6. See SUZUKI (1979, 232–49). The event was held for the second time in 1897.

7. See ANESAKI (1912, 576–87). With regard to those who held the position that hoped for “the harmony and unification of differing religions,” Ōuchi Seiran 大内青巒, Shibata Reiichi 柴田礼一, Togawa Yasuie 戸川安宅, Matsumura Kaiseki 松村介石, and Ebina Danjō are also listed (585).

2. SCHOLARS OF RELIGION AND “NEW RELIGION”

As seen above, scholars of religion had close interactions with innovative religionists and it is clear that these scholars had great interest in the religious movements of their time. This may be part of the reason why their writings on religious history were marked with a sense of practicality. For example, the religious studies scholar Katō Genchi 加藤玄智 (1873–1965) (SHIMAZONO 1995; SHIMAZONO, TAKAHASHI, and MAEKAWA 2004) was assertive in addressing contemporaneous issues in Japan in his publication *New Thoughts on Religion* (*Shūkyō shinron* 宗教新論) in 1900. While basing his own ideas on Cornelis Petrus Tiele’s notion of religious evolution, he provides his own thoughts on the Shin Bukkyō group and Unitarianism, saying that it is due to the freedom of thought as expressed in these teachings that they should no longer consider themselves to be Buddhist or Christian. He anticipates a “New Religion” with the following suggestion: “Is it not true that the spirit of this age is already preparing to establish a universal form of a New Religion that is far more vast and unbounded than the existing world religions?” (KATŌ 1900, 414–13). He also expressed a hope that a “religious genius” would appear as a leader of this movement.

In 1898 (Meiji 31), Anesaki was responsible for the “Religion” section of the extended volume of the magazine *Taiyō*, which was to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary since the transfer of the capital, and wrote about the religious history of Japan since the Meiji Restoration (ANESAKI 1898). Anesaki, who viewed the history of Japanese religions as a history of “inclusion and assimilation” (212), saw the religious history of the Meiji period as following the same pattern, but in condensed form. He concludes that through the growing proximity of various religions following the national unity advocated during the Russo-Japanese War, the Meiji 20s was a “period of testing for the potential for a New Religion” (213) and that there were high hopes for the birth of an inclusive “New Religion.” However, he also criticized that “the management of denominations and organizing sectarian doctrine are trivial matters” (214) and pointed to the “New Religions Movement” and “Ethical Culture Movement” of the West, presenting a vision of the future by saying, “As for our 2,000 years of inclusive religious history, after entering into the Meiji Era, it has taken on a calling on a national level and is riding the great wave of inclusiveness of the world” (214). The “Ethical Culture Movement” which he points to here most likely refers to the movement advocated by Felix Adler (1851–1933), who proposed the motto of “deed, not creed” and asserted that religion will evolve into an “ethical religion.” Adler’s activities for the salvation of humanity that began as a social reformist movement shifted its focus to the issue of education in 1895, which emphasized the formulation of an ethical character through one’s activities in the secular world (SHŌJI 2006). In this way, Anesaki’s vision of religious history was a prac-

tical plan that placed the Ethical Culture Movement as the next step that was to come after the “period of testing for the potential for a New Religion” (213).

In fact, Anesaki himself attempted to make his vision into reality through the establishment of the Teiyū Society (*Teiyū konwa kai* 丁酉懇話会) in 1897 (renamed as Teiyū Society for Ethics, *Teiyū rinri kai* 丁酉倫理会, in 1900). In the document of intent it clearly states, “What we call ethical *shūyō* is an expression of our hope and the issues we currently face. It is neither a dogma, nor is it clerical. It is not something we wish to indoctrinate to society. We simply wish to investigate deeply and broadly the fundamental issues of ethics together and, more specifically, we only hope to fully commit to and promote the *shūyō* and practice of a moral mind together with the youth” (UNKNOWN 1900, 5). In reality, the *Teiyū konwa kai* functioned much like an academic association, but in its rejection of religious doctrine and emphasis on the “*shūyō* and practice of the moral mind,” for Anesaki, it was a form of practice that had important implications for his vision of religious history.⁸ Katō Genchi also emphasized that the purpose of the *Teiyū konwa kai* was to eliminate superstitious thought found within Buddhism and Christianity in order to establish an ethical faith that could be seen as a kind of “new faith and religion” and a “movement of religious reform” (KATŌ 1901, 164–66). In other words, scholars of religion referenced theories on religious evolution in their conceptualization of the advent of an inclusive “New Religion,” while also taking specific means to prompt it to become a reality. It was in these developments that the term “*shūyō*” came to be connected with religious reform and the notion of “New Religion.”

3. Inoue Tetsujirō’s “Thoughts on the Future of Religion”

In his “Thoughts on the Future of Religion” (a lecture given in October 1899 and published in the December issue of *Tetsugaku zasshi*),⁹ which initiated the second phase of the “Education and Religion” debate, Inoue makes the following remarks:

In the present day and around the world, the time is approaching for some sort of change in the form of religion. The Societies for Ethical Culture¹⁰ that have

8. On Anesaki, see ISOMAE and FUKASAWA (2002). In Fukasawa’s “Anesaki Masaharu to kindai Nihon no ‘shūkyō mondai,’” included in this volume, he refers to Anesaki’s activities at this time as a “critical intervention” into the issues of religion (2002, 158). Anesaki’s vision of religious history and the *Teiyū rinri kai* were prime examples of this “critical intervention.”

9. In December, it was published in the *Kyōiku kōhō* 232 教育公報二二三号 and *Sonken ronbun shoshū* 巽軒論文初集, and in January and February of the following year, it was also printed as an ongoing series in the *Kyōiku jikken kai* 5, no. 2–3 教育実験界五卷二一三号. The same article was published in INOUE (1902), and I have used this version.

10. “Ethical culture” is translated here as *rinri teki shūren* 倫理的修練, which differs from Anesaki’s translation. It appears that the term *shūyō* was not yet the official translation of “culture.”

been appearing in Western nations are a clear sign of this. However, I feel that in our nation, the need for reform is even more urgent. There are various religions that have been able to coexist [in Japan], but there is still a tendency for each religion to teach their own doctrinal teachings, and the minds of the citizens are torn apart. (*Critique*, 27–28)

As can be seen here, there is a recognition of the movements of religious reform seen around the world, in particular of the rise of ethical culture, and while criticizing the current state of affairs in the religious world of Japan, he expresses a sense of anticipation for reform, a sentiment shared by Anesaki and Katō in their views on religious history. In the following section, I will focus on what has been called Inoue's "ethical religious theory," clarify in what way it reflects contemporaneous thought, and consider the reasons why it initiated a debate.

To begin with, Inoue viewed the separation of education and religion as inevitable, but expressed concern that this has caused the foundation of ethical education to be lost. According to Inoue, Confucianism and Buddhism were initially the source of ethical education, but due to the importation of Western academic practices, these teachings had become things of the past. However, he suggests that the mere knowledge one obtains through ethical studies is not enough to inspire internal motivation for ethical action (*Critique*, 3–5). It is from this awareness of the current issues that he comes to search for a common ground that is shared by the various religions, which can only be found through the removal of their specific characteristics. What was uncovered as common ground was the "concept of reality" (*jitsuzai no kannen* 实在の觀念). "Reality" itself cannot be described through language, but, Inoue claims, "it is the ultimate view of the world and life, and that all ethical principle originates from here" (*Critique*, 11). As for the concept of "reality," in various religions it has been expressed as "Brahman" (Bhramanism), "God" (Christianity), "Heaven" (Confucianism), "Tathāgata" or "Thusness" (Buddhism), and "Kami" (Shinto), but Inoue categorizes these terms as "personified," "universal," and "ethical." Among these, while reality as expressed in "personified" terms is seen in many religions, Inoue says that this cannot be accepted from the perspective of "scientific thought," such as the law of cause-and-effect and the nature of space. As for the "universal" understanding of reality that sees the world and reality as being one, not only is this not the predominant understanding in Christianity and Judaism, it is a mode of thought that comes out of philosophical reasoning and is not within the territory of religion. In comparison, Inoue sees the last category of "ethical" reality as an expression of the reality that exists within the spirit (*seishin* 精神) of each individual. According to Inoue, this is the only concept that is shared by all religions and poses no contradiction to scientific

thought. It is for this reason that he concludes that the value of religion does not lie in its preservation of a single worldview, but rather that it should “expound the unity of people and heaven, placing the essence of ethics within one’s mind” (*Critique*, 11–18).

In other words, when he speaks of “ethical religion,” what motivates a person to act in accordance with ethical behavior is not an external persuasion that considers the pros and cons based on self-interest, nor is it a set of ethical rules that is induced into an individual from the external world. Rather, when he says “within one’s mind,” Inoue suggests that this is the place where one can feel the place of “reality that is equal, non-discriminatory and transcends all experience.” This is also described as the “voice of the infinite Great Self” that precedes the “voice of the small self” that is based on individual desire (*Critique*, 19). This “voice of the Great Self,” while existing within the individual, simultaneously comes from a reality that goes beyond the individual. It is for this reason that when one follows the “voice of the Great Self,” the internal and external harmonize with each other, bringing a sense of fulfillment to the individual (*Critique*, 20). Inoue calls this “the greatest pleasure in life.” However, if one does not follow the “voice of the Great Self” and seeks the basis of one’s actions on external things, they will “become isolated in their solitude, move further into darkness from darkness, and in the end inevitably destroy themselves” (*Critique*, 22). In this way, in Inoue’s view of ethical religion, the internal salvation of an individual and the establishment of one’s ethical basis was an unmediated unity. When he says “the unity of people and heaven,” one could interpret this as the realm in which the ethical and religious are unified.

As seen above, in his pursuit of the essence of ethical education in which he attempted to remove the disparity in the doctrines, organizations, and practices among religions, he was able to construct something that went beyond the boundaries that divided various religions, and the categories of religion and ethics. This kind of religiosity that was marked with two levels of transcendence was also seen in Anesaki’s vision of religious history and his notion of ethical *shūyō*, and is reflective of contemporaneous intellectual culture. However, whereas Anesaki contained his ideas within the realm of “research,” Inoue, through his expression of a worldview understood through the notion of a “Great Self/small self”¹¹ and expounding on the “unity of people and heaven,” was able to present a more concrete example of what could be seen as a “New Religion.” However, when this comes to be viewed as “the *only* universal religion,” it has the potential to transform into a particular kind of theory that is capable of driving out all

11. Inoue was the first person to explicate on the “small self” as opposition to the “Great Self” (INOUE 1973, 34).

other religions. In fact, it is for this reason that his views became a catalyst for the second phase of the “Education and Religion” debates.

I would also like to add a little more about the limitations seen in Inoue’s notion of the “universal.” Inoue’s description of his vision of ethical religion as something that “governs each individual particle in the world” was in accordance with the broader trends seen around the world (*Critique*, 29), and in this sense, it could very well have been in direct conflict with *Nihonshugi* 日本主義 (“Japanism,” which emphasized the ideal of founding the Japanese nation for unifying the nation, rejecting not only Christianity, but also Buddhism as foreign religions) that was espoused by Takayama Chogyū 高山樗牛 and Kimura Takatarō 木村鷹太郎, which he himself praised just two years earlier. However, Inoue never confronted this issue and simply insisted that these two stances did not contradict each other. It could be said that while Inoue’s notion of the “universal” became the basis from which he could criticize various religions, it was also used as a means to seek harmony with the nation-state.

4. *The Aftereffects of the Ethical Religion Theory and the Third Period of Shūyō: Character, Internal Contemplation, and Zazen*

Many of the responses to the second phase of the “Education and Religion” debates appeared around the years of Meiji 32–34, and the major voices were compiled in the *Compilation of Critiques of Professor Sonken’s Theory of Ethical Religion* (*Sonken hakushi rinriteki shūkyōron hihiyōshū* 巽軒博士倫理的宗教論批評集). The focus of many of these criticisms were on the abstract nature of the theory of ethical religion and the lack of structure seen in Inoue’s attempt to unify the category of ethics and religion, but in particular, it was important for many religionists to defend the position of the concepts and practices of their tradition against Inoue’s assertions. For this reason, it was through these debates that the categories of “reality” and the “individual,” which were understood as unmediated in Inoue’s ethical religion theory, and the relationship between ethics and religion were reevaluated in an attempt to provide a more concrete structure.

In the following section, I will clarify the second phase of the “Religion and Education” debates and show how this relates to the development of the third period of *shūyō*. In particular, I will focus on Chikazumi Jōkan, Kiyozawa Man-shi, and Katō Totsudō 加藤咄堂 who were all involved in *shūyō* discourse in the early Meiji 30s.

1. “CHARACTER” AS THE GOAL OF SHŪYŌ

The rejection of the “personified” expression of reality posed a problem for those from Christian and Jōdo Shin circles, which emphasized the importance of a personified God and Amida Buddha. Inoue Enryō 井上円了 emphasized that an

expression that indicates a finite nature, in other words, a “personified” reality, was necessary as a “skillful means” to help those with limited qualities to comprehend the limitless.¹² Murakami Senshō 村上專精 explained that reality has little influential power unless it is viewed in the form of a personification, and Minami Hajime 三並良 argued that referring to reality as “ethical” is, in fact, personifying it. Maeda Chōta 前田長太 demonstrated that various philosophers, both ancient and present, accepted the personification of true reality, and Ebina Danjō stressed that the expression of true reality in the form of personification should be seen as the outcome of evolution. Tsunashima Ryōsen 綱島梁川 also expressed his critique by saying that an expression of reality that does not take the form of a personification will not be able to present an ideal form of ethics, as people would simply be unable to comprehend it (*Critique*, 106–23, 132–46, 179–89, 272–327).

However, it is important to note that these critics are not necessarily arguing for a personified reality that transcends the world, in the way that Inoue Tetsujirō rejected. For example, the personification of reality for Inoue Enryō and Murakami Senshō are merely “skillful means” (a method) and not considered to be in the realm of reality itself. This kind of mediation through the notion of “skillful means” was a point of emphasis for people like Enryō, but one could also imagine that an understanding of the function of skillful means as a way to reach another level of reality was a source of criticism as well. In fact, for Chikazumi Jōkan, who rejected a philosophical understanding of Buddhism and called for a more “practical form of religion” in 1900 (Meiji 30) (CHIKAZUMI 1900; ŌMI 2010), this was a problematic issue that he voiced:

The fact that the members of Shin Bukkyō cannot come to define a faith that is based on the fundamental meaning of a pantheistic doctrine, that Murakami, while claiming that the Buddha represents the ideal form, tries not to make prayers to it, that Professor Inoue Tetsujirō is exerting himself in his claim that the Great Self has no character, and yet is trying to hear its voice, that those of *Seishin-shugi* call “*nyorai, nyorai*” but in the end revert to a pantheistic *tathagata*, is because, in the end, this philosophical ontology has come to be seen as the center of religious thought. (CHIKAZUMI 1904, 18)

Chikazumi criticizes not only Murakami, but also the Shin Bukkyō group and Inoue Tetsujirō as falling into the problems associated with establishing a double nature of reality and suggested instead the importance of a “personified Buddha” (CHIKAZUMI 1904, 20–23). However, he also pointed out that this Buddha was one who “after resolving all of the issues of life, entered into the wondrous realm of the ultimate light” (CHIKAZUMI 1904, 85). In other words, for Chikazumi,

12. For a detailed analysis of Enryō’s thought, see HASEGAWA (2013).

the “personification” was not something that was formed simply to become an object of veneration, but was rather the very embodiment of the ideal law that people should strive for. For this reason, “faith” for Chikazumi is to “put everything one has into gazing into the spiritual light of the Buddha, to be resolute in removing defilement from one’s mind to march forward in following the right path,” and, on a daily basis, “to approach actual issues and to ask oneself whether there is not a single spot where the Buddha’s light has not reached” (CHIKAZUMI 1900, 105–106). For Chikazumi, this was the process in which one goes through *shūyō*. In other words, he took the double layer of “reality” and its “personification” and reconnected them with the notion of *shūyō*.

Perhaps it was due to these criticisms that Inoue Tetsujirō, in his article from the following year, recognized the necessity of a personified expression of reality for those who have not achieved a certain level of intellectual development (INOUE 1900, 437), and furthermore revised his thought by saying “there is a process of ethical development in that the small self transforms oneself for the better and strives to be like the Great Self.” In other words, “the unification of people and heaven” as immediately attained through religious experience and unmediated in the earlier version of this theory was now reinterpreted as a gradual process (INOUE 1908, 105). It is in this way that Inoue too came to speak of a *shūyō* theory that viewed the personification of the Four Saints (Confucius, Socrates, Shakyamuni, Christ) as the ideal models to which one should follow (INOUE 1915). Even Katō Totsudō, who advocated the *shūyō* of zazen, which I will explain in more detail later, advocated a “*shūyō* of one’s character” that took the “ideal harmonious character” (KATŌ Totsudō 1901, 45, 71) of Amida Buddha as its model. Later, Katō Genchi who went on to study Shinto, and attempted to read Shinto as a “*shūyō*-oriented faith in a personified figure” (MAEKAWA 2012, 89). In this way, the personified expression of true reality that was once rejected by Inoue Tetsujirō resurfaced as an important ideal through *shūyō* discourse.

2. SELF-REFLECTION AS A METHOD OF *SHŪYŌ*

Kiyozawa Manshi also developed his own criticisms toward the ethical religion theory, as he said, “it is entirely based on a *jiriki* (relying on self-power) attitude and does not have an inkling of *tarik*i (relying on other-power) attitude in it” (KIYOZAWA 1914, 674) and criticized it as ignoring the principle law of cause-and-effect and consideration of the Other. This critique can be said to be a clear example of a Buddhist thinker of the Shin school fully pushing forth their stance in *tarik*i faith. On the other hand, Kiyozawa was also a philosopher who, like Inoue Tetsujirō, took the stance of the “phenomenon-as-reality” theory (FUNAYAMA 1956; 1965). While it is clear that Kiyozawa was well aware of the fact that he emphasized the equality [of reality] far more than the distinc-

tions [of phenomenon] (SHIN BUKKYŌTO DŌSHIKAI, ed., 1903, 46), especially when compared to Shin Bukkyō who also followed the “phenomenon-as-reality” theory, it is clear that it was not his view that there was an ultimate being of reality that could be separated from the realm of phenomenon. It is for this reason that Kiyozawa recognized the correlation between ethics (the relationship between people) and religion (the relationship between people and reality) and said, “when one strives for individual perfection, one should wish to be ethical, and when one strives for ethical perfection, one should crave for religion,” and concludes that “if one is able to obtain a religious foundation, as an inevitable consequence they will come to understand that one’s ethical behavior toward others is of utmost importance” (KIYOZAWA 1914, 685). In his *shūyō jikan* 修養時感 published in 1903,¹³ he refers to this process as *shūyō*. Kiyozawa sees the most essential element of *shūyō* as “internal contemplation” (KIYOZAWA 1903, 18), which he views as a reflection on the decisions made within the mind that determine the actions of an individual. However, if one maintains the practice of self-reflection that is based on judgments of true/false or good/evil, one will eventually come to understand that there is a limitation to one’s own ethical practice and understanding. At the point where one becomes thoroughly conscious of one’s own limitations, there is a realization of “the absolute limitless” and once this is accepted, faith in “the absolute limitless” arises (KIYOZAWA 1903, 31–62). It is in this way that an individual is able to obtain an immovable peace of mind and, according to Kiyozawa, this becomes a concrete form of belief for *shūyō*.

In Kiyozawa’s *shūyō* discourse, one can see a double layer structure in which there is first a *shūyō* that moves from a striving for ethics to a striving for religion, and the second that is based on a firm religious foundation. However, these two are connected by a thorough self-reflection that reverts a negation of *jiriki* towards an affirmation of *tariki*. Kiyozawa criticized the unmediated nature of ethical religion theory and he was able to reevaluate the “limitless” realm and “limited” realm as connected through the process of *shūyō* without getting trapped into the problems associated with its dual structure.

3. ZAZEN AS A METHOD OF SHŪYŌ

By contrast, Katō Totsudō fully accepted Inoue Tetsujirō’s points and specified that the “religions of the future” (*shōrai no shūkyō* 将来の宗教) should have the following qualities: 1) be inclusive; 2) be ethical; 3) be secular; and 4) be scientific. He also suggested that while there was room for improvement in the category of the “scientific,” that the Zen school was the most well equipped in terms of the

13. The first appearance was in *Mujintō* 無尽灯 (Meiji 31–June, Meiji 34).

other three categories and went as far as to say that the Zen teachings could compensate for areas lacking in the current state of ethics, which he viewed as tending to overly emphasize knowledge. Furthermore, while evaluating highly the *shūyō* of one's character as expounded by Shaku Sōen, he proposes a *shūyō* based on "the zen practice of correct posture and concentration" as a method for the "actual practice of ethics," which he purported was "to listen to the voice of the Great Self and thoroughly observe the nature of the mind endowed in each individual, and to act rigorously within the current society" (*Critique*, 268–72). These points were also repeated in his publication *Noble Talks on Shūyō* (*Shūyō seiwa* 修養清話) in 1901.

Katō continued to develop his thoughts on zazen *shūyō* theory in his publication *Meditation Theory* (*Meisō ron* 冥想論) in 1905. In this work, he compiled a wide variety of examples from Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Theosophy, Quakers, mystics, Daoist saints, Shinto, and spiritualism to show that meditative practices were taught in various forms of religions that expounded upon the "sublime union of the divine and human" (*shinjin gōitsu no myō* 神人合一の妙). The purpose of presenting these forms of meditative practices was to provide a way one could "directly observe the truth" expressed by the phenomenon-as-reality theory, and to experience the "unification of the small self with the Great Self." In other words, it was an "ethical *shūyō*." Furthermore, rather than seeking the basis of his claim that "quiet sitting" was the ideal form of meditative practice in works such as *Yasen kanwa* 夜船閑話 by Hakuin Ekaku 白隠慧鶴, the fact that he sought to justify his position through the studies of "psychology" and "physiology" is an indication that he attempted to frame his work as "scientific." These theories of the relationship between body and mind led to an understanding of meditation as being effective for the *shūyō* of the diseased, with the claim that the *shūyō* of both mind and body would lead to a state of grounded peace (*anritsu no chi* 安立の地) (KATŌ 1905, 10, 24–33, 44, 68). In Katō's representative work, *Shūyōron* 修養論, published in 1909, the *shūyō* of both body and mind is also emphasized.

In this way, in his efforts to improve and disseminate Zen, Katō moved beyond the boundaries of Zen Buddhism and of the category of religion and changed his identity from a lay Buddhist to a *shūyō* thinker (SHIMAZONO 2003; OKADA 2012). He seemed aware of the risks in this shift (*Critique*, 270), and there was even a chance that he would be viewed as deviating away from his original stance of Zen. However, it is important to point out that a form of *shūyō* that attempted to go beyond the category of religion was formulated as an extension of Meiji period Buddhist reforms. After the appearance of Katō's *shūyō* discourse that incorporated zazen meditation, we see a trend in the notion of a "body-mind *shūyō*" that developed outside the context of any particular religion and received significant support by intellectuals. The "Okada Method of Quiet

Sitting” (*Okada shiki seiza hō* 岡田式静坐法) by Okada Torajirō 岡田虎二郎 and the “Method of Harmonizing the Breath and the Mind” (*sokushin chōwa hō* 息心調和法) by Fujita Reisai 藤田靈齋 are prime examples of this, with Kishimoto Nobuta 岸本能武太 becoming an ardent practitioner of the “Okada Method of Quiet Sitting” and Matsumura Kaiseki placing significant effort in spreading the “Method of Harmonizing the Breath and the Mind.” Also, Nitobe Inazō’s 新渡戸 稲造 *shūyō* theory on the practice of “silencing thought” (*mokushi* 黙思) for the “healthy development of body and mind” can also be seen as responding to this trend (NITOBE 1911, 4, 531–65). In this way, the notion of the *shūyō* of the body and mind can be understood as coming out of broader discourses on “New Religion” as it was discussed among intellectuals.

Conclusion

As illustrated above, it was through the two phases of the “Education and Religion” debates that involved both reformist religionists and scholars of religion that the general framework and content of the notion of *shūyō* took form. The term *shūyō* is an amalgamation of a multilayered discourse, and in this article I have illustrated merely one aspect of it by focusing on its relationship to broader contemporary trends in religious discourse. However, I believe I was able to clarify the context in which individuals from various religious groups in the Meiji 30s came to be involved in *shūyō* discourse and to illustrate the process in which the basic characteristics of *shūyō* were developed by religionists.

In the first period, the “*shūyō* for the establishment of an independent mind” (*jiritsu shin no shūyō* 自立心の修養) through religion connected to “civilization and enlightenment,” namely Christianity, was emphasized. In the second period, as a defensive response from attacks on Christianity that utilized the Imperial Rescript on Education, the discourse shifted to address an internal “*shūyō* for the virtuous mind” (*dōtoku shin no shūyō* 道徳心の修養). Finally, in the third period, Buddhists started to get more involved in *shūyō* discourse because by then it had become clear that all religions, and not only Christianity, would be subjected to the separation of education and religion. In this sense, the *shūyō* discourse of the Meiji 30s, far from being a response to some sort of existential crisis, was rather one that developed through a strategic articulation by religionists who were responding to contemporary issues related to ethical education. In this sense, the critique of religions that arose out of Inoue’s ethical religion theory became a catalyst that encouraged Buddhists to participate in this discourse.

Through the second phase of the “Education and Religion” debates, the focus shifted from a critique of the ethical religion theory to an emphasis on specific forms of practices and the development of “character.” At this juncture, the concept of *shūyō* was a convenient term that was used to encompass the various

forms of practices that could lead one to attain a state of ethical and religious union. After the first phase of the “Education and Religion” debates, the term *shūyō* came to be used to express the “*shūyō* for the virtuous mind,” and as it developed further through the Teiyū Society for Ethics, the term came to hold a nuance that suggested it went beyond the conceptual category of “religion” on multiple levels. It was in this way that the practices and concepts in various religions were reevaluated through the notion of *shūyō* in this period.

On the other hand, this process of reevaluation through *shūyō* also meant a recasting of the concepts and practices of various religions to fit within the framework of the “ethical religion theory.” The ideal “character” to which the various religions strove for was no longer one with religious implications, but rather was one who was able to embody the “ethical reality.” Practices such as *zazen* and internal contemplation were viewed as methods to obtain a state in which the ethical and religious were one. It was in this manner that theories on *shūyō* promulgated by religionists in the Meiji 30s—although varying in degree of emphasis—all shared fundamental characteristics in which it was viewed as a term that went beyond the category of “religion,” incorporated a hierarchy based on the theory of religious evolution, had a worldview based on the notion of “phenomenon-as-reality,” and held as its ideal form the union between the ethical and religious. Through *shūyō* discourse, these ideas were expressed with an emphasis on self-motivated practice (which is another way of saying it de-emphasized specialized and formalized doctrine and rituals), and a call for a harmony between the pursuit of the ideal and a practice grounded in reality. Furthermore, it was due to the nature of *shūyō* as a term that went beyond the category of “religion” that the practices and concepts associated with it were also able to develop outside the context of a particular religion. In this way, *shūyō* discourse developed and spread across Japan as a movement that went far beyond the boundaries of established religion (KURITA 2014).

It has been previously pointed out that “the concept of ‘ethical religion’ was never put into practice, and inevitably ended as a mere concept” (SEKIKAWA 1987, 10). However, while ethical religion was never put into practice institutionally, one could say that it was disseminated through various mediums within a cultural and intellectual framework. Through its various transformations, *shūyō* discourse functioned as one such medium.

REFERENCES

AKIYAMA Goan 秋山悟庵, ed.

1902 *Sonken hakushi rinriteki shūkyōron hihyōshū* 巽軒博士倫理の宗教論批評集.
Tokyo: Kinkōdō.

ANESAKI Masaharu 姉崎正治

1898 *Shūkyō* 宗教. *Taiyō* 4/9: 181–214.

1912 *Shūkyō to kyōiku* 宗教と教育. Tokyo: Hakubunkan.

BENEDICT, Ruth

1946 *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

CHIKAZUMI Jōkan 近角常観

1900 *Shinkō no yoreki* 信仰の余瀝. Tokyo: Dainihon Bukkyōto Dōmeikai.

1904 *Shinkō mondai* 信仰問題. Tokyo: Bunmeidō.

FUKASAWA Hidetaka 深澤英隆

2002 Anesaki Masaharu to kindai Nihon no “shūkyō mondai” 姉崎正治と近代日本の「宗教問題」. In ISOMAE and FUKASAWA, eds., 145–94.

FUNAYAMA Shin'ichi 船山信一

1956 *Nihon no kannenronja* 日本の観念論者. Tokyo: Eihōsha.

1965 *Zōho Meiji tetsugakushi kenkyū* 増補明治哲学史研究. Kyoto: Minerva Shobō.

HASEGAWA Takuya 長谷川琢哉

2013 Enryō to Tetsujirō: Dainiji “kyōiku to shūkyō no shōtotsu” ronsō o chūshin ni 円了と哲次郎—第二次「教育と宗教の衝突」論争を中心に. *Inoue Enryō sentā nenpō* 22: 23–49.

HISAKI Yukio 久木幸男

1973 *Kunrei 12 gō no shisō to genjitsu* (1) 訓令一二号の思想と現実 (1). *Yokohama Kokuritsu Daigaku kyōiku kiyō* 13: 1–23.

1974 *Kunrei 12 gō no shisō to genjitsu* (2). *Yokohama Kokuritsu Daigaku kyōiku kiyō* 14: 34–49.

1976 *Kunrei 12 gō no shisō to genjitsu* (3). *Yokohama Kokuritsu Daigaku kyōiku kiyō* 16: 69–90.

1990 *Kyōikushi no mado kara* 教育史の窓から. Tokyo: Daiichihōki Shuppan.

HOSHINO Seiji 星野靖二

2012a *Kindai Nihon no shūkyō gainen: Shūkyōsha no kotoba to kindai* 近代日本の宗教概念—宗教者の言葉と近代. Tokyo: Yūshisha.

2012b “Raise no umu” ni tsuite 『来世の有無』について. In *Supirichuaritī no shūkyō shi gekan* スピリチュアリテイの宗教史 (下巻), Tsuruoka Yoshio 鶴岡賀雄 and Fukasawa Hidetaka, eds., 419–46. Tokyo: Riton.

INOUE Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎

1893 *Kyōiku to shūkyō no shōtotsu* 教育と宗教の衝突. Tokyo: Keigyōsha.

1900 *Ninshiki to jitsuzai no kankei* 認識と実在の関係. In *Tetsugaku Sōsho*, vol. 2 哲学叢書第二集, ed. Inoue Tetsujirō, 307–438. Tokyo: Shūbunkaku.

1902 *Shūkyō no shōrai ni kansuru iken* 宗教の将来に関する意見. In AKIYAMA, ed., 1–30.

- 1908 *Rinri to shūkyō no kankei* 倫理と宗教の関係. Tokyo: Fuzanbō.
- 1915 *Jinkaku to shūyō* 人格と修養. Tokyo: Kōbundō.
- 1973 *Inoue Testujirō jiden* 井上哲次郎自伝. Tokyo: Fuzanbō.
- INOUE Zenjō 井上禅定
- 2000 *Shaku Sōen den: Zen o "ZEN" to tsutaeta Meiji no kōsō* 釈宗演伝—禪をZENと伝えた明治の高僧. Kyoto: Zenbunka Kenkyūjo.
- ISOMAE Jun'ichi 磯前順一
- 2003 *Kindai Nihon no shūkyō gensetsu to sono keifu* 近代日本の宗教言説とその系譜. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- ISOMAE Jun'ichi and FUKASAWA Hidetaka, eds.
- 2002 *Kindai Nihon ni okeru chishikijin to shūkyō: Anesaki Masaharu no kiseki* 近代日本における知識人と宗教—姉崎正治の軌跡. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan.
- IWATA Fumiaki 岩田文昭
- 2014 *Kindai Bukkyō to seinen: Chikazumi Jōkan to sono jidai* 近代仏教と青年—近角常観とその時代. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- KARAKI Junzō 唐木順三
- 1963 *Shinpan gendaishi e no kokoromi* 新版現代史への試み. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.
- KATŌ Genchi 加藤玄智
- 1900 *Shūkyō shinron* 宗教新論. Tokyo: Hakubunkan.
- 1901 *Shūkyō no shōrai* 宗教之将来. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- KATŌ Totsudō 加藤咄堂
- 1901 *Shūyō seiwa* 修養清話. Tokyo: Kōmeisha.
- 1905 *Meisōron* 冥想論. Tokyo: Tōadō.
- 1909 *Shūyōron* 修養論. Tokyo: Tōadō.
- KETELAAR, James Edward
- 1990 *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Published in Japanese as *Jakyō/junkyō no meiji: Haibutsu kishaku to kindai Bukkyō* 邪教／殉教の明治—廃仏毀釈と近代仏教. Trans. Okada Masahiko. Tokyo: Perikansha, 2006.)
- KIYOZAWA Manshi 清澤満之
- 1903 *Shūyō jikan* 修養時感. Tokyo: Morie Shoten.
- 1914 *Shūkyō to rinri to no sōkan* 宗教と倫理との相関. In *Kiyozawa zenshū 1* 清澤全集第一巻, ed. Kōkōdō 浩々洞, 668–87. Tokyo: Mugasanbō.
- KURITA Hidehiko 栗田英彦
- 2014 *Shinshū sōryō to Okadashiki seizahō* 真宗僧侶と岡田式静坐法. *Kindai Bukkyō* 21: 116–44.
- MAEKAWA Michiko 前川理子
- 2012 *Katō Genchi no Shintōron: Shūkyōgaku no risō to Tennōkyō no aida de*

(2) 加藤玄智の神道論—宗教学の理想と天皇教のあいだで(二). *Jinbungaku kenkyū johō* 47: 85–97.

MATSUMURA Kaiseki 松村介石

1893 *Wagatō no tokuiku* 我党の徳育. Tokyo: Keiseisha.

1899 *Shūyō roku* 修養録. Tokyo: Keiseisha.

MATSUMURA Ken'ichi 松村憲一

1973 *Kindai Nihon no kyōka seisaku to “shūyō” gainen: Hasunuma Monzō no “shūyōdan” katsudō* 近代日本の教化政策と「修養」概念—蓮沼門三の「修養団」活動. *Shakai kagaku tōkyū* 19/1: 1–26.

MIKAWA Tomohisa 三川智央

2009 “Saikoku risshi hen” wa dono yōni shite Meiji shoki no shakai ni hirogatta no ka 『西国立志編』はどのようにして明治初期の社会に広がったのか. *Ningen shakai kankyō kenkyū* 17: 69–81.

MIYAKAWA Tōru 宮川透

1971 *Kindai Nihon shakai shisōshi* II 近代日本社会思想史 II. Tokyo: Yūbikaku.

MORIKAMI Yūko 森上優子

2004 *Nitobe Inazō ni okeru “chōwa”*: “Shūyō” gainen o tegakari to shite 新渡戸稲造における「調和」—「修養」概念を手がかりとして. *Nihon shisōshi gaku* 36: 159–76.

NIE Chang-shun 聶長順

2013 *Chūnichikan ni okeru “kyōiku” no kindai ka* 中日間における「教育」の近代化. In *Higashi Ajia ni okeru gakugeishi no sōgō teki kenkyū no keizoku teki hatten no tame ni: Daisanjūikkai kokusai kenkyū shūkai* 東アジアにおける学芸史の総合的研究の継続的發展のために—第三一回国際研究集会, Suzuki Sadami 鈴木貞美 and Ryū Kenki 劉建輝, eds., 161–69. Kyoto: Kokusai Nihon Bunka Kenkyū Sentā.

NITOBÉ Inazō 新渡戸稲造

1911 *Shūyō* 修養. Tokyo: Jitsugyō no Nihonsha.

OKADA Masahiko 岡田正彦

2012 *Katō Totsudō to Bukkyō enzetsu: Kindai Nihon ni okeru “shūyōron” no keifu* 加藤咄堂と仏教演説—近代日本における「修養論」の系譜. In *SHIN BUKKYŌ KENKYŪKAI*, ed., 158–68.

ŌMI Toshihiro 碧海寿広

2010 *Tetsugaku kara taiken e: Chikazumi Jōkan no shūkyō shisō* 哲学から体験へ—近角常観の宗教思想. *Shūkyō kenkyū* 36/4: 75–100.

2014 *Kindai Bukkyō no naka no shinshū: Chikazumi Jōkan to kyūdōsha tachi* 近代仏教のなかの真宗—近角常観と求道者たち. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

ŌTANI Eiichi 大谷栄一

2012 *Kindai Bukkyō to iu shiza: Sensō, Asia, shakaishugi* 近代仏教という視座—戦争・アジア・社会主義. Tokyo: Perikansha.

SAWADA, Janine Tasca

- 2004 *Practical Pursuit: Religion, Politics, and Personal Cultivation in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

SEGAWA Dai 瀬川大

- 2005 “Shūyō” kenkyū no genzai 「修養」研究の現在. *Kenkyūshitsu kiyō* 31: 47–53.

SEKI Kōsaku 関臯作, ed.

- 1893 *Inoue hakase to Kirisutokyōto: Ichimei “kyōiku to shūkyō no shōtotsu” tenmatsu oyobi hyōron* 井上博士と基督教徒——一名「教育と宗教の衝突」顛末及評論. Tokyo: Tetsugaku Shoin.

SEKIKAWA Etsuo 関川悦雄

- 1987 “Kyōiku to shūkyō” dainiji ronsō: Rinri kan, ningen kan no tairitsu o chūshin ni 「教育と宗教」第二次論争—倫理観・人間観の対立を中心に. *Kyōikugaku zasshi* 21: 1–13.

SHAKU Sōen 釈宗演 and SUZUKI Daisetsu 鈴木大拙

- 1899 *Seiza no susume* 静坐のすすめ. Tokyo: Kōyūkan.

SHIGETA Shinji 繁田真爾

- 2007 1900 nen zengo Nihon ni okeru kokumin dōtokuron no ideorogī kōzō (1) 一九〇〇年前後日本における国民道徳論のイデオロギー構造(上). *Waseda Daigaku daigakuin bungaku kenkyūka kiyō* 53: 187–95.
- 2008 1900 nen zengo Nihon ni okeru kokumin dōtokuron no ideorogī kōzō (2) 一九〇〇年前後日本における国民道徳論のイデオロギー構造(下). *Waseda Daigaku daigakuin bungaku kenkyūka kiyō* 54: 173–84.

SHIMAZONO Susumu 島蘭進

- 1992 *Sukui to toku: Wagō rinri to sono kanata* 救いと徳—和合倫理とそのかなた. In *Sukui to toku: Shinshūkyō shinkōsha no seikatsu to shisō* 救いと徳—新宗教信仰者の生活と思想, ed. Shimazono Susumu, 9–86. Tokyo: Kōbundō.
- 1995 *Katō Genchi no shūkyōgaku-teki shintōgaku no keisei* 加藤玄智の宗教学的的神道学の形成. *Meiji seitoku kinen gakkai kiyō* 16: 71–93.
- 1997 *Kindai Nihon no shūyō shisō to bunmeikan* 近代日本の修養思想と文明観. In *Ajia no shūkyō to seishin bunka* アジアの宗教と精神文化, Wakimoto Tsuneya 脇本平也 and Tamaru Noriyoshi 田丸徳善, eds., 406–31. Tokyo: Shinyōsha.
- 2003 *Shiseigaku shiron* (2): *Katō Totsudō to shiseikan no ronjutsu* 死生学試論 (二) —加藤咄堂と死生観の論述. *Shiseigaku kenkyū* 2: 8–34.

SHIMAZONO Susumu 島蘭進, TAKAHASHI Hara 高橋原,

and MAEKAWA Michiko 前川理子

- 2004 *Kaisetsu* 解説. In *Katō Genchi shū*, vol. 9 加藤玄智集 第9巻, Shimazono Susumu, Takahashi Hara, and Maekawa Michiko, eds., 1–35. Tokyo: Kuresu Shuppan.

SHIN BUKKYŌ KENKYŪKAI 新佛教研究会, ed.

- 2012 *Kindai Nihon ni okeru chishikijin shūkyō undō no gensetsu kūkan: "Shin Bukkyō" no shisōshi, bunkashiteki kenkyū* 近代日本における知識人宗教運動の言説空間—『新佛教』の思想史・文化史的研究. Available online at: http://www.maizuru-ct.ac.jp/human/yosinaga/shinbukkyo_report.pdf
Heisei nijū-nijūsan nen do kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kiban (B) kenkyū seika hōkokusho.

SHIN BUKKYŌTO DŌSHIKAI 新仏教徒同志会, ed.

- 1903 *Shōrai no shūkyō* 将来之宗教. Tokyo: Shin Bukkyōto Dōshikai Shuppanbu.

SHŌJI Ippei 庄司一平

- 2006 Felix Adlerと宗教の倫理化運動. *Bunka* 70/1-2: 172-57.

SMILES, Samuel

- 1859 *Self Help: With Illustrations of Character and Conduct*. London: John Murray.
(Published in Japanese as *Saigoku rishi hen* 西国立志編, vols. 1-11. Trans. Nakamura Masanao 中村正直. Shizuoka: Hon'ya Ichizō, 1871.)

SUZUKI Norihisa 鈴木範久

- 1979 *Meiji shūkyō shichō no kenkyū* 明治宗教思潮の研究. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppan Kai.

TAKEDA Kiyoko 武田清子

- 1964 *Tennōsei shisō to kyōiku* 天皇制思想と教育. Tokyo: Mijitoshō.
1967 *Dochaku to haikyō* 土着と背教. Tokyo: Sinkyō Shuppansha.

TAKEUCHI Yō 竹内洋

- 1988 *Senbatsu shakai* 選抜社会. Tokyo: Media Factory.

TANIGAWA Yutaka 谷川穰

- 2008 *Meiji zenki no kyōiku, kyōka, Bukkyō* 明治前期の教育・教化・仏教. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan.

TEDO Kiyonobu 手戸聖伸

- 2000 "Shin Bukkyō" ni miru Bukkyōkai no kyōyōka 『新仏教』にみる仏教界の教養化. *Tokyō Daigaku shūkyōgaku nenpō* 18: 31-43.

TOKUTOMI Sohō 徳富蘇峰

- 1887 *Nihon fujinron* (2): *Seishinteki no shūyō* 日本婦人論 (第二) —精神的の修養. *Kokumin no tomo* 4: 9-16.

TSUTSUI Kiyotada 筒井清忠

- 2009 *Nihongata "kyōyō" no unmei: Rekishi shakaigakuteki kōsatsu* 日本型「教養」の運命—歴史社会学的考察. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

UNKNOWN

- 1900 *Teiyū rinrikai no ryakushi* 丁酉倫理会の略史. *Teiyū rinri kai kōenshū* 3: 1-8.

WANG Cheng 王成

- 2004 Kindai Nihon ni okeru “shūyō” gainen no seiritsu 近代日本における
〈修養〉概念の成立. *Nihon kenkyū* 20: 117–45.

WASAKI Kōtarō 和崎光太郎

- 2006 Seiki tenkanki ni okeru “shūyō” no henyō 世紀転換期における「修養」の
変容. *Kyōikushi fōramu* 5: 21–36.
2007 Seinenki jikokeisei gainen toshite no “shūyō” ron no tanjō 青年期自己形成
概念としての〈修養〉論の誕生. *Nihon no kyōikushi gaku* 50: 32–44.

WATABE Kiyoshi 渡部清

- 1998 Bukkyō tetsugakusha toshite no Hara Tanzan to “genshō soku jitsuzai-
ron” to no kankei 仏教哲学者としての原坦山と「現象即実在論」との関係.
Tetsugakuka kiyō 24: 89–113.

YAMADA Bimyō 山田美妙

- 1904 *Shinpen kango jirin* 新編漢語辞林. Tokyo: Aoki Sūzandō.

YASUTOMI Shin'ya 安富信哉

- 1994 Shinkō to jiritsu: Kiyozawa Manshi ni okeru “shūyō” no ichi 信仰と自律—
清澤満之における「修養」の位置. *Ōtani Gakuhō* 277: 18–33.

YOKOI Tokio 横井時雄 and HARADA Tasuku 原田助

- 1894 *Nihon no dōtoku to Kirisutokyō* 日本の道徳と基督教. Tokyo: Keiseisha.

YOSHINAGA Shin'ichi 吉永進一 and NOSAKI Kōichi 野崎晃市

- 2005 Hirai Kinza to Nihon no uniterianizumu 平井金三と日本のユニテリアニ
ズム. *Maizuru kōgyō kōtō senmon gakkō kiyō* 40: 124–33.

Translated by Eric H. Swanson

[Originally published in Japanese as: 明治三〇年代における「修養」概念と将来
の宗教の構想. 『宗教研究』89巻3, 471–94, 2015.]

DOI: https://doi.org/10.20716/rsjars.89.3_471