

D. T. Suzuki's Pre-war Views on *Shishi Wu'ai* and *Bodhicitta*

Visiting Researcher,
The Center for Shin Buddhist Studies, Japan
Makoto ITO

Abstract

Immediately after the end of the Asia-Pacific War, Suzuki Teitaro Daisetz (鈴木貞太郎, 大拙 1870–1966), a Japanese Zen scholar known for his extensive studies on the teachings and historical developments of Zen (Ch. *chan*, 禪) and for his prolific writings on Buddhism both in English and Japanese, presented a view of rebuilding the war-torn Japan into a newly democratic, egalitarian society by applying the Huayan idea of mutual non-obstruction of all individual things (Ch. *shishi wu'ai*, Jp. *jiji muge* 事事無礙) to the actual world. Inspired by Suzuki's post-war views, this essay discusses some of the key ideas that Suzuki consistently advocated in his pre-war and post-war studies on Huayan thought, often expressed with reference to the *shishi wu'ai* formula. As our main source of examination, we will mainly focus on *Essays on Zen Buddhism: Third Series* (published in English in 1934) in which Suzuki extensively discussed Huayan thought. Through this, the paper brings to attention Suzuki's view that the vision of *shishi wu'ai* should be taken as a fruit of spiritual insight rather than a metaphysical expression of reality and highlights his strong conviction in the power of each individual's aspiration to cherish the desire for enlightenment (*bodhicitta*) and the harboring of a Great loving heart (*mahākaruṇā*). In Suzuki's view, they form the basis of the *shishi wu'ai* world-view and are indispensable in addressing the pressing task to salvage all who are suffering in the harsh realities of the mundane world.

Keywords: D. T. Suzuki, *shishi wu'ai*, *Huayan sūtra*, *bodhicitta*, *mahākaruṇā*

Introduction

Suzuki Teitaro Daisetz (鈴木貞太郎, 大拙 1870–1966), popularly known as D. T. Suzuki or Suzuki Daisetz,¹ is known for his pioneering works in elucidating Zen thought to Western audiences through his publications and lectures in the English language. He was also influential in propagating Zen philosophy in pre-war, wartime, and post-war Japan. Suzuki practiced Zen meditation as a youth under the Rinzai School (Ch. *Linji zong* 臨濟宗) masters Imakita Kōsen (今北洪川, 1816–92) and Shaku Sōen (釋宗演, 1860–1919) and attained initial awakening (Ch. *jianxin*, Jp. *kenshō* 見性) in 1897 before moving to the United States to become a translator and writer at a publishing company based in La Salle, Illinois that dealt with writings on religion and spirituality. After his return to Japan in 1909, he first lectured at Gakushuin University (學習院大學) and Tokyo Imperial University (Tokyo Teikoku Daigaku 東京帝國大學), consequently taking up professorship at Shinshu Otani University (真宗大谷大學, presently Otani University 大谷大學) in Kyoto from 1921. After this, he began publishing a series of essays on Zen in English titled *Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series: 1927, Second Series: 1933, Third Series: 1934)* in which he discussed the *Huayan* sūtra together with the *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtras in the third series. He continued to teach and publish throughout his long career, spending several years abroad in the 1950s, most notably lecturing at Columbia University in New York (1952–57). After assuming professorship at Otani University, his research interests broadened to include Pure Land thought, perhaps owing in part to sustained interactions with fellow professors at Otani University affiliated with the Otani-ha sect of the Shin Buddhist School (Shinshu Otani-ha 真宗大谷派), a major Pure Land order in Japan. It seems that his interests in Pure Land thought grew stronger especially in his later years.²

¹ Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki follows the order of dharma name, first name, and family name which is the most popularly known form in the West. For other Japanese persons I will put the family name first followed by the dharma name (for monks and priests) or first name (for lay persons) based on the Japanese custom, hence Imakita Kōsen (今北洪川) and Takemura Makio (竹村牧男), for example. The romanization of Japanese names and terms will be based on the Hepburn system unless an alternative transliteration is available by those directly concerned, as in the cases of Otani University (大谷大學) and Shinshu Otani-ha (真宗大谷派), for example.

² Bandō 1993, pp. 36–38. Suzuki had already published a book on Pure Land thought and an English translation of a biography of the Shin Buddhist patriarch Shinran (親鸞, 1173–1262) together with the Otani-ha sect priest and Buddhist scholar Sasaki Gesshō (佐々木月樵, 1875–1926) in 1910 and 1911 while both were still residing in Tokyo (Bandō 1993, pp. 37–38). A brief chronology of the life of Suzuki can be found in Bandō 1993, pp. 120–126. For an extensive treatment of biographical and chronological facts on Suzuki, see Grace 2014. A brief summary of the phases of academic studies on Suzuki up to the present can be found in Sueki and Toda 2016.

It is interesting to see that shortly after the end of the Asia-Pacific War, Suzuki proposed rebuilding the political structure and society of Japan based on the Huayan formula of mutual non-obstruction of all individual things (Ch. *shishi wu'ai*, Jp. *jiji muge* 事事無礙, hereafter: *shishi wu'ai*). The concept of *shishi wu'ai* forms a part of the Huayan world-view theorized as the 'four dharma realms' (Ch. *sifajie*, Jp. *shi-hokkai* 四法界):³ the realm of individual things or the realm of actual phenomena (Ch. *shifajie*, Jp. *jihokkai* 事法界), the realm of principle which pervades all individual things (Ch. *lifajie*, Jp. *rihokkai* 理法界), the realm of non-obstructed interpenetration of principle and individual things (Ch. *lishi wu'ai fajie*, Jp. *riji muge hokkai* 理事無礙法界), and the realm of non-obstruction of all individual things (Ch. *shishi wu'ai fajie*, Jp. *jiji muge fajie* 事事無礙法界).⁴ In this paper, inspired by an essay by doctor Takemura Makio who discussed Suzuki's post-war agenda, I will put Suzuki's post-war views in a historical context by contrasting it with his pre-war views. Through this, we will find in the reading of the *Huayan sūtra* by Suzuki his consistent interest—albeit shifting in focus—in how one may be able to address, through the teachings found in the *Huayan sūtra*, the anxieties and pains of the people in the actual world we live in. Our main source of analyses will be Suzuki's *Essays in Zen Buddhism: Third Series*.

1. Suzuki's Post-war Discussion on *Shishi wu'ai*

1-1. *Shishi wu'ai* as a Key Concept in the Rebuilding of Japan

Dr. Takemura Makio (竹村牧男, 1948–), former president of Toyo University and a renowned researcher of Suzuki's life and thought, discussed in his 2018 paper "Daisetz' Huayan Studies" ("Daisetsu no Kegongaku", 〈大拙の華嚴學〉) how, in 1946, a year after Japan's defeat in the Asia-Pacific War, Suzuki envisaged applying the Huayan formula of *shishi wu'ai*, to his ideas on the reconstruction of Japan and her future contribution to world peace.⁵ Takemura acknowledges that the desire for enlightenment

³ Although the *shishi wu'ai* formula has often been regarded as the ultimate expression of Huayan thought, even as that of the *Huayan sūtra* itself, both in traditional and modern studies on Huayan, Ishii Kōsei has clarified that it was not necessarily regarded as an ultimate, highest truth at least among the early Huayan patriarchs Zhiyan (Jp. Chigon 智儼, 602–668), Fazang (Jp. Hōzō 法藏, 643–712), and Chengguan (Jp. Chōgan 澄觀, 738–839). See Ishii 1996. Suzuki, however, took a traditional view and understood *shishi wu'ai* to be the ultimate expression of an enlightened world-view expounded in the *Huayan sūtra* and which is consistent with the revelation of enlightenment in Zen as we can see from his writings on the topic.

⁴ See, for example, Chengguan's *Profound Mirror of Huayan Dharma Realm* (Ch. *Huayan fajie xuanjing*, Jp. *Kegon hokkai genkyō* 《華嚴法界玄鏡》, T45, No. 1883, 672c12–15, 21–28.

⁵ Takemura 2018. Suzuki's views in this regard are found in *The Construction of a Spiritual Japan*

(*bodhicitta*, Ch. *putixin*, Jp. *bodaishin* 菩提心) and the Great loving heart (*mahākaruṇā*, Ch. *dabei*, Jp. *daihi* 大悲) at its core are important factors in Suzuki's Huayan thought. However, he noted Suzuki's emphasis "on the other hand, of the thought and philosophical principles [Jp. *shisō/tetsuri* 思想／哲理] included in the *Huayan sūtra*"⁶ and focused his attention on Suzuki's post-war views on the *shishi wu'ai* formula. Takemura argued that the ancient Huayan formula formed the basis of Suzuki's view to establishing, in post-war Japan, a society where all individuals are fulfilled in the perfection of themselves while mutually respecting each other. Takemura writes:⁷

Daisetz...tried to put the logic of *shishi wu'ai* that it [=Huayan thought] discloses into practice and make it a reality in the actual society.... [Suzuki] says "hitherto the Japanese understood this [=shishi wu'ai] as a thought, but from now it must be realized in the practical aspects of collective life, namely, in the fields of politics, economy, and society respectively" (*The Main Purport of Buddhism*, p. 80) . During the wartime, Daisetz must have been deeply worried about the foolishness and the horrors of war that he seriously contemplated on the future of Japan and future of the world, searching earnestly for an ideal way to be....Severely criticizing the pre-war state-system, he envisaged a new social system true to humanity, founded on Huayan thought.⁸

Takemura notes that Suzuki emphasized that, in place of the pre-war and war-time nationalistic political state-system of Japan in which the emperor ruled over the people and forced them into servitude of self-sacrifice (Jp. *messhi hōkō* 滅私奉公), in post-war Japan, a new form of society must be established where every citizen each needs to play a leading role. Takemura points out that this view of a new society modeled on the Huayan idea of the dharma realm of mutual non-obstruction of all individual things (Ch. *shishi wu'ai fajie*, Jp. *jijimuge hokkai* 事事無礙法界) was neither a totalitarian nor an

(*Reiseiteki Nihon no Kensetsu* 《靈性的日本の建設》. Hereafter: *Construction*) (1946) and *The Main Purport of Buddhism (Bukkyo no Taii* 《佛教の大意》) (1947), the latter being based on a series of lectures given to Emperor Hirohito in 1946. According to Stefan Grace, the reason why Suzuki was called on to give a lecture to the emperor is unknown. In the two-day lecture, Suzuki discussed Great wisdom (大智) on the first day (April 23) and Great loving heart (大悲) on the second day (April 24). See Grace 2014, pp. 141–144.

⁶ Takemura 2018, p. 39.

⁷ All citations from non-English sources including Suzuki's writings given in this paper in English are my translation.

⁸ Takemura 2018, p. 41. Words in brackets in the citations are my addition throughout this paper.

individualistic vision of society and that it was envisioned as a form of society that must be realized for the sake of true human existence.⁹

Takemura further notes that Suzuki believed that at the basis of the people's mutual respect, there must exist something that transcends both oneself and others: Suzuki wrote that the idea of “also respecting others because one respects one's own value flows out from the realization that oneself and others both live within something larger than them both”.¹⁰ Takemura states that when we think about Suzuki's idea of “actually realizing Huayan thought especially in the fields of politics, economy, and society respectively, ... what is important is not to lose sight of the fact that at the core of it the Buddha's Great loving heart [*mahākaruṇā*, Ch. *dabei*, Jp. *daihi* 大悲] is at work”.¹¹ Takemura notes that Suzuki went as far as equating the Pure Land of Amitābha Buddha—the Buddha of infinite *mahākaruṇā*—with the Huayan notion of *dharmadhātu* (Ch. *fajie*, Jp. *hokkai* 法界). Takemura cites the following words of Suzuki:

...The *dharmadhātu* as grasped by spiritual intuition [Jp. *reiseiteki chokkaku* 靈性的直覺] means the Pure Land of Amitābha. And Amitābha is nothing other than each and every one of us. If we beat the *shishi wu'ai* into one totality, it becomes Amitābha, and if the Great loving heart of Amitābha is divided into the pearls that each and every individual things are [Jp. *koko-jiji no shinju* 個個事の真珠], we sentient beings will each be decorative ornaments [Jp. *shōgon* 莊嚴] of the Pure Land”.¹²

Although Suzuki's idea of interpreting *mahākaruṇā* as an attribute of something transcendent needs further consideration, his strong interest in bringing Huayan thought down to the level of actual social and national life through the formula of *shishi wu'ai* is significant as an attempt at finding a modern meaning in the *Huayan sūtra*. The concept

⁹ Takemura 2018, p. 42. Regarding Suzuki's view of society that was neither “totalitarian” nor “individualistic”, Alice Freeman offers a similar observation on Suzuki's immediate post-war standpoint in general when she notes that “Suzuki's vision for a “spiritual Japan,” which he had been formulating already during the war years, would seek to temper the potential excesses of Americanization, democratization, and mechanization of occupied Japan with a spirituality that was simultaneously Japanese and global, and yet avoided the pitfalls of the recently discredited Shinto ultranationalism” (Freeman 2022, pp. 200–201).

¹⁰ Takemura 2018, p. 42. The citation from Suzuki is from *Construction*, p. 138.

¹¹ Takemura 2018, p. 43.

¹² Takemura 2018, pp. 44–45. The citation from Suzuki is from *The Main Purport of Buddhism* (hereafter: *Main Purport*), p.111.

of unobstructed perfect interfusion (Ch. *yuanrong wu'ai*, Jp. *en'yū muge* 圓融無礙) of all things in an all-encompassing equilibrium of the *dharmadhātu* which the *shishi wu'ai* concept implies had been an object of both praise and criticism in discussions on Huayan thought in pre-war Japan from the Meiji period to early Showa. For example, the Buddhist scholar and philosopher Inoue Enryō (井上圓了, 1858–1919) was inspired by the idea of *shishi wu'ai* describing the infinite mutual relationship of all things to establish his theories of mutual inclusion (Jp. *sōgan ron* 相含論) and recurrent becoming (Jp. *junka setsu* 循化說), through which he sought to overcome the dualistic views of modern Western philosophy.¹³ However, such philosophical handling of Huayan thought was strongly criticized, together with their historical forebearers such as the Huayan doctrine of the ancient Chinese Huayan patriarch Fazang (Jp. Hōzō 法藏) centered on the concept of unobstructed perfect interfusion of all things, by later Otani-ha sect scholar priests such as Sasaki Gesshō (佐々木月樵) and Kaneko Daiei (金子大榮, 1881–1976). They were advocates of the influential Spiritual Movement (Jp. *Seishinshugi* 精神主義) established by Kiyozawa Manshi (清澤滿之, 1963–1909), which focused more on the inner angst of the modern religious person than on establishing a metaphysical view of the *dharmadhātu*.¹⁴ They saw the traditional interpretation of the *Huayan sūtra* centered on the concept of perfect interfusion of all things as being excessively philosophical, abstract, and removed from the actualities of everyday life full of anxieties and pain. Although Suzuki did not make direct references to their views, we may see Suzuki's post-war views on *shishi wu'ai* as a development, whether having being conscious or unconscious, of discussions on Huayan thought in pre-war Japan.¹⁵

1-2. Criticism Towards Suzuki's View

However, this attempt by Suzuki to apply the theory of *shishi wu'ai* to an effort of renewed nation-building with a global reach was severely criticized by Ichikawa Hakugen (市川白弦, 1902–86), a Rinzai School priest and social activist who lived through the tumultuous periods of trans-war Japan much like Suzuki.

¹³ Inoue 1909, 1917. I gave a brief presentation on Inoue's theories at the XIXth Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (IABS) hosted by Seoul University, South Korea, in August, 2022. An abstract can be found on p. 182 of the proceedings which can be downloaded at: https://iabsinfo.net/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/List_Of_Abstracts.pdf (last accessed: July 31, 2024).

¹⁴ Ito 2020a, 2020b, 2021.

¹⁵ Suzuki must have been aware of Sasaki's and Kaneko's critical views towards traditional Huayan thought as he was a close acquaintance of both men at Otani University, where Sasaki was a professor (1906–1924) and later president (1924–26), and Kaneko a professor (1916–28, 1941–49. Professor emeritus from 1951).

Ichikawa argued that the notion of the Huayan *dharmadhātu* is actually a transcendent spiritual vision (as Suzuki also acknowledged in his writings much to the same effect); an ideal to be envisioned in inner contemplation and not something that can be realized in any practical real-life sense in the form of a society or a state. Ichikawa argued that applying this spiritual idea of the *dharmadhātu* to the actual world may lead to an erroneous appraisal of the status quo, which could lead to neglecting the actual problems that our societies and cultures may have. Ichikawa cites a passage from an essay by Kamata Shigeo (鎌田茂雄, 1927–2001), a renowned Buddhist scholar and specialist on Zen and Huayan thought, in which Ichikawa found resonance with the point he was making:

Shishi wu'ai in its true sense develops upon religious intuition [Jp. *shūkyōteki chokkaku* 宗教的直覺]...If one forgets this point, and based on the [dualistic] distinguishing views of a common person [Jp. *bombu no fumbetsu* 凡夫の分別], one affirms the “things” [Ch. “*shi*”, Jp. “*ji*” 〈事〉] as they are and advocates their perfect interfusion [Ch. *yuan rong*, Jp. *en'yū* 圓融], it will become a completely different kind of thought. Phenomena can be regarded as absolute [only] when they are seen [through religious intuition] as forming one lotus-store world [Ch. *lianhua zang shijie*, Jp. *rengazō sekai* 蓮華藏世界]. If one ignores this and says that all phenomena have absolute significance, it would mean affirming the reality [around us] *per se*. With one mis-step, it would mean unconditionally affirming the actual structures of domination [Jp. *shihai-kōzō* 支配構造] and [current] social structures. A philosophy of absolute affirmation can become a fawning philosophy [Jp. *goyō tetsugaku* 御用哲學] which simply approves the reality [around us] and caters to the rulers.¹⁶

Ichikawa's warning is all the more significant, as in actual history, Huayan thought was often corrupted into nationalistic ideologies catering to the needs of the propagators of militaristic expansion of imperial rule over Asia, as Ishii Kosei has already shown.¹⁷

¹⁶ Ichikawa 1961, p. 334. The citation from Kamata is from Kamata 1960, p. 446.

¹⁷ Ishii 2007. Ishii discusses pre-war Huayan thought by thinkers such as Kametani Seikei (亀谷聖馨, 1858–1930) and Kihira Tadayoshi (紀平正美, 1874–1949). Ichikawa himself criticized the nationalistic renderings of Huayan thought in Takakusu Junjirō (高楠順次郎, 1866–1945) and Nishida Kitarō (西田幾多郎, 1870–1945), for example. More recently, Ando Reiji has criticized Nishida's view, noting that “Nishida, employing the [idea of] *dharma* realm of mutual non-obstruction of all individual things [= *shishi wu'ai fajie*, 事事無礙法界] and the metaphor of the [Jeweled] Net of

Although Ichikawa praised Suzuki's passionate and earnest effort as a Buddhist in re-assessing the *shishi wu'ai* formula and trying to present a new view on the ideal political structure of post-war Japan, he was critical on yet another point in Suzuki's post-war views on Huayan thought. Ichikawa pointed out that Suzuki, while envisioning the *shishi wu'ai* world-view as a model for a newly democratic Japan, still posited the emperor as a central linchpin of that web of human relations (although not as an absolute ruler positioned above the citizens like in pre-war and wartime ideologies).¹⁸

The *dharmadhātu* according to Suzuki's theory is purported to have a global nature, but could a logic and ethics that invariably positions a single human being belonging to a singular specific bloodline [Jp. *yui'itsu tokutei no kettō* 唯一特定の血統] ever be seen to have such global reach? ...Even if the position of the emperor is as in the theory of Suzuki [=central, and not placed above the people]...if one accepts imperial rule of some kind, and at the same time argues that such a system has a global nature, will not that logic harbor the potential to grow into a new form of the theory of “unification of the eight corners of the world under one roof” [Jp. *hakko ichi'u* 八紘一宇]?¹⁹

Ichikawa argued that if one thoroughly followed through with the idea of *shishi wu'ai* as Suzuki argued, there should be no logical foundation for even a “democratic” form of imperial rule (Jp. *ten'nō sei* 天皇制) to stand.²⁰

Indra of Huayan, gives a kind of affirmation to the concept of the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere [*Daitōa kyōeiken kōsō* 大東亞共榮圈構想]...Nishida claims that it is the Imperial Household that...takes central place in the co-prosperity sphere (the Net of Indra)...making it [=the Imperial Household] a privileged existence which reflects the image of Asian states positively and actively” (Andō 2020, p. 22).

¹⁸ Ichikawa 1961, pp. 325–327. Ichikawa cites Suzuki's view of *shishi wu'ai* and post-war Japanese political structure in detail from Dasietz's *Construction*, pp. 160–163 where Suzuki elaborates on his view, using a diagram, where the emperor is depicted as a central node in the infinite web of mutual inter-dependence of *shishi wu'ai*. For analyses of Suzuki's views and Ichikawa's criticism, see also Iijima 2020 and chapter 3 of Iijima 2021.

¹⁹ Ichikawa 1961, pp. 328–329. The concept of “unification of the eight corners of the world under one roof” (Jp. *hakko ichi'u* 八紘一宇) was a term coined by the Nichirenist activist and thinker Tanaka Chigaku (田中智學, 1861–1939) and became one of the key concepts in pre-war and war-time nationalist ideologies.

²⁰ Christopher Ives makes a similar observation on how Ichikawa viewed Suzuki's ideas on the *shishi wu'ai* world-view, together with his famous logic of “*soku-hi* (is/is not)” based on *Prajñāpāramitā* literature, could end up simply affirming the status quo, including imperial rule: “Ichikawa argues that this tendency was exacerbated by the “logic of *sokuhi*” and certain interpretations of Huayan (J. Kegon) Buddhist metaphysics, which obfuscated distinctions between the “is” and the “ought” and led Buddhist leaders and philosophers like Nishida to valorize actuality and certain particulars therein,

In summary, we can see that Ichikawa's criticisms towards Suzuki's post-war views on Huayan thought are twofold: Firstly, Suzuki's views can lead to an erroneous affirmation of the status quo as being equal to the spiritual reality of the *dharmadhātu* which the *shishi wu'ai* formula establishes, making Huayan thought a fawny politico-social philosophy catering to those in power; Secondly, Suzuki's idea of establishing a new democratic and egalitarian state and society in Japan according to the *shishi wu'ai* formula with the emperor as a central linchpin is contradictory and undemocratic.²¹ Both points need to be assessed if we are to advocate revisiting Suzuki's post-war views on Huayan thought as one having contemporary significance.

In this respect, while acknowledging the limitations and problems in Suzuki's views from historical and political perspectives, we may still seek to find important observations in his views on the *shishi wu'ai* formula and its world-view from the perspective of Huayan studies.²² It is significant to note that the idea of *mahākaruṇā* holds a central position in Suzuki's argument; it pins down the potentially lofty, idealistic, as well as politically controversial formula of *shishi wu'ai* to the harsh realities of sentient beings' life. The notion of *mahākaruṇā* is extensively discussed in his earlier writings on Huayan thought included in his *Essays on Zen Buddhism, Third series*, where he equates it with the desire towards enlightenment: *bodhicitta* (Ch. *putixin*, Jp. *bodaishin* 菩提心). The

whether the emperor or the imperial household." (Ives 2009, p.2). Ives gives a detailed analysis of the logic of *soku-hi* and its ramifications, in Nishida's philosophy for example, in chapter 2 of his book *Imperial-Way Zen*. It may be worth noting here that Suzuki's famous logic of *soku-hi* has been severely criticized by Okimoto Katsumi as a result of totally erroneous reading and interpretation of the *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā* sūtra, even calling Suzuki's views nonsensical (Okimoto 2017, pp. 250–251). However, the interplay of the concept of *shishi wu'ai* and the logic of *soku-hi* is still often highly evaluated as Suzuki's profound original insight (see, for example, Andō 2018, chapter 6, especially pp. 242–252, for one of the latest views on Suzuki's thought in this respect). I find Okimoto's criticism towards Suzuki's logic of *soku-hi* more reasonable.

²¹ Iijima has noted on the ambivalent nature of the *shishi wu'ai* world-view, which allows for both a democratic and a reactionary interpretation, in his discussion on Kihira Tadayoshi and Ichikawa Hakugen. See Iijima 2020, pp. 359–366. A related point of interest is the question of how we may evaluate Suzuki's trans-war positions and views regarding Japan's war efforts and related war-time ideologies. Alice Freeman notes that the interpretations of Suzuki are "somewhat polarized between those who regard him as having endorsed Japanese militarism and those who contend that he sought to resist it" (Freeman 2022, p. 204). Freeman mentions that Bernard Faure, Robert H. Sharf, and Victoria [Daizen] take the former view, while Kirita Kiyohide and John Maraldo take the latter (Freeman 2022, pp. 220–221, fn. 27).

²² This is not to say that historical assessment of Suzuki's socio-political views in connection with war-time ideologies is unimportant; rather, having acknowledged the significance of the points made from such a perspective by previous thinkers from Ichikawa to modern day scholars such as Ishii and Iijima, this paper seeks to examine the significance of Suzuki's views from the perspective of Huayan bodhisattvahood and tries to find their relevance in the modern world as in the case of Takemura's discussion.

focus on *mahākaruṇā* and *bodhicitta* and his keen eye towards the sufferings of sentient beings in the realities of this deluded world is a core element which pierces through his pre-war, war-time, and post-war views on Huayan thought. Although it may be possible to make a distinction between his ideas on *bodhicitta* and *mahākaruṇā* as being more religious and soteriological and his ideas on *shishi wu'ai* as being more practically socio-philosophical, we should take note of the consistency, with *bodhicitta* and *mahākaruṇā* being the cornerstones of the *shishi wu'ai* world-view, in Suzuki's strong concern towards the sufferings and pain in the real world. Next, we will examine Suzuki's ideas on *shishi wu'ai* in connection with *bodhicitta* and *mahākaruṇā* in his pre-war views on Huayan thought.

2. Focus on *Bodhicitta* and the Sufferings of Sentient Beings in Suzuki's Pre-war Huayan Thought

2-1. An Overview of *Essays in Zen Buddhism, Third Series*

Suzuki published a series of essays in English discussing the core ideas of the *Huayan sūtra* in 1934 as a part of *Essays in Zen Buddhism, Third Series* (hereafter: *EZB3*).²³ Suzuki writes that “in this Third Series of *Zen Essays* I have tried to trace the relationship which exists between Zen and the two chief Mahāyāna sūtras, the *Gaṇḍavyūha* and the *Prajñāpāramitā*, and then the transformation through which Indian Buddhism had to go while adapting itself to Chinese psychology”.²⁴ We can see that his interest was in exploring the interactions between the two major Mahāyāna sūtras and Chinese and Japanese Zen. Concerning the interaction between the *Huayan sūtra* and Zen, he writes that “the method of Zen differs from that of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, but as both agree in spirit, the one will prove complementary to the other when we endeavor to study Buddhism comprehensively as it has developed in the Far East”.²⁵ Our interest in this paper, however, is in Suzuki's interpretation of the core ideas he found in the *Huayan sūtra*.

²³ In the *First Series* (1927), Suzuki discussed the early history of Zen in China, enlightenment and meditation in Zen, and comments on the Ten Cow Pictures (Ch. *shiniu*, Jp. *jiggyūzu* 十牛圖); in the *Second Series*, he discussed the *koan* (Ch. *gong'an* 公案), some major Zen texts such as the *Wumenguan* (Jp. *Mumonkan* 《無門關》) and touched upon Pure Land teachings and *nembutsu* (Ch. *nian fo* 念佛).

²⁴ *EZB3*, p. 3. This is from the Preface to the 1953 edition. For different editions of *EZB*, see the list of reference sources at the end of this paper.

²⁵ *EZB3*, p. 90.

EZB3 consists of eight chapters:

- I. From Zen to the *Gaṇḍavyūha*
- II. The *Gaṇḍavyūha*, the Bodhisattva-ideal, and the Buddha
- III. The Bodhisattva's Abode
- IV. The Desire for Enlightenment
- V. The Significance of the *Prajñāpāramitā-Hṛdaya* Sūtra in Zen Buddhism
- VI. The Philosophy and Religion of the *Prajñāpāramitā*
- VII. Buddhist, Especially Zen, Contributions to Japanese Culture
- VIII. The Zen Life in Pictures

Chapters I–IV concern the *Huayan* sūtra, V and VI the *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtras, VII is based on a series of lectures given in Kyoto in 1931 and discusses Zen culture through ink paintings, haiku poetry, swordsmanship, and tea,²⁶ and VIII is a brief and somewhat unfocused reflection on Zen art meant as a guide for the readers to appreciate the various illustrations included in the volume. The sources for our examination will be focused on the chapters in which Suzuki discusses the *Huayan* sūtra.

In the first four chapters discussing the *Huayan* sūtra, Suzuki focused mainly on the final chapter of the *Huayan* sūtra, “Chapter on Entry into the *Dharmadhātu*” (Ch. *Ru fajie pin*, Jp. *Nyū-hokkai-hon* 〈入法界品〉, hereafter: “Chapter on Entry”) and emphasized the idea of *bodhicitta* as being the core concept, not only of the *Huayan* sūtra but of Mahāyāna Buddhism itself. This is not necessarily a unique approach as both Sasaki Gesshō and Kaneko Daiei had also acknowledged earlier the significance of the bodhisattva path (Ch. *pusa dao*, Jp. *bosatsu-dō* 菩薩道) beginning with *bodhicitta* by emphasizing the role of the same chapter.²⁷ It is significant to note, however, that Suzuki's discussion is based not only on his criticism of excessive theorizing and abstraction in

²⁶ As Suzuki wrote in the Preface to the 1953 edition (*EBZ3*, p. 12), the aim of Chapter VII was more comprehensively realized in his *Zen Buddhism and its Influence on Japanese Culture* based on a series of lectures he gave in 1936 and published in 1938 by the Eastern Buddhist Society which Suzuki had established and was affiliated with Otani University. It was translated into Japanese with some revisions as *Zen to Nihon Bunka* 《禪と日本文化》 and *Zoku Zen to Nihon Bunka* 《續・禪と日本文化》 in 1940 and 1942 respectively as titles in the Iwanami Shinsho 岩波新書 series. A revised and expanded version was published in English by the Bollingen Foundation in New York as *Zen and Japanese Culture* in 1959, which has only recently been translated into Japanese as *Zen to Nihon Bunka: shin-yaku kanzen-ban* 《禪と日本文化〈新譯完全版〉》 in 2022. See the translator's commentary in *Zen to Nihon Bunka: shin-yaku kanzen-ban* 《禪と日本文化〈新譯完全版〉》, pp.659–660.

²⁷ See Itō 2020a, 2020b, 2021.

traditional Huayan doctrine and in modern Huayan studies but also on his keen insight into human suffering, as we shall see later. This may also be seen to be in line with the above two predecessors' views but with more emphasis on the social role of the individual as opposed to the focus on inner spiritual needs of the practitioners themselves found in the discussions by Sasaki and Kaneko.

In the following sections, we will consider Suzuki's views from two perspectives: the role of the individual and the concepts of *bodhicitta* and *mahākaruṇā* found in *EZB3*.

2-2. The Role of the Individual

Suzuki comments on “the sense of mystery which envelops the whole text of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* as one of its striking characteristics” and notes that it originates in “what may be termed its [= *Gaṇḍavyūha*'s] fundamental spiritual insight”.²⁸ He goes on to elaborate that:

The fundamental insight of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* is known as Interpenetration.²⁹ ... Each individual reality besides being itself, reflects in it something of the universal,³⁰ and at the same time it is itself because of other individuals. A system of perfect relationship exists among individual existences and also between individuals and universals, between particular objects and general ideas”.³¹

The former “perfect relationship” is the *shishi wu'ai* while the latter is the *lishi wu'ai* (Jp. *riji-muge* 理事無礙), forming the two most important elements in the theory of the four dharma realms. We must take note that Suzuki viewed the Huayan world-view of “interpenetration” as based on “spiritual insight”. Here, the causal relationships of all individual existence in this actual world, as explained by the theory of dependent arising (Ch. *yuan qi*, Jp. *engi* 緣起), or the truth of *lishi wu'ai*, can be empirically observed and consequently be said to be an empirical truth, rather than a spiritual one. However, the

²⁸ *EZB3*, p. 87.

²⁹ In the Japanese translation of the chapters on the *Huayan sūtra* in *EZB3* (*Kegon no Kenkyū* 《華嚴の研究》), Sugihira translates this term as *sōsoku-sōnyū* 相即相入 (Ch. *xiangze xiangru*), i.e. mutual identity and interpenetration. See the Japanese translation of *EZB3*, p. 103.

³⁰ Sugihira translates this term as *fuhensha* 普遍者. See the Japanese translation of *EZB3*, p. 104. It is not clear what Suzuki actually meant by it, but from the perspective of the theory of the four *dharmadhātus* (Ch. *si fajie*, Jp. *shihokkai* 四法界), we may take it to mean the universal principle (Ch/Jp. *li* 理)

³¹ *EZB3*, p. 87.

insight into the infinite mutual relationship penetrated by the universal principle of mutual dependency creates a view of the world that strikes us with a “sense of mystery” which envelops the existence of everything in this world in its totality. Suzuki comments that “If science surveys the objective world and philosophy unravels intricacies of logic, Buddhism dives into the very abyss of being, and tells us in the directest possible manner all it sees under the surface”.³²

In his discussion on the four dharma realms based on the part in the “Chapter on Entry” where the pilgrim Sudhana enters Maitreya’s Tower called the *Vairocana-alamkāra-vyūha-garbha* (Store of ornaments decorating the Vairocana, Ch. *pilushena zhuangyan-zang*, Jp. *birushana shōgon-zō* 毘盧舍那莊嚴藏), Suzuki criticizes “what is now known as the Hua-yen school [Ch. *Huayan zong*, Jp. *Kegon-shū* 華嚴宗]”, which in Suzuki’s view, transformed what was seen through spiritual eyes into an abstract, metaphysical construct detached from an experiential base. Suzuki claims with a touch of irony that “this wonderfully mysterious spectacle was once the object of metaphysical speculation on the part of some brilliantly-gifted Chinese intellects”—such as Fazang, for example—and that “I gravely doubt whether this philosophical systemization did such good as was expected to the proper understanding of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*; that is to say, whether the truest and deepest significance of the Vairocana Tower [=Maitreya’s Tower] has gained by being so analysed and rendered more or less comprehensible by the intellect”.³³ Suzuki insists that:

When we speak of identity, interpenetration, or unobstructedness as the fundamental philosophical conception of the *Avatamsaka*, we must not, however, forget that this conception by no means ignores the reality of individual existences. For unobstructedness is only possible when there are individual existences; for interpenetration is to be regarded as characteristic only of a world of particulars; for when there are no particulars, no individual existences, identity is an empty notion.³⁴

³² EZB3, p. 90.

³³ EZB3, p. 150. Suzuki does not elaborate on this, but we may surmise that he had, for example, such Huayan school theories as the Ten Profound Views on Dependent-arising (Ch. *shixuan yuanqi men*, Jp. *jūgen engi-mon* 十玄緣起門) or the Ten-fold Consciousness-only Theory (Ch. *shichong weishi*, Jp. *jūjū yuishiki* 十重唯識) among others in mind.

³⁴ EZB3, p. 154.

Suzuki further elaborates on how the vision of the Maitreya's Tower which he took to be the "abode of Bodhisattvahood"³⁵ connects with the individual:

Every kind of imagery is resorted to in order to bring home to the reader's imagination the real nature of the Tower....for we find this:

1. That Maitreya's Tower is no other than the Dharmadhātu itself;
2. That the Dharmadhātu is from one point of view different from the Lokadhātu [=the mundane world, Ch. *shijie*, Jp. *sekai* 世界] which is this world of relativity and individuality, while from another point of view the Dharmadhātu is the Lokadhātu;
3. That the Dharmadhātu is not a vacuum filled with empty abstractions, but is brimful of concrete individual realities...
-
6. That in the Dharmadhātu, therefore, there is an interfusion of all individual objects, each of which, however, retaining all its individuality there is in it;
-
10. That all these wonderful phenomena, and indeed the Dharmadhātu itself, take their rise through the sustaining power of the Bodhisattva...
11. The sustaining power, Adhiṣṭhāna, while not expressly defined, is composed of the Bodhisattva's Praṇidhāna (vow) and Jñāna (knowledge).

Here, Suzuki states that the *dharmadhātu*, which can be equated in this case with the world of *shishi wu'ai* from the above point 6, is in one sense no other than the *lokadhātu*, therefore, it is not something that is completely detached from our real world; it is not an abstract concept or a metaphysical world-view. However, he also points out that the *dharmadhātu* manifests itself to the bodhisattvas through the "sustaining power" (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of the bodhisattva consisting of the bodhisattva's vow (*praṇidhāna*) and knowledge (*jñāna*); it is a vision arising from the bodhisattva's spiritual power and not simply a description of physical phenomena. From this, we may say that Suzuki understood the *dharmadhātu*, as seen from the perspective of the *shishi wu'ai* formula, as a view of the actual world arising from and sustained by the spiritual power of each and every bodhisattva "brimful" therein.

³⁵ EZB3, p. 147.

Then what is the aim of Suzuki in emphasizing the significance of the individual in the *dharmadhātu*, a world viewed from the *shishi wu'ai* perspective? What is the bodhisattva's *prañidhāna* that sustains the spiritual vision of the *dharmadhātu* together with knowledge (*jñāna*)?³⁶ These questions lead us to an examination of Suzuki's views on *bodhicitta* and *mahākaruṇā*.

2-3. *Bodhicitta* and *Mahākaruṇā*

Suzuki acknowledged that “The Dharmadhātu, which is the world of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* is assuredly a transcendental one standing in no connection with the hard facts of this life”, and that we “must remember that the point from which we are to survey the world according to the *Gaṇḍavyūha* is not that of a mind immersed in the mire of individualization....the Mahāyāna expects us first to clear off all the obstacles that rise from our obstinacy in taking the world of relativity as the ultimate limit of reality”.³⁷ However, when Sudhana enters into the Tower of Maitreya, Suzuki points out that:

No more sitting on the summit of reality (*bhūtakoti*), in the tranquility of absolute oneness, do we review the world of turmoil; but rather we see both the Bodhisattvas and the Buddhas shining in the sweat of their foreheads, in the tears shed for the mother who lost a child, in the fury of passions burning against injustice in its multifarious forms—in short in their never-ending fight against all that goes under the name of evil.³⁸

Here, the role of each bodhisattva in the real world of sentient beings filled with injustice and pain is clarified in relation to the notion of *bodhicitta* or the arousal of it (*bodhicittotpāda*, Ch. *faputixin*, Jp. *hotsu bodaishin* 發菩提心) which is the core of a bodhisattva's vow (*prañidhāna*): the fundamental idea that the bodhisattva is “a being who on the one hand seeks after enlightenment, and on the other, out of his compassionate heart intensely desires to lead the whole universe to the enjoyment of spiritual welfare”.³⁹ In Suzuki's view, the Mahāyānists' “wish for enlightenment was first of all for the sake of the world. Just because they desired the enlightenment and emancipation of all the world they strove first to enlighten themselves,...to make themselves free from the

³⁶ Although ‘knowledge’ (*jñāna*) may involve numerous elements, in this context, we may take it as the full recognition of the Huayan world-view according to the theory of the four dharma realms.

³⁷ EZB3, p. 85.

³⁸ EZB3, pp. 85–86.

³⁹ EZB3, p. 169.

bondage of all the karma- and knowledge-hindrances”.⁴⁰ Suzuki argues that “Enlightenment is not a mere personal affair which does not concern the community at large;...Therefore, that I have been able to conceive a great longing for enlightenment means that the entire world wishes to be liberated from ignorance and evil passions”.⁴¹ What merits noting here is that, if we follow Suzuki’s view, the profound spiritual insight into the nature of *dharmadhātu* becomes, not an ultimate ideal to be simply envisaged and acknowledged philosophically or intellectually, but a necessary step to something beyond, namely, the “never-ending fight against all that goes under the name of evil” and to liberate “the entire world” from “ignorance and evil passions”.

Suzuki emphasized that the arousal of *bodhicitta* entails a call for actual action. Suzuki describes what it means to have one’s “mind raised to enlightenment” or “cherishing the desire for enlightenment” (*bodhicittotpāda*) which he equates with *praṇidhāna*.

The Bodhisattva’s *Praṇidhāna* is his intense determination to carry out his plan of universal salvation. Of course, it is necessary here to have an adequate knowledge or full intellectual grasp of the work he intends to accomplish;⁴² but a *Praṇidhāna* is far more than this, it is the will to do. Mere intellectuality has no backing of the will-power; mere idealism can never be an efficient executive agency. *Cittotpāda* is a form of *Praṇidhāna*. ‘To conceive an idea’ or ‘to awaken a thought’ is one thing, and to carry it out in action is quite another, especially when it is carried out with intensity and fervency.⁴³

Suzuki’s fundamental view that bodhisattvahood is about action arguably resonates with his later post-war views on the role of individuals who are expected to take leading roles, i.e. take action, in the rebuilding of a newly democratized Japan.

With reference to the praise that the monk Sāgaramegha, the second mentor of Sudhana in the “Chapter on Entry” in the *Huayan sūtra*, offers Sudhana for cherishing the bodhisattva’s *bodhicitta*, Suzuki lists the qualities which are indispensable for *bodhicittotpāda*.

⁴⁰ EZB3, pp. 167–168.

⁴¹ EZB3, p. 178.

⁴² We may take this to be an element of ‘knowledge’ (*jñāna*) which forms the core of the bodhisattva’s “sustaining power” together with ‘vow’ (*praṇidhāna*).

⁴³ EZB3, p. 172.

1. A great loving heart (*mahākaruṇācitta*) which is desirous of protecting all beings;
2. A great compassionate heart (*mahāmaitrīcitta*) which ever wishes for the welfare of all beings;
3. The desire to make others happy (*sukhacitta*), which comes from seeing them suffer all forms of pain;
4. The desire to benefit others (*hitācitta*), and to deliver them from evils and wrongs deeds;
5. A sympathetic heart (*dayācitta*) which desires to protect all beings from tormenting thoughts;
-
10. A pure heart (*viśuddhacitta*) which is in conformity with the wisdom of the past, present, and future;
11. A wisdom-heart (*jñānacitta*) by which one can enter the great ocean of all knowledge.⁴⁴

Here again, we find that one is expected to nurture both a loving heart and abundant wisdom in order to start walking the bodhisattva's path. Suzuki also notes that "the cherishing of desire [= *bodhicittotpāda*] at once stamps a man as a bodhisattva and thus distinguishes him from other followers of Buddhism; for he holds a great compassionate heart for all beings, and also has perspicuity of spiritual insight which sees into the nature of existence.....so that he is able to adapt himself to the ever-changing conditions of existence".⁴⁵ What we may note here is that although Suzuki lists both *mahākaruṇācitta* (Ch. *dabei xin*, Jp. *daihi-shin* 大悲心) and *mahāmaitrīcitta* (Ch. *daci xin*, Jp. *daiji-shin* 大慈心) which are often understood as a set, thus the frequent use of the compound *mahāmaitrīkaruṇā* (Ch. *dacibei*, Jp. *daijihi* 大慈悲) in Mahāyāna sūtras and writings, from our analyses so far, we find that the concept of *mahākaruṇā* is more strongly emphasized over that of *mahāmaitrī* by Suzuki. Hence the passage we saw earlier where Suzuki depicted the Buddhas and bodhisattvas as "shining in the sweat of their foreheads, in the tears shed for the mother who lost a child, in the fury of passions burning against injustice in its multifarious forms". We may conclude that Suzuki's emphasis on the individual and *bodhicitta* in his discussion of the *dharmadhātu* and the *shishi wu'ai* had at its core his firm belief that bodhisattvahood is about action based most importantly on

⁴⁴ EZB3, pp. 179–180.

⁴⁵ EZB3, p. 183.

mahākaruṇā and the wish to address the sufferings and injustice that we find in our *lokadhātu*.

One last point that needs to be discussed is that when Suzuki refers to *mahākaruṇā* in the *EZB3*, it is one harbored in the hearts of the practitioners rather than in a transcendent or essential existence such as Amitābha. As we saw in section 1–1 based on doctor Takemura Makio’s essay of 2018, in his post-war book *The Construction of a Spiritual Japan (Reiseiteki Nihon no Kensetsu 《靈性的日本の建設》)*, Suzuki wrote that “the realization that oneself and others both live within something larger than them both” is at the base of mutual respect between individuals. He further says that “through negation of the self, the self comes to live within that larger thing”.⁴⁶ A similar view can be seen in the *Main Purport* when Suzuki says in his second day’s lecture to the emperor on Great loving heart (*mahākaruṇā*):

To get back to the discussion on Great loving heart, what moves the *dharmadhātu* of Huayan is nothing other than this, and it is customary for Buddhists to give it concrete form [Jp. *gutaika*, 具體化] by bestowing on it a human appearance [Jp. *jinkaku-teki sōgō*, 人格的相好]. The Amitābha Tathāgata is one form of humanization [of Great loving heart] in this respect. (*Main Purport*, p. 107)

Stefan Grace notes that this strikes us as if Suzuki’s idea of the “*dharmakāya* with a will” (Jp. *ishi wo motsu hosshin*, 意志をもつ法身) found in Suzuki’s earlier work *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism* (1907) has been revived.⁴⁷ We may say that in Suzuki’s post-war view of *shishi wu’ai*, *mahākaruṇā* is not something that each of us are expected to give rise to from within ourselves through our own vows (*prañidhāna*) as a bodhisattva; conversely, it is seen as a transcendent source of power within the *dharmadhātu* and which is, in effect, conferred on us as a kind of grace from a transcendent existence larger than ourselves. This is controversial, as it fundamentally changes the meaning of *mahākaruṇā*.

Another shift in Suzuki’s post-war view is that he is more concerned with the difficulty of overcoming the notion of the self, on which Dr. Takemura also focused his attention in his essay of 2018. Suzuki stated in his *Main Purport*:

⁴⁶ *Construction*, p. 138.

⁴⁷ Grace 2014, p. 143. Grace notes that Suzuki claimed in the *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism* that the *dharmakāya* “willfully” and “rationally” “directs the course of the universe” (Grace 2014, p. 69, *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 238).

The power that moves the dharma realm of mutual non-obstruction of all individual things [Ch. *shishi wu'ai fajie*, Jp. *jijimuge hokkai* 事事無礙法界] is nothing other than *mahākaruṇācitta* [Ch. *dabei xin*, Jp. *daihi-shin* 大悲心]. It is owing to this *mahākaruṇācitta* that the human individual ego [Jp. *ningen no koga* 人間の個我] (or the individual self [Jp. *koko* 個己]) breaks through its limitations and broadly encompasses and is taken into [JP. *hen'yō shōnyū* 徧容攝入] the many other individual egos....Therefore, if they are hurt, oneself also comes to be hurt....This is not done with deliberate consciousness, but becomes so naturally.⁴⁸

How should we assess this difference in Suzuki's pre-war and post-war views on *mahākaruṇā*? An observation which doctor Takemura has cited in his essay from Suzuki's *Main Purport* may shed some light on this question:

Distinguishing views [Jp. *fumbetsu*, 分別] [based on duality] acknowledges the ego as true. This ego manifests itself in various forms. There are the ego of individual self, ego of the state, ego of the race [Jp. *koko-ga* 個己我, *kokka-ga* 國家我, *minzoku-ga* 民族我], for example....If this [=ego of distinction. Jp. *fumbetsu-ga* 分別我] is stubbornly clung to,...the *dharmadhātu* of each individual existence mutually identifying with each other simultaneously [Jp. *jiji no dōjigosoku no hokkai* 事事の同時互即の法界] is completely forgotten. If this is forgotten, there is no way for this world but to become a place of *aśuras*. The Pure Land of Amitābha will disappear without a trace.⁴⁹

We may observe Suzuki's war-time experiences of ego-centric forces working not only within individuals but also collectively within the state and the Japanese people reflected in the above observation, which possibly was one of the causes of his shift in perspective. Fully addressing this topic will need a more detailed and focused examination which is beyond the scope of this present paper. At present, may it suffice for us to confirm that Suzuki's conviction in the power of *mahākaruṇā* remained consistent both in his pre-war and post-war views on the *shi shi wu'ai*, while at the same time showing a degree of shift in perspective and emphasis from the *mahākaruṇā* of autonomous but also mutually connected individuals to that of a transcendent existence larger than ourselves.

⁴⁸ *Main Purport*, pp. 103–104. See also Takemura 2018, p. 44.

⁴⁹ *Main Purport*, pp. 111. See also Takemura 2018, p. 45.

Conclusion

It is significant that the *dharma* realm of mutual non-obstruction of all individual things (Ch. *shishi wu'ai fajie*, Jp. *jijimuge hokkai* 事事無礙法界) is in principle a spiritual vision or ideal harbored within the hearts of Bodhisattvas, as argued by Suzuki in his pre-war *EBZ3*. As Ichikawa Hakugen has warned us, it should not be taken simply as a model or template that can be readily applied to more mundane social or political visions. Otherwise it may result in an uncritical acceptance of the status quo subsuming all worldly concerns under it—consequently neglecting the pressing issues that must be addressed, whether by an individual or more collectively by a society or a state. However, it is still significant that Suzuki tried to connect the Huayan formula of *shishi wu'ai* to the real world in his writings of both pre-war and post-war Japan, although in different perspectives: focusing on the individual in the former, and on the society and state in the latter. Suzuki's views can be acknowledged as efforts to make the ancient ideas in the *Huayan sūtra* more relevant to the modern person and the modern times.

If we may reaffirm the value of this perhaps lofty but nevertheless beautiful concept of a mutually interconnected dynamic world of *shishi wu'ai* from Suzuki's pre-war views, we may say that it is through the fervent desire and action of each individual for the betterment of oneself and salvation of others, founded upon the acknowledgement of pervasive mutual interrelatedness and respect, that such a *dharma* realm can be envisaged as having any real significance. Suzuki concludes his pre-war essay on Huayan bodhisattvahood by saying that “if the Mahāyāna has anything to contribute to the deepening of religious consciousness, it is no other than our realization of the Citta as Prajñā and Karuṇā”.⁵⁰ Although this might be taken as a somewhat commonplace summary of the core tenets of Mahāyāna, in view of the pervasive pain and suffering we are witnessing in the present world today, it is something worth revisiting, much like Suzuki did in the face of the reality that he was witnessing in the wake of a global war that had left his own country and other regions throughout Asia in devastation.⁵¹

⁵⁰ *EZB3*, p. 218.

⁵¹ I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Satō Atsushi (佐藤厚), visiting researcher at the Toyo University Institute of Oriental Studies, for his comments and suggestions during our discussion on an early synopsis of this paper.

Reference Sources

Primary sources: writings by D. T. Suzuki

Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism. London: Luzac and Company, 1907.

Essays on Zen Buddhism: Third Series. Delhi: New Age Books. 2017. (Originally published by Samuel Weiser, Maine, 1934. Later republished as a volume of *The Complete Works of D. T. Suzuki*, edited by Christmas Humphreys and published by Rider & Company in London in 1953, together with the First Series and the Second Series. Japanese translation: *Kegon no Kenkyū* 《華嚴の研究》, translated by Sugihira Shizutosi 杉平顥智, Tokyo: Kadokawa Sophia Bunko 角川ソフィア文庫, 2020. Originally published by Hōzōkan 法藏館, Kyoto, 1955).

Zen to Nihon Bunka: shin-yaku kanzen-ban 《禪と日本文化〈新譯完全版〉》, translated by Ōmi Toshihiro 碧海壽廣, Tokyo: Kadokawa Sophia Bunko 角川ソフィア文庫, 2020. (Originally published in English as *Zen and Japanese Culture* 《禪と日本文化》, by the Bollingen Foundation, New York, 1959).

Reiseiteki Nihon no Kensetsu 《靈性的日本の建設》. *Suzuki Daisetsu Zenshū* 《鈴木大拙全集》, vol. 9. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1968. (Originally published by Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社, Tokyo, 1947).

Bukkyō no Tai'i 《佛教の大意》. Tokyo: Kadokawa Sophia Bunko 角川ソフィア文庫, 2017. (Originally published by Hōzōkan 法藏館, Kyoto, 1947).

Secondary sources

(Japanese sources)

Andō, Reiji (安藤禮二). 2018. *Daisetsu* 《大拙》, Tokyo 東京: Kōdan-sha 講談社, 2018.

Andō, Reiji (安藤禮二). 2020. “Ima Daisetsu wo yomi naosu tameni” 〈いま大拙を讀み直すために〉, *Gendai Shisō* 《現代思想》 Vol. 48–15 (November, 2020, Special edition, 2020年11月臨時増刊號). 2020.

Grace, Stefan P. (ステファン・P・グレイス). 2014. “Suzuki Daisetsu no kenkyū: Gendai ‘Nihon’ bukkyō no jikoninshiki to sono ‘seiyō’ ni taisuru hyōgen” (PhD dissertation) 〈鈴木大拙の研究——現代「日本」佛教の自己認識とその「西洋」に對する表現〉 (博士學位論文), Komazawa University 駒澤大學. 2014.

- Ichikawa, Hakugen (市川白弦). 1961. “Zen/kegon/anakizumu” 〈禪・華嚴・アナキズム〉, in *Ichikawa Hakugen Chosakushū* 《市川白弦著作集》, vol. 3. Kyoto 京都: Hōzōkan (法藏館), 1993. (Originally published in the magazine *Jiyūshisō* 《自由思想》 (1961) 5, Tokyo: Shimbisha 審美社. 1961).
- Iijima, Takayoshi (飯島孝良). 2020. “Zen/kegon to Nihonshugi” 〈禪・華嚴と日本主義〉, in *Kindai no Bukkyō to Nihonshugi* 《近代の佛教と日本主義》, supervised by Ishii Kōsei 石井公成; Kondō Shuntarō 近藤俊太郎 and Nawa Tatsunori 名和達宣 eds., Kyoto 京都: Hōzōkan (法藏館), 2020.
- Iijima, Takayoshi (飯島孝良). 2021. *Katarare-tsuzukeru Ikkyū-zō: Sengo-shisōshi kara Miru Zen-bunka no Shosō* 《語られ續ける一休像—戦後思想史から見る禪文化の諸相》, Tokyo 東京: Perikan-sha ぺりかん社, 2021.
- Inoue, Enryō (井上圓了). 1909. *Tetsugaku Shin'an* 《哲學新案》, in *Inoue Enryō Senshū* 《井上圓了選集》, vol. 1, Tokyo 東京: Toyo University 東洋大學. 1987.
- Inoue, Enryō (井上圓了). 1917. *Funtō Tetsugaku* 《奮闘哲學》, in *Inoue Enryō Senshū* 《井上圓了選集》, vol. 2, Tokyo 東京: Toyo University 東洋大學. 1987.
- Ishii, Kōsei (石井公成). 1996. “‘Jiji muge’ wo toitanowa dareka” 〈〈事事無礙〉を説いたのは誰か〉, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 《印度學佛教學研究》 Vol. 44, No. 2. 1996.
- Itō, Makoto (伊藤真). 2020a. “Sasaki Gesshō ni okeru Kegongyō no rikai” 〈佐々木月樵における『華嚴經』の理解〉, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 《印度學佛教學研究》 Vol. 68, No. 2. 2020.
- Itō, Makoto (伊藤真). 2020b. “Kaneko Daiei ni okeru ‘Shin butsu gyū shujō san musabetsu setsu’” 〈金子大榮における〈心佛及眾生三無差別説〉〉, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 《印度學佛教學研究》 Vol. 69, No. 1. 2020.
- Kamata, Shigeo (鎌田茂雄). 1960. “Kegon tetsugaku no konponteki tachiba” 〈華嚴哲學の根本的立場〉, in *Kegon Shisō* 《華嚴思想》, Nakamura Hajime 中村元 ed., Kyoto 京都: Hōzōkan 法藏館. 1960.
- Okimoto, Katsumi (沖本克己). 2017. *Zen: Chinmoku to jōzetsu no bukkyōshi* 《禪—沈黙と饒舌の佛教史》, Tokyo 東京: Kōdan-sha 講談社, 2017.
- Takemura, Makio (竹村牧男). 2018. “Daisetsu no Kegon gaku” 〈大拙の華嚴學〉, *Gendai Shisō* 《現代思想》 Vol. 46–16 (October, 2018, Special edition, 2018年10月臨時増刊號). 2018.

(English Sources)

- Freeman, Alice. 2022. "Suzuki Daisetz' "Spiritual Japan" and Buddhist War Responsibility: An Alternative History of the Allied Occupation of Japan, 1945–1952", in *Beyond Zen: D. T. Suzuki and the Modern Transformation of Buddhism*, John Breen, Sueki Fumihiko, and Yamada Shōji eds., Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press. 2022.
- Ishii, Kōsei. 2007. "Kegon Philosophy and Nationalism in Modern Japan", in *Reflecting Mirrors: Perspectives on Huayan Buddhism* (Asiatische Forschungen xxi), Imre Hamar ed., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. 2007.
- Itō, Makoto. 2021. "The *Huayan Sūtra* as 'Our Sutra': A Reappraisal of Kaneko Daiei's Huayan Thought", *Toyo University Oriental Studies* 《東洋學研究》 Vol. 58. 2021.
- Ives, Christopher. 2009. *Imperial-Way Zen: Ichikawa Hakugen's critique and lingering questions for Buddhist ethics*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press. 2009.
- Sueki, Fumihiko; Toda, Dylan Luers. 2016. "Reading D. T. Suzuki with a Focus on His Notion of "Person"", *The Eastern Buddhist*, NEW SERIES, Vol. 47, No. 2. 2016.

