

## SUZUKI DAISETSU'S CRITICISM OF INOUE ENRYŌ

SATŌ Atsushi 佐藤厚

### 1. Introduction

INOUE Enryō 井上円了 (1858–1919; below, Enryō), published in 1887 *Prolegomena of a Living Discourse on Buddhism* 『仏教活論序論』, the first volume of his *Living Discourse on Buddhism* series (which also included *Refuting the False* 『仏教活論本論：破邪活論』 and *Disclosing the Right* 『仏教活論本論：顯正活論』). The aim of this series was to (1) show that Buddhism was a superior religion to Christianity and (2) heighten Buddhism's status by arguing that it contained thought that was of the same value as Western science and philosophy. It is said that by doing so he roused a Buddhist world that had been stagnant due to *haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈, the persecution of Buddhism that took place at the beginning of the Meiji period (1868–1912).

<sup>0</sup> SATŌ Atsushi 佐藤厚, Senshu University 専修大学, sato\_inbuds@yahoo.co.jp. The paper was presented at the 5th Annual Meeting of the International Association for Inoue Enryō Research in 2016 at Toyo University. Translated by Dylan Luers TODA.

I have been doing research on Enryō's thought, primarily focusing on the *Living Discourse on Buddhism* series, and recently discovered a letter in which SUZUKI Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (1870–1966<sup>1</sup>; below, Daisetsu), a major figure in modern Japanese Buddhism who was twelve years Enryō's junior, criticizes this series. Daisetsu wrote this letter in 1898 to NISHIDA Kitarō 西田幾多郎 (1870–1945) while residing in the United States. The twenty-eight year old Daisetsu evidently did not see much value in Enryō's series, remarking, "It's an inevitable result that Inoue Enryō's *Living Discourse on Buddhism* has achieved nothing for Japan's Buddhism."

I took an interest in this letter, and believe that it is important for the following reasons. First, Daisetsu's criticism is example of one of the various ways in which people saw the series during its time.<sup>2</sup> Thus it is important for the field of Enryō studies. Second, by making clear why Daisetsu criticized Enryō, the characteristics of the latter's thought become clear. Third, this is SUZUKI Daisetsu's criticism. Past research has not compared Enryō and Daisetsu, and it is my hope that the discovery of this letter will contribute to the formation of such a perspective and thereby research on modern Buddhism as well.

## 2. Brief Biographies of Daisetsu and Enryo

First let us briefly take a look at the biographies of these two individuals.<sup>3</sup>

### 2.1 A Brief Biography of Suzuki Daisetsu

SUZUKI Daisetsu was born in 1870 in Kanazawa City 金沢市 (Ishikawa Prefecture 石川県). He studied at Tokyo Senmon Gakkō 東京専門学校 and took courses at Tokyo Imperial University. While a student he engaged in Zen training under IMAKITA Kōsen 今北洪川 and SHAKU Sōen 釈宗演 at Engaku Temple 円覚寺 in Kamakura 鎌倉, and had a *kenshō* 見性 ("seeing [one's own Buddha] nature") experience. In 1897 at the age of twenty-seven he went to the United States at the recommendation of SHAKU Sōen, and worked on the publication of books related to the East at Orientalist Paul CARUS' Open Court Publishing Company. During this time, he also published an English translation of *The Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana* 『大乘起信論』 (1900) and his own work entitled

1 2016 is the fiftieth year of SUZUKI Daisetsu's death, and commemorative events are being held at Matsugaoka Bunko 松ヶ丘文庫 and other places.

2 Appendix A gives a table of the various opinions people had regarding the series during its time.

3 Appendix B gives a chart comparing the two biographies.

*Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*, thereby presenting Mahāyāna Buddhism and Japanese Buddhism to the Western world. Daisetsu's criticism of Enryō is found in a letter he wrote during this time in the United States. In 1909 he returned to Japan at the age of thirty-nine, and held a post at Gakushūin 学習院 while living at Engakuji. In 1921 at the age of fifty-one he became a professor at Otani University, and moved to Kyoto. In his later years he lived in Kamakura and engaged in research at Matsugaoka Bunko, which he had established in 1945 at the age of seventy-five. In 1950 (when he was eighty years old) he began giving lectures on Buddhism throughout the United States. He taught classes on Buddhism (particularly Zen Buddhism) at Columbia University as a visiting professor, and spread Zen thought amongst the upper circles of United States society. Daisetsu also gave lectures at the University of Hawai'i, Yale University, Harvard University, Princeton University, and so on, and exchanged letters and engaged in discussions in-person with Carl G. Jung and Martin Heidegger. In 1966 he passed away at the age of ninety-five.

FURUTA Shōkin 古田紹欽 says there were seven themes in Daisetsu's research—Avatamsaka 華嚴 (Ch. Huāyán, Jp. Kegon) thought, Bodhidharma, the idea of "no-mind" 無心, Bankei 盤珪, Japanese spirituality, and Rinzai 臨濟 (Ch. Línjì)—and also observes, "He consistently tried to understand Buddhism as experience. He experientially investigated how the thought of Bankei and Rinzai came from their respective experiences, not viewing their thought externally but internally."<sup>4</sup>

TAKEMURA Makio 竹村牧男, on the other hand, understands Daisetsu's thought in terms of the categories of Zen 禪 and Pure Land 淨土. He argues that Daisetsu's understanding of the former is characterized by the "logic of identity-difference" 即非の論理 and an emphasis on the "marvelous functioning of true emptiness" 真空妙用, as well as that his view of the latter was Daisetsu's unique creation that differed from orthodox Shin 真 sect doctrine. However, in the end, Daisetsu also understood Pure Land thought in terms of the "marvelous functioning of true emptiness." Takemura states that Daisetsu understood this concept to mean "the functioning of the supra-individual individual: the individual is opened by the supra-individual and yet functions as an individual."<sup>5</sup>

4 FURUTA Shōkin 古田紹欽. 「鈴木大拙先生の生涯的な歩みと学問的歩みの意義」 [The significance of Suzuki Daisetsu Sensei's lifepath and academic path], in 『鈴木大拙の人と学問』 [Suzuki Daisetsu the person and his academics], ed. by FURUTA Shōkin, supplementary volume to 『鈴木大拙禅選集』 [Selected Zen writings of Suzuki Daisetsu] (Tokyo: 春秋社, 1961), 61–62.

5 TAKEMURA Makio 竹村牧男. 『西田幾多郎と鈴木大拙：その魂の交流に聴く』 [Nishida Kitarō and Suzuki Daisetsu: Listening to their soulful exchanges] (Tokyo: 大東出版社, 2004), 276.

## 2.2 An Overview of Enryō's Life

INOUE Enryō was born in 1858 into the Ōtani 大谷 Branch Shin sect temple Jikō Temple 慈光寺 (present-day Nagaoka City 長岡市, Niigata Prefecture 新潟県). In 1877 at the age of nineteen he entered Higashi Hongan Temple 東本願寺 Teacher's School 教師学校 in Kyoto. The following year he was chosen by Higashi Honganji to study in Tokyo, where he attended Tokyo University's Preparatory School 東京大学予備門 and then entered its Philosophy Department (Faculty of Letters). He graduated from the latter in 1885, at the age of twenty-seven. While enrolled he began writing, publishing *The Golden Needle of Truth* 『真理金針』, amongst other works. In 1887 at the age of twenty-nine he established the Philosophy Academy 哲学館 (the predecessor to Toyo University) in order to spread philosophy. In 1908 at the age of forty-seven he removed himself from the school's operations due to the Philosophy Academy Incident three years earlier (amongst other reasons), and launched a movement to establish a so-called Personal Cultivation Church 修身教会 for the improvement of Japan's morality while basing himself in the Philosophy Shrine 哲学堂 that he had established in Tokyo's Nakano (today, the Nakano City Temple Garden of Philosophy 中野区立哲学堂公園). He also went on extended lecture tours. In 1919, he passed away while giving a lecture in Dàlián 大連, China. He was sixty-one years old.

Enryō engaged in a wide range of activities and his works span many fields. In *Inoue Enryō Selected Writings* 『井上円了選集』 (pub. Toyo University), the latter are divided into five categories: philosophy (*An Evening Conversation about Philosophy* 『哲学一夕話』, *Essentials of Philosophy* 『哲学要領』, etc.), Buddhism (*Prolegomena of a Living Discourse on Buddhism* 『仏教活論序論』, etc.), psychology (*Fundamentals of Psychology* 『心理摘要』, etc.), ethics (*Outline of Ethics* 『倫理通論』, etc.), education (*General Discussion of Education* 『教育総論』, etc.), travel dairies, and Mystery Studies 妖怪学. His publication of the aforementioned *Prolegomena of a Living Discourse on Buddhism* in 1887 gave the Buddhist world confidence. In the same year he then released *Living Discourse on Buddhism: Refuting the False* (a criticism of Christianity), and in 1890 *Living Discourse on Buddhism: Disclosing the Right* (a discussion of the relationship between Buddhism and philosophy). He had originally planned to release soon thereafter the third volume of the series entitled *Living Discourse on Buddhism: Protecting the Dharma* 『仏教活論：護法活論』, however for various reasons it was published approximately twenty years later in 1912 under the title *Living Buddhism* 『活仏教』.

### 3. Daisetsu's Criticism of Enryō

#### 3.1 Enryō's Living Discourse on Buddhism Series

Since Daisetsu criticizes Enryō's *Living Discourse on Buddhism* series, let us summarize its main points. I will particularly focus on Enryō's systematization of Buddhism that is centered on the concepts of "intellect" and "emotion" because it relates to Daisetsu's criticism.

Enryō categorizes various traditional Buddhist schools (Tiántái 天台 (Jp. Tendai), Pure Land 淨土 (Jp. Jōdo), etc.) using the categories of the "gate of the sages' path" 聖道門 and the "gate of the Pure Land" 淨土門. Pure Land teachings describe the former as being comprised of difficult "self-power" 自力 practices and the latter easy "other-power" 他力 practices, and argue that since in the current latter Dharma age human's abilities to engage in Buddhist practice have declined and there are few people who can reach enlightenment by pursuing the former, the gate of the Pure Land is the most appropriate path. ("Other-power" refers to the power of Amida Buddha.) Enryō reinterprets this in his own way. Using psychological terms, he argues that the gate of the path of the sages is centered on the intellect, whereas the gate of the Pure Land is based on emotion. Here, we find his distinction between intellect and emotion. (Interestingly, to make this claim he uses the character 智 to not mean "religious wisdom" but simply "intellect."<sup>6</sup>)

In terms of types of humans, he says that the gate of the sages' path is for intellectuals, and the gate of the Pure Land for the foolish. In terms of academics, the former is intellectual philosophy, and the latter an emotional religion. He argues that since Buddhism is comprised of both and Christianity only the latter, Buddhism is superior. Intellectual Buddhism refers to its philosophical Abhidharma 俱舍, Fǎxiāng 法相, Tiántái, and Avatamsaka 華嚴 schools, and emotional Buddhism to the various Pure Land schools.

Enryō held that the former schools are comparable to Western philosophy's materialism, idealism, and rationalism. Furthermore, he argues that Buddhism is better than Western philosophy since the idea of the "middle way" 中道 found in the Tiántái and Huāyán sects was preached by Śākyamuni far before Western rationalism. While Enryō

<sup>6</sup> YOSHITANI Kakuju 吉谷覺寿 also criticized Enryō's distinction between intellect and wisdom. See SATO Atsushi. "Inoue Enryō and the Thought of Yoshitani Kakuju," *International Inoue Enryō Research* 3 (2015).

modifies this somewhat in *Disclosing the Right*, the basic framework as shown in the table below remains the same.<sup>7</sup>

<b>Gate</b>	Gate of the Sages' Path	Gate of the Pure Land
<b>Psychology</b>	Intellect	Emotion
<b>Addressee</b>	Intellectuals	Foolish People
<b>Realm</b>	Philosophy	Religion (Christianity)
<b>Buddhist schools</b>	Abhidharma, Fāxiāng, Tiántái, Huāyán	Jōdo, Jōdo shin
<b>Western philosophy</b>	Materialism, Idealism, Rationalism	(none)

He presents the above to argue that Buddhism surpasses Christianity and that Buddhist philosophy is comparable to Western philosophy. However, Enryō did not come up with this entirely on his own; his accomplishment lies in his reinterpretation from a new perspective of Buddhist doctrinal studies from the Edo period and earlier. I am of the opinion that Enryō was inspired to do this by YOSHITANI Kakuju 吉谷覺寿, who lectured on "Indian Philosophy" (Buddhism) at Tokyo University.<sup>8</sup>

### 3.2 Daisetsu's Criticism of Enryō

Now let us finally turn to the main topic of my presentation, Daisetsu's criticism of Enryō. It appears in a letter that he sent to NISHIDA Kitarō while residing in the United States. Daisetsu sent Nishida thirty-one letters during this time. According to TAKEMURA Makio, the vast majority of them contain moral support for the latter's Zen practice, as well as intellectual discussions.<sup>9</sup> Here I will focus on two letters: the one in which Daisetsu criticizes Enryō, and one from which we can get a glimpse of Daisetsu's related views on religion.

7 The following three points are changed in *Disclosing the Right*. First, "gate of the sages' path" and "gate of the Pure Land" are respectively renamed "gate of theory" 理論門 and "gate of the common schools" 通宗門. Second, *The Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* and Shingon 真言 school are added to the gate of the sages' path. Third, the Zen 禪 and Nichiren 日蓮 schools are added as examples of Buddhism's emotional aspect. In this way, in *Disclosing the Right*, Enryō's systematization of Buddhism came to include many Japanese Buddhist schools.

8 Regarding the background to Enryō's systematization of Buddhism, see SATŌ Atsushi 佐藤厚. "Inoue Enryō and the Thought of Yoshitani Kakuju"; idem. 「井上円了『八宗綱要ノート』の思想的意義」 [The meaning of Inoue Enryō's 'Notes regarding *Essentials of the Eight Sects*' in intellectual history terms], *Annual Report of the Inoue Enryō Center* 『井上円了センター年報』 22 (2013); idem. 「井上円了における伝統仏教体系と仏教・哲学一致論」 [Inoue Enryō's systematization of traditional Buddhism and Buddhism-philosophy concordance theory], *Toyo University Asian Studies* 『東洋学研究』 50 (2013).

9 TAKEMURA 竹村. 『西田幾多郎と鈴木大拙』 (see note 5), 30.

(1) 20th February 1898 Letter to Nishida Kitarō

This letter is long; it spans four pages in Daisetsu's complete works. He discusses mystical philosophy and Eduard von HARTMANN, the issue of Zen enlightenment, and then the relationship of the three psychological functions of the intellect, emotion, and volition with enlightenment, forcefully arguing that latter two are more important than the former. He then criticizes philosophers for tending to be biased towards the intellect:

Philosophy aside, in actual practice emotion and volition should not always be at the command of the intellect. Philosophers since ancient times in the East and West often forgetting this and only emphasizing knowledge—this has been a failure. It is similar to how today some so-called scholars in our country make this error. I think that they may still have not deeply studied some parts of the human mind. Now I think it's an inevitable result that Inoue Enryō's *Living Discourse on Buddhism*<sup>10</sup> has achieved nothing for Japan's Buddhism. Truly, religion does not emphasize the dry discrimination of knowing but rather emotion and volition, which are active.<sup>11</sup>

In religion, Daisetsu emphasized not the intellect but emotion and volition, and criticizes the intellect as the "dry discrimination of knowing." This is the complete opposite of Enryō's above-discussed perspective, and is probably why Daisetsu criticized Enryō's *Living Discourse on Buddhism* as having "achieved nothing for Japan's Buddhism."

Daisetsu disparaged the intellect probably because he was a Buddhist that took Zen as his foundation. While Buddhism generally dislikes the discriminative intellect, this is particularly true in the case of Zen. We can thus understand why Daisetsu didn't like Enryō's approach of dividing Buddhism into the intellectual and the emotional, and attaching importance to the former to show that Buddhism is just as outstanding as Western philosophy. Daisetsu disliked philosophy to the extent that he suggested as a measure to reform Buddhism that it no longer use "the philosophy-like Tendai, Shingon, and so on in explanations of doctrine."<sup>12</sup>

10 On page 39 of SUZUKI Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, 『鈴木大拙全集』 [Suzuki Daisetsu's complete works] vol. 36 (Tokyo: 岩波書店, 2004), the title of Enryō's work is mistakenly written as 仏教清論 instead of 仏教活論. On page 132 of NISHIMURA Eshin 西村恵信, ed. 『西田幾多郎宛鈴木大拙書簡』 [Suzuki Daisetsu's letters to Nishida Kitarō] (Tokyo: 岩波書店, 2004), the correct title appears.

11 Underlining added by author. SUZUKI 鈴木, 『鈴木大拙全集』 (see note 10) vol. 36, 39.

12 SUZUKI Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, 「1897 (明治30)年12月20日西田幾多郎宛」 [20 December 1897 letter to Nishida Kitarō], in 『鈴木大拙全集』 (see note 10) vol. 36, 118.

(2) 20 January 1898 Letter to Nishida Kitarō

Next let us consider Daisetsu's views on religion using another letter. In it, he first argues that all religions are of the same nature:

I always hold that both Eastern and Western religions in ancient times and the present are the same. I do not think that this is a vague delusion; there is in fact objective evidence for it. This is because if one removes all the foreign elements mixed into religions—in other words, their intellectual elements, superstitious elements, and formalistic elements—to make them bare, they are the same when it comes to their original *religious instinct, or impulse, or feeling, or perfection, or intuition, whatever the designation may be*. While people of the world frequently know that differences between religions appear due to superstitious elements and formalistic elements, they forget about the existence of intellectual elements. Saying that Buddhism is superior or inferior to Christianity has to do with the intellectual elements within these religions. If one removes such elements as well, it appears that the religions practiced in civilized countries all understand each other.<sup>13</sup>

In this way Daisetsu argues that religions are fundamentally the same. He looked to the shared parts of Buddhism and Christianity that transcended the distinction between the two. As he states in the underlined sentences above, people argue about the relative superiority and inferiority of Buddhism and Christianity because of the intellectual elements in them. This is perhaps a criticism of Enryō, who compared them and argued that the former was superior.

In this letter Daisetsu then defines religion as the emotion of "absolute dependence," and gives as an example the Shin sect's "settled mind of faith in other power" 他力安心 and the Zen sect's idea of "great capacity and great functioning" 大機大用. This is also an important part of Daisetsu's thought.

Schleiermacher defined religion as the emotion of *absolute dependence*. This means throwing away inferior abilities and predispositions and absolutely entrusting [oneself] to the ultimate instinct's natural and lofty activity. The Shin sect's settled mind of faith in other power is also like this: entrusting [oneself] to Amida's primal vow—since to the ignorant Amida is an objective and concrete single thing, it is hard for them to be saved—without getting caught up in selfish thinking. ["]While I might not go to paradise via Amida's primal vow and thus end up in hell, those with full faith should be even less indifferent.["]

13 Underlining added by author. Italic portion appears in English in the original. SUZUKI 鈴木. 『鈴木大拙全集』 (see note 10) vol. 36, 125.

In other words, put in passive terms this is absolute dependence, and put in active terms this is the Zen sect's "great capacity and great functioning."<sup>14</sup>

In this way, Daisetsu presents the Shin sect and Zen sect as examples of the emotion of absolute dependence. Both of these were looked down on by Enryō because they did not fall into the "intellect" category. In contrast, Daisetsu emphasized Shin and Zen Buddhism, as can be seen even in his later representative work *Japanese Spirituality*.

In this way, Daisetsu's criticism of Enryō arose due to the differences in their views of Buddhism. However, even so, I believe it is excessive to say that "it's an inevitable result that Inoue Enryō's *Living Discourse on Buddhism* has achieved nothing for Japan's Buddhism." Daisetsu does not try to consider the role that Enryō played during the late 1880s and the 1890s.

However, after having gone to the US at the age of 27, we can imagine that Daisetsu lived a somewhat gloomy life. It was also a time of contemplation in which his own thought was maturing. In this context, Enryō may have served as a teacher for Daisetsu in the sense that he set what Daisetsu saw as a bad example. He also probably used the expression "achieved nothing" because he was writing a letter to Nishida, a friend whose views he understood.

#### **4. Closing Remarks: Daisetsu's Criticism of Enryo and the Path of Modern Japanese Buddhism**

In closing, let us consider Daisetsu's criticism of Enryō in the context of the path traversed by the Buddhist world during the Meiji period. As we have seen above, in the background to Daisetsu's criticism of Enryō was a difference in their view of Buddhism: Enryō advocated a Buddhism of the intellect, and Daisetsu one of emotion (or, in other words, experience). Here, I would like to speculate how Daisetsu's criticism of Enryō related not to just Daisetsu himself but the general path taken by Meiji Buddhism.

For some time I have wondered how Enryō's thought was overcome. This would be easy to answer if it was clearly rejected and superseded, yet one does not find any traces of this. I feel that Daisetsu's criticism of Enryō might provide a hint in this regard.

<sup>14</sup> Italic phrase appears in English in the original. SUZUKI 鈴木. 『鈴木大拙全集』 (see note 10) vol. 36, 126.

For example, while KIYOZAWA Manshi 清沢満之 (1863–1903) was similar to Enryō in many ways (he was from the Shin sect Ōtani branch and his senior at Tokyo University, where he also studied Western philosophy) Kiyozawa's Buddhism was centered on inner contemplation, emphasizing experience more than that of Enryō. Also, *My Experiment Seeing God* 『予が見神の実験』 by TSUNASHIMA Ryōsen 綱島梁川 (1873–1907), who is receiving considerable attention in recent scholarship, was published in 1905.

From this time onwards, unexpectedly the intellect-centered Buddhist-philosophy concordance discourse of the late 1880s and 1890s loses its impact rapidly, and is replaced by a Buddhism emphasizing experience and religiousness. It appears that in this context Enryō's systematization of Buddhist philosophy was forgotten. However, this is nothing more than a casual theory, and I plan to consider it in more detail in the future.

## Appendix

### A. Comparison of Daisetsu and Enryō's Biographies

#### Suzuki Daisetsu

1870 (Age 0): Born in what is today Kanazawa City, Ishikawa Prefecture.

1891 (Age 21): Drops out of Tokyo Senmon Gakkō.

1892 (Age 22): Begins taking courses at Tokyo Imperial University's philosophy department.

1897 (Age 27): Goes to the United States. Works at Open Court Publishing Company. Publishes translation of *The Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, etc.

\* Sends letter to Nishida criticizing Enryō

1921 (Age 51): Otani University professor.

1927 (Age 57): *Collection of Zen Articles* 『禅論文集』, vol. 1.

1942 (Age 72): *On Pure Land Thought* 『浄土系思想論』

1944 (Age 74): *Japanese Spirituality* 『日本の靈性』

#### Inoue Enryō

1858 (Age 0): Born in what is today Nagaoka City, Niigata Prefecture.

1877 (Age 19): Enrolls in Tokyo University Preparatory School.

1885 (Age 27): Graduates from Tokyo University. *Golden Needle of Truth*

1887 (Age 29): Philosophy Academy opens. *Prolegomena of a Living Discourse on Buddhism, Living Discourse on Buddhism: Refuting the False*

1890 (Age 32): *Living Discourse on Buddhism: Disclosing the Right*

1902 (Age 44): Philosophy Academy Incident.

1905 (Age 47): Resigns from posts at Philosophy Academy University (president) and Kei-hoku Middle School 京北中学校 (principal). Begins the Personal Cultivation Church movement.

1912 (Age 54): *Living Buddhism*

1919 (Age 61): Passes away in Dàlián, China.

1945 (Age 75): Establishes Matsugaoka Bunko in Kamakura.

1949 (Age 79): Lectures at University of Hawai'i. Becomes a member of The Japan Academy 日本学士院. Conferred the Order of Culture 文化勲章.

1950 (Age 80): Gives lectures at Princeton University, New York University, etc.

1952 (Age 82): Visiting Professor at Columbia University.

1966 (Age 95): Passes away.

B. Contemporary Opinions about Living Discourse on Buddhism<sup>15</sup>

	Date	Author	Medium	Subject	○ / ×	Notes
1	1887-03	Reporter	<i>Current Events in Education</i> 『教育時論』 68	<i>Prolegom.</i>	○	
2	1887-05	FUSHIMI Tamenari 伏見為成	<i>New Enlightenment Magazine</i> 『明教新誌』	<i>Prolegom.</i>	○	
3	1887-09	KASHŪ Sei 葭秋生	<i>Publications Review Monthly</i> 『出版月評』	<i>Prolegom.</i>	○	
4	1887-09	TAKAHASHI Gorō 高橋五郎	<i>Friend of the Nation</i> 『国民の友』	<i>Prolegom.</i>	□	Christian
5	1888-02	TAKAHASHI Gorō 高橋五郎 <sup>16</sup>	<i>The Cosmos</i> 『六合雜誌』 86	Part 1	×	Christian
6	1888-03, -05	MIYAKE Yūjirō 三宅雄次郎	<i>Publications Review Monthly</i> 8, 9	Part 1	×	
7	1890-11	TAKAHASHI Gorō 高橋五郎	<i>Friend of the Nation</i>	Part 2	×	Christian
8	1890-12	KIYONO Tsutomu 清野勉	<i>Natural Law</i> 『天則』 3.5	Part 2	○	
9	1898-02	SUZUKI Daisetsu	<b>Letter to NISHIDA</b>	<b>Series</b>	×	
10	1914	MURAKAMI Senshō 村上專精	<i>61 Years: Or, Exposed</i> 『六十一年：一名赤裸裸』	<i>Prolegom.</i>	□	Reminiscences
11	1916	TANIMOTO Tomeri 谷本富	<i>Principles of Religious Education</i> 『宗教々育原論』	Part 1, 2	×	Reminiscences
12	1919	KANEKO Daiei 金子大栄	<i>Inoue Enryō Sensei</i> 『井上円了先生』	<i>Prolegom.</i>	○	Reminiscences
13	1928	TOKIWA Daijō 常盤大定	<i>Meiji Culture: Complete Collection</i> 『明治文化全集』 19	<i>Prolegom.</i>	○	Reminiscences

<sup>15</sup> The column "○ / ×" gives the evaluation of the respective author. "○" indicates a positive opinion, "×" indicates negative opinion, and "□" indicates a mixed opinion. "Part 1" and "Part 2" refers to *Refuting the False* and *Disclosing the Right* respectively. The table is based on TAKAGI Hirō 高木宏夫. 「井上円了の『真理金針』、『仏教活論序論』について」[On Inoue Enryō's "The golden needle of truth" and "Prolegomena of a living discourse on Buddhism"], in 『井上円了の世界』[The World of Inoue Enryō] (Tokyo: 東洋大学井上円了記念学術センター, 2005) and MIURA Setsuo 三浦節夫. 「『真理金針』、『仏教活論序論』に関する論評」[Reviews of 'The golden needle of truth' and 'Prolegomena of a living discourse on Buddhism'], chapter 2, section 7 in 『井上円了』(Tokyo: 教育評論社, 2016).

<sup>16</sup> Under pen-name Zaiichi Koji 在一居士.

## Bibliography

### *Primary Sources*

- INOUE Enryō 井上円了. 『仏教活論序論』 [Prolegomena of a living discourse on Buddhism], vol. 3 of 『井上円了選集』 [Inoue Enryō selected writings] (Tokyo: 東洋大学, 1986).
- . 『仏教活論：顕正活論』 [Living discourse on Buddhism: Refuting the false] in vol. 4 of 『井上円了選集』 .
- NISHIMURA Eshin 西村恵信, ed. 『西田幾多郎宛鈴木大拙書簡：億劫相別れて須臾も離れず』 [Suzuki Daisetsu's letters to Nishida Kitarō: Apart for ages but not separated a bit] (Tokyo: 岩波書店, 2004).
- SUZUKI Daisetsu 鈴木大拙. 『鈴木大拙全集』 [Complete works of Suzuki Daisetsu], ed. by HISAMATSU Shin'ichi 久松真一, YAMAGUCHI Susumu 山口益, and FURUTA Shōkin 古田紹欽, 36 vols. (Tokyo: 岩波書店, 2004).

### *Secondary Sources*

- FURUTA Shōkin 古田紹欽, ed. 『鈴木大拙の人と学問』 [Suzuki Daisetsu, the person and his scholarship], supplementary volume to 『鈴木大拙禅選』 [Selected Zen writings of Suzuki Daisetsu] (Tokyo: 春秋社, 1961).
- Matsugaoka Bunko 松ヶ岡文庫, ed. 『鈴木大拙：没後40年』 [Suzuki Daisetsu: Forty years after his death] (Tokyo: 河出書房新社).
- MIURA Setsuo 三浦節夫. 『井上円了：日本近代の先駆者の生涯と思想』 [Inoue Enryō: Life and thought of a pioneer of modern Japan] (Tokyo: 教育評論社, 2016).
- TAKAGI Hirō 高木宏夫. 「井上円了の『真理金針』、『仏教活論序論』について」 [On Inoue Enryō's "The golden needle of truth" and "Prolegomena of a living discourse on Buddhism"], in 『井上円了の世界』 [The world of Inoue Enryō] (Tokyo: 東洋大学井上円了記念学術センター, 2005).
- TAKEMURA Makio 竹村牧男. 『西田幾多郎と鈴木大拙：その魂の交流に聴く』 [Nishida Kitarō and Suzuki Daisetsu: Listening to their soulful exchanges] (Tokyo: 大東出版社, 2004).
- . 『「宗教」の核心：西田幾多郎と鈴木大拙に学ぶ』 [The core of "religion": Learning from Nishida Kitarō and Suzuki Daisetsu] (Tokyo: 春秋社, 2012).
- SATŌ Atsushi 佐藤厚. "Inoue Enryo and the Thought of Yoshitani Kakuju," *International Inoue Enryo Research* 3 (2015).

- . 「井上円了『八宗綱要ノート』の思想史的意義」 [The meaning of Inoue Enryō's "Notes regarding *Essentials of the Eight Sects*" in intellectual history terms], *Annual Report of the Inoue Enryō Center* 『井上円了センター年報』 22 (2013).
- . 「井上円了における伝統仏教体系と仏教・哲学一致論」 [Inoue Enryō's systematization of traditional Buddhism and Buddhism-philosophy concordance theory], *Toyo University Asian Studies* 『東洋学研究』 50 (2013).