

7

The Use of Traps and Snares: Shaku Sōen Revisited

Michel Mohr

Kōgaku Sōen (1860–1919),¹ known during his lifetime as Shaku Sōen, was a teacher in the Rinzai denomination of Zen, affiliated successively with its Myōshinji branch, then with its Engakuji branch. His renown comes from his participation in the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions as chief of the Japanese delegation² and from the notoriety gained by his disciple Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō (1870–1966). In spite of significant advances in the study of Sōen and his lineage,³ serious Japanese scholarship on this figure is almost nonexistent and resources are dominated by sectarian accounts.

In 1909, Sōen published a collection of talks entitled *Record of Traps and Snares* (*Senteiroku*), an allusion to chapter 26 of the *Zhuangzi* that emphasizes the provisional function of words. According to the *Zhuangzi*, in the same way fish traps and rabbit snares only serve to catch prey, words should be forgotten once their meaning has become clear.⁴ This metaphor served to emphasize the modest character of Sōen's talks, but his book, unfortunately, does not discuss language and its function. Ironically, as this collection records Sōen's candid views on the Russo-Japanese War, the author fell, to a certain extent, into his own trap. We will return to this crucial issue below when we deal with Sōen's views on war.

This chapter challenges some received ideas about Sōen. After providing a sketch of his life, I will examine the construction of Sōen's image as a Zen master, while occasionally filling some of the copious blanks left in his biography. This will lead us to examine

attempts to deconstruct the master's image, either by casting doubt on his morality or by highlighting his links with militarism. Finally, I suggest reflecting on how the reevaluation of Sōen's image could move us closer to recovering his distinctive voice.

Sōen's Early Profile

Sōen's childhood and the circumstances surrounding his entrance into the Buddhist clergy are depicted in an autobiographical account, which was probably written in his early forties.⁵ Sōen was born in Takahama in the west of present Fukui prefecture. His father, Ichinose Goemon Nobusuke, was the descendant of a samurai family from the Aizu domain in the northeast, which had embraced agriculture after moving to Fukui in the seventeenth century. Sōen's mother Yasuko was from the Hirata family.⁶ They had six children, two sons and four daughters. Their elder son was Chūtarō.⁷ Sōen, who was the youngest of the six, was given the name Tsunejirō. Sōen succinctly states, "our family was not as rich as in the past, but the household including more than ten members was living comfortably," and mentions that they had at least one maid.⁸ He also discloses the fact that since childhood he was hot-tempered⁹ and had a weak constitution.

His elder brother Chūtarō played a crucial role in Sōen's decision to become a monk. Chūtarō had frequented Buddhist temples since an early age and occasionally stayed at Jōkōji in Obama (Fukui prefecture), a Rinzai temple. Chūtarō had wanted to become a monk, but was not allowed to do so because of his duties as the elder son of the family. Thus, the young Sōen was persuaded to accomplish his sibling's dream and recalled, "I just took the place of my elder brother." Yet, the decision was not taken against his will. Perhaps to make it sound casual, he mentions how his brother used to tell him that even emperors become disciples of the Dharma (that is, listened to monks preaching the Buddhist teachings), and how he resolved to choose this path "without a precise objective," but rather out of "juvenile curiosity."

Sōen was ten years old in 1870,¹⁰ when Ekkei Shuken (1810–1884)—a widely respected priest from the Rinzai temple Myōshinji¹¹ who was also a relative¹²—came to visit his family in Takahama. Chūtarō managed to convince his parents to entrust their younger son to Ekkei, who conditionally agreed by telling Sōen, "if you intend to become a great monk I will consent to it." First, the boy was given the ordination name Sokō, meaning "the light of the patriarchs," but his name was changed to Sōen ("expression of the principle"), the name of another novice who had died from sickness.¹³

Crucial Years of Wandering Practice

After the usual years of apprenticeship as a novice under Ekkei, mostly at Tōkaian (the Myōshinji subtemple reserved for the chief abbot), Sōen was entrusted to a subtemple of Kenninji, in the heart of Kyoto, where he studied and practiced under the direction of Shungai Tōsen (1830–1875), the abbot of Ryōsokuin.¹⁴ When he came at age fourteen, only a handful of disciples were living there, but as Shungai's reputation spread their number quickly reached forty. Because of this, they chose to form a group of dedicated young student-monks who lived in a semi-autonomous way.¹⁵ They gave the name Forest of Gathered Jewels (*Gungyokurin*)¹⁶ to their improvised school and lodged in the adjacent Gokokuin. Among Sōen's description of his adolescent years, his perception of the Kenninji's surroundings is particularly interesting:

Kenninji is located in the midst of Kyoto's amusement quarter. Right outside the temple gate are the Gion and Miyagawa wards, famous breeding grounds for wasting money in drink and pleasures. In short, these are the demons' dwellings (*makutsu*). Younger codisciples and I thought that it was fascinating to be in such a place observing the strict monastic rules, a Zen monastery popping up at the very core of these demons' dwellings, and we were all studying hard.¹⁷

When Shungai died in 1875 at age forty-five, it was a shock to Sōen and his fellow monks. They decided to engage in a mourning retreat period of forty-nine days in memory of their deceased teacher. This was to culminate with the *Rōhatsu sesshin*, the harshest week of meditation training held in December. Sōen was sitting with Mokurai Sōen (Takeda, 1854–1930),¹⁸ a fellow monk of weak constitution, who later became the chief abbot of Kenninji;¹⁹ Sōen reports having benefited immensely from this monk's encouragements. Although the expression is intentionally veiled out of modesty, it is during this *sesshin* that Sōen, who was now fifteen, reached a decisive awareness after having been sitting for days in the cold: "It is really at that time that I realized the existence of this One Great Matter right under my surplice (*yo ga kesaka ni kono ichidaiji aru o seishita*)."²⁰

This marks the beginning of a precocious spiritual itinerary that led Sōen to consult several teachers, always recommended by his first spiritual mentor, Ekkei, who resided at Myōshinji but with whom he remained in close contact. Eventually, these early steps led Sōen to travel in and outside Japan, and to gain access to the highest rank in the Rinzai hierarchy. As described later, Sōen's monastic career culminated in 1883 with his certification by Kōsen Sōon (Imakita, 1816–1892) as Dharma heir.²¹

The Construction of Sōen's Image

Sōen's image as a Zen master and the construction of his portrayal for posterity includes four main layers: 1. autobiographical accounts, 2. biographies by disciples and admirers, 3. writings by apologists, and 4. the translation of his works.

Accounts by Sōen Himself

The first layer includes the autobiographical manuscript *Splits in a Monk's Robe* (*Koromo no hokorobi*), which ends with an account of the death of Gisan Zenrai in March 1878, as well as Sōen's voluminous correspondence and articles or books published while he was alive. Here, an important remark must be made concerning Sōen's so-called "Complete Works" (*Shaku Sōen zenshū*, published in 1929–1930). These ten volumes are by no means "complete." They mostly include minor textual commentaries, and comprise less than one-fifth of Sōen's published works.

The vast majority of Sōen's "writings" consists of oral teachings, written down by disciples or auditors, presumably with some accuracy. Stenography was commonly used since the Meiji period,²² and some of Sōen's recorded talks include notes concerning reactions in the audience, such as laughter or applause,²³ and occasionally ellipses indicating that the transcriber was unable to catch a quote from the classics.²⁴ Texts published while Sōen was alive are likely to have been checked to some degree by the author, but the numerous anthologies of his teachings published after his death in 1919 may reflect his thoughts less faithfully.

The only publications actually written down by Sōen himself are letters, serials,²⁵ newspaper articles, and his various travel diaries written in classical Chinese. These diaries reveal the sequence of Sōen's major trips abroad and the publications following each of them:

(1) Trip to Ceylon (Sri Lanka) and Thailand from March 8, 1887 to October 12, 1889. He wrote *Buddhism in the Southwest* (*Seinan no bukkō*),²⁶ published in January 1889—before his return—and *Chronicles of the Island of Ceylon* (*Seirontōshi*), published in April 1890. Parts of a draft entitled *Diary of a Journey to the West* (*Saiyū nikki*) were discovered in 1936 and published in facsimile edition in 1941 (a newly edited version was printed in 2001).

(2) Trip to Chicago from August 4 to October 29, 1893. He wrote *A Glance at the World's Parliament of Religion* (*Bankoku shūkyō taikai ichiran*), published in November 1893 (and reprinted several times), together with *Diary of a Trip*

to America (*Tobei nikki*).²⁷ This publication was based on notes taken by the interpreter, Nomura Yōzō, as Sōen acknowledges in his own explanatory notes.²⁸

(3) Trip to Manchuria. Shortly after the declaration of war against Russia (February 10, 1904), Sōen left Kamakura on March 12 (he spent some time in Hiroshima, departing from Hiroshima on April 21 and landing in Jinzhou on the Liaoning Peninsula on May 7). He went to the front in Manchuria, which he left on July 12, returning to Kamakura on July 25,²⁹ where he wrote *Journal on Defeating Demons (Gōma nisshi)*, published in December 1904.

(4) Trip to the United States, Europe, and Asia. He left Kamakura on June 11, 1905, and arrived in San Francisco on June 27. He remained in the United States until April 23, 1906. With a gift received from the Russells (discussed below), he then visited England, arriving in London on April 30. After having been to Scotland, France, Germany, Austria, and Italy, he took the boat in Naples on July 4 and headed toward Asia via Egypt. He stopped in Ceylon between July 20 and 26, before continuing to India. He then returned to Colombo on August 8, and finally left Ceylon on August 17, reaching Kōbe on September 4, 1906. He wrote *Idle Conversations (Kankattō)*, which was published in April 1907,³⁰ and *Diary of a Monk in Europe and America (Ōbei unsuiki)*, published in October of the same year. Portions of these works were included in *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot*, which carries the date 1906, but was printed in January 1907.³¹

(5) Trip to Korea and China at the invitation of the South Manchurian Railway. He left on October 8, 1912, from Shimonoseki and arrived in Pusan the following morning. He then left Changchun on October 31, earlier than expected, because of sickness; he was accompanied by Hōgaku Jikō (Seigo, 1875–1942)³² and Taibi Keishun (Shaku, 1882–1964), who took notes. A collection of talks he gave on various occasions during this trip was published as *A Guidebook to Practice (Shuyō no shiori)* in 1913, reprinted as *The Flower Held up and the Subtle Smile (Nenge mishō)* in 1915.

(6) Trip to Korea and China. He left on September 9, 1917, from Shimonoseki and arrived in Pusan on the evening of the same day; he returned to Nagasaki on November 15, 1917. He wrote *The Clouds of Yan [Hebei] and the Water of Chu [Hebei-Hunan] (En'un sosui)*, published in May 1918.

Sōen's autobiographical pieces are mostly narrated from an almost impersonal perspective, as if he were describing someone else's deeds. These texts stand in sharp contrast to the "confession" genre that was more common among Chinese literati.³³ One Japanese author even characterizes Sōen's accounts as "masterpieces of reportage."³⁴ As we will see below, Sōen nevertheless occasionally revealed some of his own feelings.

Biographies by Disciples and Admirers

After Sōen's death in November 1919, Nagao Daigaku (also known as Nagao Sōshi, 1894–1965)³⁵ brought into print *Zen Master Sōen's Face* (*Sōen zenji no menmoku*, 1920), a first attempt to perpetuate his teacher's memory. He followed with *Those Who Surrounded Zen Master Sōen* (*Sōen zenji to sono shūi*, 1923), *A Selection of Zen Master Sōen's Exposition of Mu* (*Sōen zenji musetsushū*, 1925), and finally, the invaluable *Anthology of Zen Master Sōen's Letters* (*Sōen zenji shokanshū*, 1931). One of Sōen's former assistants, Taibi Keishun, also compiled his *Yearly Biography of Ryōgakutsu* (*Ryōgakutsu nenjiden*), which was not published until 1942. Ryōgakutsu (Lankā's Den) is Sōen's "chamber name" as a teacher, an allusion to his stay in Ceylon.

Writings by Apologists

The third layer includes works by apologists who did not directly know Sōen, such as Inoue Zenjō (1911–2006). In 1941, Inoue became the abbot of Tōkeiji—the temple where Sōen spent the later part of his life.³⁶ In the postwar period, Inoue held a near monopoly of all publications in Japanese related to Sōen, due to his position as the guardian of primary sources kept at the Matsugaoka treasure-house (*Matsugaoka hōzō*) within his temple.³⁷ Regardless of this priest's good intentions and his sometimes meticulous work, publications that saw the light of day under his supervision reflected a single purpose: to demonstrate how great a teacher Sōen was. Deploring the fact that most people ignored Sōen, but were familiar with the name of Natsume Sōseki (who briefly visited him at Tōkeiji), Inoue wrote: "My intention is to praise Sōen while using Sōseki as a pretext" (for attracting people).³⁸ Unsurprisingly, the October 1968 special issue of the journal *Zenbunka* in commemoration of the fiftieth death anniversary of Sōen (including an article by Inoue) contains contributions that all reflect the same hagiographic slant. Let us examine one example of how the sectarian bias informed Sōen's biography.

THE KEIŌ COLLEGE EPISODE. In his afterword to Sōen's *Diary of a Journey to the West*, Suzuki Daisetsu writes that "after having completed his three years at Keiō College he [Sōen] further wanted to spend three years abroad."³⁹ Using a similar shortcut, Nagao Daigaku also states, "In the spring of 1887 [Sōen] graduated from Keiō College."⁴⁰ The histories of Engakuji, of course, follow suit⁴¹ and, as far as I know, Sōen's graduation from Keiō College has always been taken for granted.⁴² Thus, the common assumption is that Sōen, exceptional in

every task he undertook, swiftly completed his studies and then left for his first trip abroad. This contributed to the image of a Zen master who was open to modern forms of learning. The archives kept at Keiō University, however, tell us an altogether different story.

Admittedly, Sōen's choice to enter college can be described as a yearning for new approaches to learning. The way Sōen overcame the early opposition of his teacher Kōsen and eventually obtained his permission after the intercession of Torio Tokuan (Koyata, 1847–1905) constitutes one of the few relatively well-known episodes in Sōen's carrier.⁴³ Sōen's move—highly unusual for a Zen priest at this time—is attested by the name Shaku Sōen inscribed in the *Register of Entrances into the Keiō College Society* in Sōen's handwriting on September 1, 1885.⁴⁴

At that time, Keiō College functioned with a system of several different sections that reflected the students' language proficiency, since instruction was largely given in English by foreign instructors. Fortunately, the archives of the Fukuzawa Research Institute contain the complete list of all students enrolled at Keiō, with the details of their grades. This allows us to see precisely when Shaku Sōen was affiliated with this institution, and the sections in which he studied, as well as the name of fellow students. The college records indicate that Sōen attended classes during a total of four trimesters, from the third trimester of 1885 to the third trimester of 1886, but never graduated. Details of his study pattern during this period of fifteen months is worth paying some attention to, because all sorts of legends about this abound, even in supposedly serious publications. During the first trimester, in September 1885, Sōen was enrolled in the section “Outside Curriculum” (*kagai*), and was “promoted to [the next] level (*tōkyū*).”⁴⁵

During the next semester, his total grade was 394, with the best student in his class having a grade of 762, and Sōen's entry does not include “promoted to the next level.”⁴⁶ He received a zero grade for the final examination in both foreign languages and mathematics, two tests he might simply have chosen not to take. This appears to confirm his limited command of English. He did very well in Chinese classics (100/100), but during his studies in the temples he had had little exposure to these newer branches of learning. Out of forty-eight students in this class, Sōen is listed as number thirty-three in the order of performance. The degree of effort Sōen invested in this exercise is unknown, but this ranking must have been a humiliating experience for someone who was already certified as a designated Rōshi.

For the following semester, in May 1886, we find Sōen listed in the Separate Curriculum (*bekka*), sixth grade. Here the requirements were slightly different, and he was the best of his small class of eight students where mathematics was not taught.⁴⁷ This was probably not a selective curriculum, so that he was automatically promoted to the next fifth grade, where we find him

during the third trimester of 1886, again the best of his small class of ten students.⁴⁸ This constitutes the last recorded instance of Shaku Sōen's presence in the archives of Keiō College, and suggests that Sōen formally terminated his studies in December 1886. Had he intended to pursue his studies in this institution until graduation, he would have needed four additional trimesters to move from grade four to grade one. Unsurprisingly, Sōen's hagiographers pass rather quickly on this episode in Sōen's life as a student at Keiō College, which was undistinguished.

CURRICULUM AND MISSIONARIES. During Sōen's affiliation with Keiō College, he came into contact with Christian teachers. In his October 9, 1885, letter to Hasegawa Keitoku,⁴⁹ a friend who had just entered the Myōshinji monastery, Sōen mentions foreign mentors and the pressure he felt as a student:

The tigers of physics and philosophy in front and the wolf of Christianity in the back are simultaneously coming [to me], each of them sharpening its claws and showing its teeth. For the time being, let us put aside the relative merits of Christianity. From the first they [the Christians] are experts in administrating the world's resources and are extremely good in using science. Concerning these two aspects, they are doubtlessly far better than the Buddhists (*naikyōsha*). Presently, in our college we have [two] hired lecturers called Lloyd⁵⁰ and Kitchin.⁵¹ Both of them are missionaries of the non-Buddhist teachings (*gekkyō*), but undeniably they are also great scholars who have graduated from universities in England and America, those countries claiming to be civilized.⁵²

One may wonder what readings were given to the students. *The Mission Field* of July and October 1885 provides the list of classes taught by Arthur Lloyd (1852–1911). In history, students were assigned Parry's *World History*, and Quackenbos's *History of the United States*, *History of England*, and *Universal History*.⁵³ In law and philosophy, they read Fawcett's *Political Economy*; in elementary law, *Logic* by Mill;⁵⁴ and they had lectures on international law, as well as mental and moral philosophy. In the so-called literature classes they actually focused on history and political science, reading Guizot's *History of Civilization*,⁵⁵ Macauley's *Essays*, Mill's *On Liberty*, and Mill's *Representative Government*. Their classes in mathematics included arithmetic, algebra, geometry, bookkeeping, and trigonometry. In English, they had classes in grammar, reading, dictation, composition, conversation, and rhetoric.⁵⁶

Such a curriculum appears rather dry, and it is understandable that Sōen was not thrilled by the prospect of having to spend another year and a half

struggling with these textbooks. Nevertheless, the decision to quit this course of study must have been a difficult one, especially because of the support he had requested from Torio Tokuan. Unfortunately, there is no decisive piece of evidence allowing us to fathom Sōen's motivation for choosing to move on to a completely different approach and to focus for a while on the roots of the Buddhist tradition outside Japan. Some allusions are found in "The Career of Master Shaku Sōen" (*Shaku Sōen Zenji no keireki*), but this anonymous piece—likely to have been written by Nagao Daigaku⁵⁷—appears to be based on hearsay. In any case, it strikes us as an unusual account for a text included in the "official" biography.

According to this source, while studying at Keiō, Sōen had gained a reputation for hanging out with friends and indulging in noisy drinking, embarrassing his fellow students with boisterous utterances. Yet at the same time, he appeared distressed (*hanmon*) at his own future in the clergy and was even considering the possibility of returning to secular life.⁵⁸ Apparently informed of these rumors, Kōsen discussed the issue with Fukuzawa, so that Fukuzawa was entrusted with the delicate task of using tact to convince Sōen to stay on the monastic track. Fukuzawa suggested: "Your determination is to find the Way, what about traveling to Ceylon and investigating the source [of your tradition]? You should not give up your original intention!"⁵⁹

The above story indicates a sort of existential crisis experienced by Sōen when he completed his monastic training, after reaching the goal he set for himself since childhood. His experiment with Western approaches to learning obviously did not provide the sort of answer he was looking for, and he wanted to postpone institutional appointments in order to pursue his "long cultivation" (*chōyō*) outside the denomination's fold. Sōen eventually followed the advice of his teachers, setting out for an adventurous journey to South Asia. Another way to look at what happened would be to consider that Fukuzawa, who intended to improve morality within his institution, found an ingenious way to deflect the energy of his embarrassing Zen student, while giving him an opportunity to discover how strictly the precepts were observed in other Buddhist countries.

This might also be interpreted as an indication that Sōen, as gifted as he may have been in some areas, was pushed by a form of restlessness, and that although he had survived the monastic regimen, he hardly could endure academic constraints. Sōen's dislike for the academic approach can be seen in his publications, which reflect his wide repertoire in the classics and remarkable skills in oratory, but provide very little analysis and certainly do not display philosophical rigor. This inclination is even more visible when comparing the Japanese original of some of his discourses with their English translations.

Further Image-building through Translations

The role of Suzuki Daisetsu and other editors in “arranging” Sōen’s writings for Western consumption was a crucial part of the process of building his image as a master. Here I will examine only three examples: the first address delivered at the 1893 World’s Parliament of Religions; lectures given during his stay in the United States between June 1905 and April 1906; and a talk given after his return to Japan in September 1906.

ADDRESS AT THE 1893 WORLD’S PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS. In spite of a growing body of research dealing with the 1893 conference and the issues at stake, so far no researcher appears to have compared the Japanese original of Sōen’s address with its English translation. There seems to be a good excuse for this neglect: the two texts are so different that at first glance they seem to have little in common.

Concerning the Japanese versions, at least four different editions of the same text are available, but they are almost identical except for added punctuation and minor stylistic changes.⁶⁰ Similarly, the two main English versions are almost identical.⁶¹ What is striking is the great divergence of the English text from the original. The translators removed most technical terms and allusions to the sutras, and gratuitously invented almost poetical examples to illustrate Sōen’s intent.⁶² For instance, the beginning of Sōen’s address in Japanese can be rendered thus:

Ladies and Gentlemen, all the various things (*hinbutsu*)⁶³ succeed to each other in the unlimited [dimension of] time and are aligned in the endless [dimension of] space, but what are they made of? As far as I can tell, they emerge as the result of two mental causes (*shinteki gen’in*). And these two mental causes are [our] nature (*shō*) and [our] emotions (*jō*).

In the English version attributed to Suzuki Daisetsu this was expanded to:

If we open our eyes and look at the universe, we observe the sun and moon, and the stars on the sky; mountains, rivers, plants, animals, fishes and birds on the earth. Cold and warmth come alternately; shine and rain change from time to time without ever reaching an end. Again, let us close our eyes and calmly reflect upon ourselves. From morning to evening, we are agitated by the feelings of pleasure and pain, love and hate; sometimes full of ambition and desire, sometimes called to the utmost excitement of reason and will. Thus the action of mind is like an endless issue of a spring of water. As the

phenomena of the external world are various and marvelous, so is the internal attitude of human mind. Shall we ask for the explanation of these marvelous phenomena? Why is the universe in a constant flux? Why do things change? Why is the mind subjected to constant agitation? For these Buddhism offers only one explanation, namely, the law of cause and effect.

This gives a general feeling of the contrast between Sōen's conciseness and the extended development of the English "translation," and a measure of the considerable liberties taken in interpreting Sōen's prose. In defense of the translator, it should be noted that some sections of the Japanese text as it stood would have remained extremely obscure to an unprepared American audience, because it required too much background knowledge, and its organization was rather chaotic, with a considerable amount of repetition.

LECTURES GIVEN IN THE UNITED STATES, 1905–1906. Publications in English by Suzuki Daisetsu, such as *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot* (1907), constitute a special category in the construction of Sōen's image. When he published this anthology, Suzuki already felt confident of his command of English and his ability to adjust the teachings of Sōen to the tastes of Western readership. Thus he frankly wrote about the transcripts of Sōen's teachings entrusted to him: "In going over these documents critically, I found that I could not make use of all the material as it stood; for the talks during his stay on the Pacific coast were mostly of a very informal nature, and a copy of them prepared from shorthand notes needed a great deal of revision."⁶⁴

After enumerating some of the choices made in the revision process, Suzuki further claimed, "In spite of these alterations and the liberties I have taken with the manuscripts of the Reverend Shaku, these lectures remain a faithful representation of the views as well as the style of preaching of my venerable teacher and friend."⁶⁵ In this instance, no Japanese original is left that would allow us to compare Suzuki's rendering with the discourses as they were given, but the *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot* should be treated with caution, for they reflect Suzuki's own anticipation of what American readers might have expected.

"REFLECTIONS ON AN AMERICAN JOURNEY." Such editorial "improvement" based on Sōen's sayings did not end with the work of Suzuki Daisetsu. Another recent example is provided by Wayne S. Yokoyama and the way he translated the "Reflections on an American Journey" based on Sōen's account (1993). This piece is presented as "an adapted translation of *Tobei zakkān*" included in the

first volume of Sōen's complete works.⁶⁶ Actually, this text was itself based on the presentation given by Sōen shortly after his return from the United States in September 1906, at the Eastern Association (*Tōhō kyōkai*), a piece included in *Record of Traps and Snares*. This first published version is much closer to the style of oral delivery; it contains salutations to the audience and verbose passages that have been cut in the complete works. This talk by Sōen and its successive incarnations, first in Japanese, then in English, provides us with a rare detailed example of how editorial choices were made and of what was left out in the process.

Aside from minor details eliminated to make the text more concise, the two successive filters applied to Sōen's prose reveal some of the criteria adopted by both the editor and the translator. First, in the version included in the complete works, the text was completely rewritten and the rather emotional account⁶⁷ of Sōen's acquaintance with Ida Evelyn Russell (1862–1917)⁶⁸ was reduced to a bare minimum. The first address recorded in *Senteiroku* included the following seven sections:

1. The Purpose of the Journey was My Own Benefit, the Benefit of Others, and Gratitude
2. The Motivation for Going to America: The Zen of Mrs. Russell
3. Activities as a Guest of the Russell Family
4. Tour to the Eastern Part of the United States
5. Trip to Europe as a Practice for My Own Benefit
6. The West Is Individualist: Piety Toward One's Wife
7. Pilgrimage to Buddhist Sites

It was recast in the following way for the collected works:⁶⁹

1. [How Americans] Were Inspired to Do Zazen
2. Sentient Beings Are All My Children⁷⁰
3. An Excellent Teaching [Found] in Japan
4. Prince Shōtoku Was a Great Hit

In the first version we see a much more personal account, where human relations and the encounter with the Russells is placed at the center of the story. Modesty being the rule, Sōen first diminishes the weight put on this trip, saying that it was planned "aimlessly" and was devoid of ambition and purpose. Then he frankly describes one of his reasons for going to the United States as being the wish to improve his health (*kenkō o yashinai ga tame*) and the additional incentive of the possibility that it might benefit others (*rita*).⁷¹ This was carefully excised from the version in the complete works and therefore is not visible in the English translation, either.

The English translation of the passage depicting Ida Russell's initial motivation for practicing meditation before coming to Japan includes the following seemingly innocuous passage: "In today's world of open scholarship, the scholarly investigations of religion made her realize that there are other religions in lands outside of Christendom, religions beyond Christianity" (Yokoyama, p. 140).

What is remarkable here is that in the Japanese text Sōen said: "There are certainly religions *superior* to Christianity" (*kirisutokyo ijō no shūkyō*).⁷² Sōen was here speculating about the reasons that led Mrs. Russell to such curiosity for non-Christian teachings, and he imagined how she thought that "there must be more to religion than Christianity." In this case we see the translator, consciously or not, editing Sōen's discourse to lessen the potential impact of his words on Western readership. It is often in those subtle emendations or in word choices that undisclosed intentions appear. There are other talks by Sōen that also convey the impression that he happened to speak frankly or even naively to his audience. One example is where he recalls that, despite having tried several times to quit smoking and drinking, he kept failing until he was invited to stay with the Russells.⁷³

Overall, Sōen's original addresses were definitely more straightforward than subsequent versions. The alterations applied by editors and translators to his texts build an impersonal image transcending human emotions and worldly considerations. In other words, editorial work contributed to remove traces of weakness and the trivial dimensions of Sōen's character, and emphasized the solemn character of the master and his equanimity.

The Other Sides of Sōen and His Stance on War

Not many authors overtly challenged Sōen's authority or sincerity as a Zen master. Two of them, Inoue Shūten (1880–1945) and Brian Victoria, deserve closer examination. The first, Inoue Shūten, was a disgruntled former Sōtō priest who began advocating pacifism after returning from the Russo-Japanese War. Some of Inoue's favorite topics were social (in)justice, the consequences of Asian colonization, and the arrogance of Zen teachers who lacked proper understanding of Chinese sources.⁷⁴ In the 1910s, Inoue was one of the few Japanese intellectuals who had traveled to Theravada countries and to China, but unlike Sōen, he considered Buddhism abroad more authentic. Tensions between Inoue and Suzuki Daisetsu, fueled by Inoue's criticism of Sōen, resulted in the exchange of a series of virulent articles that came to a head in 1912, marking the definitive breakup between the two men.⁷⁵

The real issues dividing Suzuki and Inoue seem to have been their respective positions toward the emperor. Yet Inoue resorted to a below-the-belt tactic, insinuating that Sōen was a depraved monk: “One hears it was common for the priest Sōen when he returned from a preaching travel to make his assistant go back to the temple first; he would then go alone and stay overnight in the pleasure quarters (*karyū no chimata*).”⁷⁶

Whatever the veracity of such hearsay, this way of publicizing gossip did not serve Inoue well and seems to have undermined his credibility as a scholar. Yet the testimony of historian Haga Kōshirō (1908–1996), who engaged in a convoluted defense of Sōen, ironically reinforces the impression that these rumors were not entirely unfounded. He wrote,

“According to what I directly heard from Sōen’s Dharma-heir Sōkatsu, Sōen was extremely strict in his observance of the precepts and in his behavior until 1898, when he gave his certification to Sōkatsu.”⁷⁷

Aside from his academic career, Haga was also a Zen practitioner in the lineage of Tatsuta Eisan (1893–1979), who had been certified by Sōkatsu. Such background suggests that Haga’s conversation with Sōkatsu was more than an outsider’s interview. Because this also evokes the above-mentioned story about Sōen’s reputation at Keiō College, it might indicate some form of deep ambiguity in Sōen’s character and demeanor. This dimension obviously was never publicly discussed and does not allow us to advance further hypothesis. Let us therefore examine aspects of Sōen’s life that are better documented, if not necessarily less ambiguous.

Sōen’s views on war deserve to be scrutinized, especially in the wake of Brian Victoria’s publications, *Zen at War* (1997) and *Zen War Stories* (2003). Victoria forced the Japanese clergy to face their war responsibility, and he has thus helped to open the debate on a topic considered taboo in the postwar period. His discussion of Sōen, however, is limited to presenting him as a typical example of one of many who “promoted the idea of a close relationship between Buddhism and war.”⁷⁸ Before we examine more closely the sources used to support this statement, two elements of background information should be taken into account: the way Sōen experienced the British presence in Asia, and the informed opinion of one of his colleagues with whom he had practiced in Kyoto.

Sōen’s Views on Colonialism

We have already seen the circumstances surrounding Sōen’s departure for Ceylon. Sōen wrote about his impressions abroad in a series of letters to Fukuzawa Yukichi, which were partially published in the *Jiji Shinpō*, the newspaper owned by

Fukuzawa.⁷⁹ They clearly reveal Sōen's indignation at the way the local population was treated by the British in Ceylon. For instance, in a letter published on July 5, 1887, he observed:

Already 70 or 80 years have elapsed since this country began to be plundered (*ryakudatsu*) by England. From that time onward everyone well knows how the British government has been ill-treating (*gyakutai*) the natives (*domin*). Just to mention one extreme example, from age 15 to age 60 each single citizen is required to pay a tax [equivalent to] 25 *sen* every year, [indicating] that people are treated exactly in the same way merchandise (*shinamono dōyō*) would be handled.

Sōen's depictions of life under the colonial regime abound in details, such as taxes imposed on each coconut, one of the most important resources of the island. What is important for our purpose is to note that his descriptions are not purely factual; they reveal Sōen's acute perception that the colonial rule was profoundly unfair and in direct contradiction to ideals of universal justice proclaimed in the books he had studied at Keiō.

Aside from Sōen's direct experience of being treated almost like an animal on board the German ship that took him to Ceylon,⁸⁰ the above-mentioned outrage may have been furthered by contacts he had with the Theosophical Society during his stay. In a letter composed on his way back to Japan, on June 19, 1889, he wrote to fellow monks:

I left Galle⁸¹ two or three days ago and, presently, I am staying at the Theosophical Society in Colombo, waiting for a reliable ship. . . . The other day (June 16), Mr. Olcott (accompanied by three Japanese Shinshū priests) arrived here coming back from his trip to Japan. . . . At tonight's meeting Mr. Olcott spoke about the present situation in Japan and expressed his wish that in the future friendship between this country and ours would be further promoted.⁸²

Given the anti-missionary agenda of Henry Steel Olcott (1832–1907),⁸³ it is not surprising that at that time the two men shared an aspiration to resist the Western presence in Asia. They were both witnesses to the geopolitical unbalance brought about by the Industrial Revolution and the rise of Western military power across the world. Later in Sōen's career, though, we see that he was much less critical of Japan's colonial role in Korea and, after having deplored the excessive presence of Christian missionaries there, he concluded "I think that we must bear the responsibility of transplanting Japanized Buddhism in that land to guide (*γūdō*) the Koreans."⁸⁴ Sōen's criticism of colonization appears

thus to be limited to its Western manifestations, and reflects a lack of distance from his own context. It is therefore reasonable to wonder whether the frustration he experienced in Ceylon and the political awareness derived from this limited exposure to life abroad led him to justify violence and, if so, to what degree.

Mokurai's Understanding of the Word "Killing"

Before we further discuss Sōen's position, it is important to see how his friend Mokurai Sōen clarified the usage of a word crucial for our inquiry. Here is how he explained his understanding of the verb "to kill" (*korosu*), beginning with an anecdote:

Quite a long time ago, the military officer Torio⁸⁵ came to me and, when our conversation moved to "killing" he said, "my profession precisely consists in killing people." Yet, when I use this word it doesn't mean to kill the physical body (*shintai*). To kill the mind (*kokoro*), to kill craving (*yokushin*), to kill the sixth consciousness [*sic*] and the eighth consciousness, to kill them all completely, this is what I mean.⁸⁶

In case this could be interpreted as a rhetorical device to justify Japanese militarism, let us have a glimpse at the metaphor of "the sword that gives life versus the sword that kills people" as it is used in the classics. In the eleventh-century Chinese *Jingde chuanglu*, we find the following critique of Ciming Chuyuan (also known as Shishuang, 986–1039): "Although Shishuang has the blade killing people, he lacks the sword giving them life."⁸⁷

Classical sources use "life" and "death" in the spiritual sense, with "death" or "killing" indicating the removal of bondage and delusion or the absorption in *samadhi*, while "life" refers to the "revival" coinciding with the reemergence of the true self. Either aspect can be emphasized, depending on the skills of the teacher, as indicated by a phrase in the *Anthology of Verses Used in Zen Monasteries* (*Zenrin kushū*):

Manjusri holds aloft the sword that slays people.
Vimalakirti draws the sword that gives people life.⁸⁸

Such textual sources do not exclude the possibility that the metaphor's meaning could have been distorted by Zen teachers. Yet it is clear they were originally used in the context of meditation practice, where the primary concern is dying to one's small self and awakening. This should facilitate a serene discussion of Sōen's perspective, without, on the other hand, displaying

any complacency toward his political leanings or toward atrocities perpetrated by the military.

Sōen's Writings about War

As discussed previously, English texts attributed to Sōen, such as *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot*, should be taken with a grain of salt, because they reflect to a large extent Suzuki Daisetsu's own ideas and expressions. In addition, Suzuki and Sōen's tour of the United States should be understood in the context of Japan's victory in the Russo-Japanese War of 1905. This victory had attracted the attention of many Westerners, who were intrigued by what could have made this mysterious Far Eastern country powerful enough to beat the Russian empire. In the same year, Okakura Tenshin (1862–1913) wrote "The average Westerner . . . was wont to regard Japan as barbarous while she indulged in the gentle arts of peace: he calls her civilized since she began to commit wholesale slaughter on Manchurian battlefields."⁸⁹ Sōen and Suzuki Daisetsu no doubt capitalized on this fascination. In any case, the *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot* cannot serve as the primary resource for discussing Sōen's stance on war; one must turn to his publications in Japanese.

Among several addresses where Sōen deals with this topic, his "Attainment of Peace of Mind for the Military," which appeared in the April 1904 issue of the magazine *Taiyō* (The Sun), discloses, quite frankly, some of his intentions for joining the army as chaplain *before* he moved to the battlefield:

Because this war constitutes a brilliant feat (*kaiji*)⁹⁰ and a unique opportunity, I have chosen to follow the army anyway. As some among the soldiers are studying Zen and a lot of them appear to understand it to a certain extent, I thought it would really be fortunate if by going to the front I could provide some spiritual support. The Nishi Honganji has spared no effort in sending many priests to serve as war chaplains,⁹¹ but I have not yet heard of priests being sent from the Higashi Honganji. From the Zen denominations, there is no other war chaplain besides me. Of course, I don't know where we will be sent, but I will go where the army goes, and to begin with I am planning to spend four or five months at the front.⁹²

No reservations and no doubts are expressed concerning the legitimacy of the Japanese intervention in this conflict, and one can even discern Sōen's idealization of his role. Shortly after this declaration he landed near Jinzhou, jumping into the water in the night of May 7 like all other soldiers, and he

quickly experienced his baptism of fire. He left a day-by-day account of his involvement with the troops in *Journal on Defeating Demons* (*Gōma nisshi*).

In the political arena, Sōen clearly identified the “enemy.” He blamed in particular Konstantin Pobedonostsev (1827–1907)—the éminence grise of Tsar Alexander III—for being “the giant leader of the non-Buddhist evil spirits” (*akuma gedō no kyokai*), who “regards himself as the messenger of God” and “brings the Russian Tsar to his knees.”⁹³ On the other hand, Sōen made clear in his Foreword to the diary that the “demons” he was planning to defeat during his trip were as much internal as external, writing “outside the mind there is no Buddha, how could one notice a demon with the eyes?”⁹⁴

On the ground, however, the task proved much harder than Sōen had expected; rather than preaching, he ended up spending most of his time visiting field hospitals, where flocks of wounded soldiers received emergency treatment, and conducting funerals. Many soldiers did not survive and, in his journal entry for May 17, Sōen recalls being so overwhelmed in front of two dead bodies that he could not even chant the sutras.⁹⁵ He mentions that wounded Russian soldiers were admitted into the field hospital, adding “being also loyal to their country, even if they are enemies, how could one not feel deep pity for them?”⁹⁶ He also describes the plight of local peasants who came to beg for mercy, saying that they had to endure the worst from both Russian and Japanese troops, and that they had not eaten for three days. Sōen notes, “having finished speaking, they burst into tears, and I also was left wordless.”⁹⁷ Sleep-deprived and starving, Sōen describes thirst and lack of water as the worst ordeals. After a month following the army, he still did not have the opportunity to wash himself, let alone do any laundry, and like all soldiers, he was infested by fleas.⁹⁸

The two months spent in Manchuria took a toll on Sōen’s body, and he started complaining of abdominal pain on July 8. When Prince Fushimi Sadanaru (1858–1923) was recalled to Japan, Sōen was allowed to follow him and left Dalian on July 12, 1904, earlier than he had originally planned. Reading Sōen’s description of how, when the boat passed Okayama, he remembered his young days at Sōgenji and his handkerchief was drenched with tears,⁹⁹ one can easily imagine the physical and psychological wounds left by his war experience, which today might be labeled “post-traumatic stress disorder.” He was so sick that he had to stay in bed for three days on his way to Kamakura.¹⁰⁰

The overall significance of the Manchurian experience on Sōen’s thought is difficult to measure, but it certainly turned out to be more than the “brilliant feat” he had expected. His ailments led him to resign his position of chief abbot, with the indirect effect of prompting him to accept the invitation of his friends the Russells to go to the United States. When, as we saw above, Sōen disclosed

that one of the purposes of his trip was the wish to improve his health, it was not a figure of speech. After a month spent at the Nasu Hot Spring in September 1904,¹⁰¹ he still had not recovered. The repercussions of the Russo-Japanese War on Sōen were, however, not limited to his own person; one of his dearest disciples never made it back to Japan.

THE IMPACT OF UEMURA SŌKŌ'S DEATH. Among Sōen's disciples, the presence of Uemura Sōkō (Teizō; 1875–1906) and the attention given to him deserve a special mention because of its connection to the war issue. After having graduated from the Department of Philosophy at Tokyo Imperial University in 1899, Uemura first spent a year as a volunteer in the army. He requested ordination by Sōen in January 1901 and received the new name Sōkō. Suzuki Daisetsu was already in Illinois at that time, and the expectations for the future of a monk with such intellectual background seem to have been high. Even Nishida Kitarō wrote that he felt humbled by Sōkō's determination.¹⁰² A couple of years after his ordination, when the group led by Ida Russell stayed at Engakuji between July 1902 and March 1903, Sōkō was one of the interpreters, an indication of his proficiency in English.¹⁰³

Shortly after Sōen's return to Japan, Sōkō was sent to the front in November 1904,¹⁰⁴ as second lieutenant (*shōi*). News that Sōkō had died in Manchuria first reached Sōen on January 14, 1906, while he was in San Francisco.¹⁰⁵ Suzuki Daisetsu, who was present at the side of his teacher, testified that "the dark sadness emanating from the Rōshi at that time was unforgettable."¹⁰⁶ For a while, he received conflicting reports that Sōkō had been captured and was still alive, but eventually hope vanished. When Sōen came back to Tōkeiji in September 1906, one of his first tasks was to perform a memorial service for Sōkō and to erect a five-story small stūpa, which he could see from his quarters, and which is still visible at Tōkeiji. It is only much later, in 1937, that the circumstances of Sōkō's death became clear and were reported in the press.¹⁰⁷ A former Japanese officer who was searching the area interviewed a Manchurian witness, who reported that he had seen Sōkō captured, and since he was an officer he had received preferential treatment, but that he chose to fast to death.

Sōen was deeply affected by the consequences of the Russo-Japanese War, physically and morally. The war also harmed his Dharma lineage, as he lost one of his most promising heirs. Sōen's views on war were informed by all these events and, although he kept viewing the conflict with Russia as legitimate, to a certain extent he seems to have ceased to romanticize war.

Thus, Sōen's perspective, like that of all thinkers examined in earnest, was not static but changed with time. We must therefore briefly direct our attention to the anthology of his talks published a few months before his

death, *An Alert Person, A Swift Horse* (*Kaijin kaiba*, 1919).¹⁰⁸ This is the only Japanese text mentioned by Victoria, but the three passages he quotes mostly emphasize the relation between Zen and Bushidō during the Kamakura period, and the relevance of Zen for the modern period.¹⁰⁹ There are several other passages in the book that would have been much more pertinent to the discussion of militarism. One of them is the rather surreal chapter where Sōen discusses the fate of Wilhelm II, the exiled German emperor, and the involvement of Woodrow Wilson in the negotiations to put an end to World War I.¹¹⁰ After having summarized the latest political developments, Sōen half-jokingly suggests that if Wilhelm lived in Japan he could become a monk to retire in an honorable manner, but reaches the conclusion that it is not entirely feasible. Nevertheless, Sōen's suggestion goes as follows:

He could from the bottom of his heart enter the state of mind of a monk (*shukke no kibun*) and, based on what he deduced from his own experience, he could in a majestic and manful way proclaim the reasons that led him to realize (*satoru*) that whatever the factors [that lead to it], war is a tragedy (*hisan*) causing countless harms and not a single benefit. Defining his position [in favor of] disarmament (*heibi teppai*) and world peace (*bankoku heiwa*) he could try to travel to every nation, emphasizing the tragedy of war.¹¹¹

Sōen focused on the misfortune of the deposed emperor and on the disastrous consequences of the ongoing world war, but through this fantasy he also projected some of his own hopes onto the international scene. This is not to say that Sōen became a pacifist; his loyalty to the imperial system clearly prevented him from condemning the Japanese military ambitions in Asia; he also resolutely opposed socialist ideas.¹¹² After the Manchurian experience, and toward the end of his life, he nonetheless appears to have become acutely aware of the futile and devastating effects of war.

This stands in stark contrast to the belligerent position he had advocated earlier in his *Record of Traps and Snares*, where he explicitly justified taking life for the sake of a “righteous war” to oppose the injustice committed by the Russian government toward its own people.¹¹³ Whatever ensnarement Sōen had in mind, in this former text he endorsed “great killing” (*daisesshō*), supposedly coming out of compassion, which he opposed to the “small killing” (*shōsesshō*) committed by the Russian troops as a result of the greed of their rulers.¹¹⁴ In the particular context of this war, and before going to the front, Sōen did not use the word “killing” in its metaphorical sense.

Conclusion

Even a cursory examination shows that many of Sōen's public addresses, if taken out of context, could serve either to justify or to condemn his attitude toward contemporary events. What Sōen's inconsistent positions primarily reveal is that, even in the case of someone as famous as he was, considerable work remains to be done to advance primary research through the publication of sources representative of the wide range of his opinions. The publication and translation of his prolific output as well as the work of contemporary figures is necessary to gain a more balanced and comprehensive appreciation of the Meiji and Taishō intellectual and religious history. The task admittedly is huge, marked by urgency (documents are being eaten by bugs and are turning into dust, and witnesses are passing away before their testimony can be recorded), and requires collaborative efforts.

Sectarian hagiographies have dominated the scene for almost a century, but now the time seems ripe to put this into perspective, and finally come to terms with the fact that Zen teachers are not beyond the reach of critical studies and historical scrutiny. Presently, Japanese Zen denominations are so preoccupied with their survival and with marketing a positive image that in this regard very little can be expected from their side.

Western scholars have engaged since the 1990s in a systematic dissection of how Suzuki Daisetsu, especially in his English writings, promoted a romanticized version of Zen while subscribing to schemes of cultural superiority. On the other hand, Janine Sawada's meticulous study on religious communities up to the late nineteenth century has contributed to highlight the permeability of sectarian boundaries and has suggested the breadth of the intellectual fermentation taking place in the Engakuji circle (2004). Sōen represents the articulation between these two worlds, as the recipient of Kōsen's Tokugawa legacy, and as the teacher of Suzuki Daisetsu, entrusting his disciple with the task of developing exchanges with the outside world. Through various factors illustrated in this chapter, Sōen became acutely aware that the clergy needed to counterbalance the proselytizing efforts of competing religious groups. In the wake of major sociohistorical transformations, Sōen cannot entirely escape the charge of having sometimes made opportunistic choices. Yet, his pivotal role deserves to be further examined, and an enormous amount of work remains to be done to account for the full range of positions he expressed, without suppressing their unpleasant components.

Successive alterations in Sōen's biography gradually developed the image of an exemplary master, which served to sell Rinzai Zen to the public. The

investigation of some less-publicized aspects of his life conducted in this chapter indicates the extent to which Sōen's profile was embellished, and invites circumspection in the handling of biographical materials. Biographies of Zen teachers such as Sōen are still being used as devices to divert our attention from the vulnerability of these figures to their own times. The opposite strategy of indicting them for what they did or did not do to conform to undefined present ethical standards appears equally unprofitable, because a mere tarnishing of the image similarly blurs the contours. It is only by looking through the sectarian rhetoric and by a careful examination of each utterance in its own context that we may be able to hear the distinctive voices of these teachers.

NOTES

Part of the research conducted for this chapter was carried out with the support of the University of Hawaii Japan Studies Endowment. The author also wants to express his gratitude to the staff of the library at Keiō University Mita Campus, who granted permission to consult their archives and always kindly responded to numerous requests and questions.

1. Most publications still have Sōen's date of birth incorrect. He was born on the eighteenth day of the twelfth lunar month, in the year Ansei 6, which corresponds to January 10, 1860, in the solar calendar. See Inoue Zenjō, *Shaku Sōen den* (Kyoto: Zenbunka kenkyūjō, 2000) (cited hereafter as Inoue 2000), p. 4. For ordained people active after the Meiji period, during their lifetime their name would be composed of the family name (*zokusei*) followed by the ordination name (*hōki* or *imina*; example: Shaku Sōen). After their death, it was and still is considered disrespectful to use the family name. The full name is thus indicated by the surname (*dōgō* or *azana*) followed by the ordination name (example: Kōgaku Sōen). For famous people who were widely known by their family name, it is frequently used even after death, although formally this usage is considered "inappropriate." Because the ordination name Sōen sounds more familiar than Kōgaku, hereafter I will simply speak of "Sōen," even in the period when he had not yet received this name, and even if Kōgaku would have been more symmetrical to the name of his teacher Kōsen.

2. His first discourse at the parliament has been edited by Wayne S. Yokoyama, "Two Addresses by Shaku Sōen: 'The Law of Cause and Effect, as Taught by Buddha,'" translated by D. T. Suzuki, 'Reflections on an American Journey,'" *Eastern Buddhist* 26/2 (1993): 131–148. Studies mentioning the role played by Sōen at this conference include James E. Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); Judith Snodgrass, *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism, Occidentalism, and the Columbian Exposition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); and John S. Harding, *Mahāyāna Phoenix: Japan's Buddhists at the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions* (New York: Peter Lang, 2008). There will be more on this text in the next section of this chapter.

3. See in particular the invaluable contributions by Richard Jaffe, “Seeking Śākyamuni: Travel and the Reconstruction of Japanese Buddhism,” *Journal of Japanese Studies* 30/1 (2004): 65–96, and “Buddhist Material Culture, ‘Indianism,’ and the Construction of Pan-Asian Buddhism in Prewar Japan,” *Material Religion* 2/3 (2006): 266–293; also see Janine Sawada, “Religious Conflict in Bakumatsu Japan: Zen Master Imakita Kōsen and Confucian Scholar Higashi Takusha,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 21/2–3 (1994): 211–30; “Political Waves in the Zen Sea: The Engaku-Ji Circle in Early Meiji Japan,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25/1–2 (1998): 117–50, and *Practical Pursuits: Religion, Politics, and Personal Cultivation in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004).

4. See Burton Watson, *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), p. 302.

5. These autobiographical notes are included in a manuscript entitled *Splits in a Monk's Robe* (*Koromo no hokorobi*). First published by Nagao Sōshi (= Daigaku). *Sōen zenji no memoku* (Tokyo: Ryūbunkan, 1920), pp. 181–199 (cited hereafter as Nagao 1920), then included in SZ, vol. 10, pp. 257–276. The version in Inoue 2000, pp. 3–27, is incomplete and contains unacknowledged cuts and changes. Yet these notes only extend up to the death of one of his teachers, Gisan Zenrai (1802–1878), in March 1878. For the remaining part of his life we must rely on his disciples' accounts, on his letters, or on external sources. Concerning the dating of this manuscript, Inoue gives the approximation of 1899, on the basis of a poem composed when Sōen returned to his hometown of Takahama. Sōen wrote in the autobiography that he “went to visit the grave five or six years ago” and quotes the poem that he composed on this occasion, lamenting the demise of most of his relatives. Yet Inoue's reasoning that the autobiography “must have been composed seven years after the death of his father” is unclear, especially since he gives the date 1891 for the father's death (Inoue 2000, p. 4).

6. Concerning the family name of Sōen's mother, the first version of the autobiography published by Nagao correctly lists the village name followed by her family name (Nagao 1920, p. 181). The version in SZ, vol. 10, p. 258, dropped the village name, so that her family name became Wada, but this has been corrected by Inoue 2000, p. 3. The correct family name is corroborated by Nagao Daigaku (= Sōshi), ed., *Sōen zenji shokanshū* (Tokyo: Nishōdō, 1931) (cited hereafter as Nagao, ed. 1931), p. 1. The information concerning her dates is based on the note provided by Inoue 2000, p. 27, where he gives the date for Yasuko's death as February 1876. Coupled with the traditional age of fifty-four given for her death, she was apparently born in 1823. Inoue can be trusted, because he certainly had the registry of the deceased (*kakochō*) at his disposal.

7. Little is known about Chūtārō, except that he was born in 1845 (Kōka 2) and that “he died at a young age without witnessing the success” of his younger brother Sōen (Nagao, ed. 1931, p. 454). Sōen mentions Chūtārō in a letter from Ceylon sent to his parents on November 11, 1888, but this seems to be the last mention of him (Nagao, ed. 1931, pp. 56–58).

8. SZ, vol. 10, p. 260; and Inoue 2000, p. 6. Sōen describes how his mother would give directions to the maid(s) (*kahi*) for preparing the meals of the following day. It could be singular or plural.

9. For “hot-tempered,” the original text in both Nagao 1920, p. 182, and in SZ, vol. 10, p. 258, has a different compound read *kanrai*, whose meaning is unclear. Because the second character *rai* is also used for “leprosy,” although it could also indicate “scabies,” Inoue assumed that it was a misprint and corrected it into *kanteki* without warning (Inoue 2000, p. 4). If we assume the correct word is *kanteki*, it refers to *kanshaku*, which can mean “nervousness” in the weak sense or, more strongly, “irrepressible accesses of anger.” One way to understand this feature of Sōen’s biography and his apparent restlessness might be to follow the suggestion that gifted children may have greater psychomotor, sensual, imaginative, intellectual, and emotional “overexcitabilities.” See Sal Mendaglio, “Dabrowski’s Theory of Positive Disintegration: Some Implications for Teachers of Gifted Students,” *Agate* 15/2 (2002): 14–22. Another indication of Sōen’s vulnerability in certain psychological areas, even during his adult years, is given by the anecdote concerning his phobia of snakes. See Brian Daizen Victoria, *Zen War Stories* (London: Routledge Curzon, 2003), pp. 112–113.

10. For years of age, I followed the Western reckoning, unless explicitly using the adjective “traditional.” According to this reckoning, Sōen had his first birthday on January 18, 1861, although he was born in the sixth year of the Ansei era (1859). It may seem confusing because the solar Gregorian calendar was introduced during his lifetime, in Meiji 5, when the third day of the twelfth lunar month was declared to be the first January of Meiji 6 (1873). This means that in most cases one has to subtract two years from the traditional ages mentioned by Sōen, Inoue, and other authors. Here, Sōen says that he left home (*shukke*) in Meiji 4 (1871), traditional age twelve, but the date has been corrected in Inoue 2000, p. 7.

11. Ekkei is especially famous for having established the present-day Myōshinji training monastery (*sōdō*) within the Tenjuin subtemple. The new monastery’s inauguration ceremony (*kaitanshiki*) was finally performed in the spring of 1878. See Nōnin Kōdō, ed., *Kundoku Kinsei zenrin sōbōden* (Kyoto: Zenbunka kenkyūsho, 2002) (cited hereafter as Nōnin, ed., 2002), vol. 1, p. 184. The chronicle of the opposition and hardship encountered by Ekkei is included in Ekkei’s *Kinmōkutsu nisshi*, partially transcribed in Kimura Shizuo (Jōyū), “Ekkei: Myōshinji sōdō kaitan no ki,” in Zenbunka kenkyūsho, ed., *Meiji no zenshō* (Kyoto: Zenbunka kenkyūsho, 1981), pp. 25–45. See also Myōshinji sōdō, ed., *Kinmōkutsu ihō*, rev. ed. (Kyoto: Zenbunka kenkyūsho, 2002).

12. According to Kimura, Sōen was the nephew (*nikutetsu*) of Ekkei, who was therefore his uncle (Kimura, “Ekkei,” p. 28). Ekkei, who was also born in Takahama, came to celebrate the birthday of his mother, who had reached the traditional age of eighty-two. The character used for “nephew” suggests they were related through Sōen’s mother, who might thus have been Ekkei’s sister. If Ekkei’s family name could be identified as Hirata, then it would be confirmed, but so far I only found an indication that, like several contemporary monks, he adopted the family name Shaku (simply indicating a disciple of Sakyamuni) when family names became mandatory in 1875 (*heimin myōji hisshō gimu rei*). This is mentioned by Kishida Kinuo, *Kikutsu no tan: Kindai zensō no sei to shi* (Kyoto: Tankōsha, 1994), p. 10, who merely provides a journalistic treatment and does not quote his sources.

13. The explanation given by Sōen is that after the enforcement of the new census register law of 1872, the bureaucracy had become so heavy that his teacher thought it

was easier to recycle the name of a novice of the Jushōin (a subtemple of Myōshinji) who had died. No further clarification is given, and this choice is described as having been “for reasons related to the register” (*kosekimen no tsugō*) (SZ, vol. 10, p. 263; and Inoue 2000, p. 11).

14. The date for the death of Shungai Tōsen, October 10, 1875 is confirmed by the records of Ryōsokuin. The year of his birth is calculated by subtracting forty-five years, since his traditional age upon death is given as forty-six.

15. The word used by Sōen is *jichitaiteki*, an adjective indicating a self-governing group. He also explains that they subsisted on donations of rice collected from the neighborhood. Because of the prohibition of mendicant rounds between 1872 and 1881, they could not openly practice *takuhatsu*. Sōen speaks of “gathering offered rice (*kumai*) three or four times per month.”

16. It actually comes from a phrase written on a plaque hanging in front of the monk’s dormitory (*shuryō*) at Kenninji.

17. SZ, vol. 10, p. 269; and Inoue 2000, p. 18.

18. As stated above, while a member of the clergy is alive he is identified by his family name followed by the ordination name, whereas the family name is not used after death. For the purpose of easier identification, I provide the family name in parenthesis when it is available. Sōen’s friend was known as Takeda Mokurai while alive.

19. Apparently, there was a lot of mutual respect between Mokurai and Sōen, who followed common teachers (Ekkei, Gisan, and Shungai). Sōen had recommended that Mokurai join them at Gungyokurin, because Mokurai had such a fragile body that he could not endure the hardships of practicing in a monastery; Itō Tōshin, “Kenninji no Mokurai zenji,” in *Zenbunka kenkyūsho*, ed., *Meiji no zenshō* (Kyoto: Zenbunka kenkyūsho, 1981), p. 259.

20. SZ, vol. 10, p. 270; and Inoue 2000, p. 20. The decisiveness of this phase in Sōen’s practice is confirmed by an external observer. In his memories of Sōen, Mokurai wrote “as far as I can tell, I think that Sōen’s *kenshō* dates back to this period” (Nagao Sōshi, ed. 1923. *Sōen zenji to sono shūi*. Tokyo: Kokushi kōshūkai (reprint in 1993 by Ōzorasha), p. 99. The word translated here as “surplice” (*kesa*) indicates the rectangular piece of cloth put above the monk’s robe, symbolizing the original Indian robe made from scraps of material (Skt. *kasaya*).

21. The original seal of approval (*inka shōmei*) is reproduced in Takahamachō kyōdo shiryōkan, *Shaku Sōen: Kyōdo no unda meiji no kōsō* (Takahama: Takahamachō kyōdo shiryōkan, 2003), p. 4, but it carries no date. According to Taibi, it was composed in fall of 1883; Shaku Keishun (Taibi), ed., *Ryōgakutsu nenjiden* (Kanaoka mura, Shizuoka: Daichūji, 1942), p. 7. Inoue places the first verse of recognition back “at the end of the year 1882,” but remains silent concerning the certification (Inoue 2000, pp. 32–33). The reason why Kōsen may have chosen not to include the date is that Sōen was still officially affiliated with Myōshinji until the autumn of 1883, when they went together to Kyoto and asked Ekkei for official permission to “transfer” Sōen from the Myōshinji branch to the Engakuji branch.

22. One indication of the widespread popularity of shorthand (*sokki*) is found in the autobiography of Hiratsuka Raichō (1886–1971), where she mentions having learned this technique during her third year of college in 1905. See Raichō Hiratsuka, *In the*

Beginning, Woman Was the Sun: The Autobiography of a Japanese Feminist, translated by Teruko Craig (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), p. 89. The technique was seriously introduced in Japan since 1882, through articles in the *Jiji Shinpō* newspaper.

23. For instance, following a passage in Sōen's talk where he explained that "filial piety in Japan corresponds to the importance given to the wife in the West," the transcriber inserted within brackets "laughter bursting out"; Shaku Sōen, *Senteiroku* (Tokyo: Kōdōkan, 1909), p. 64.

24. Example in Sōen, *Senteiroku*, p. 90.

25. Sōen's contributions can be found across many periodicals, but the two journals published by Engakuji obviously contain the most significant number of contributions. The journal *Zengaku* (Zen Study) appeared between 1895 and 1900, whereas *Zendō* (The Path of Zen) was published between 1910 and 1923. There is a gap of ten years between these two publications, which may be related to Suzuki Daisetsu's sojourn abroad between March 1897 and April 1909.

26. Note that "Southwest" in the title intentionally indicates the position of Ceylon from the Japanese perspective, as opposed to the "Southeast" it represents from a Eurocentric perspective. Sōen's manuscript is dated August 1889 and was sent by mail to a friend named Itō Naozō, who wrote the afterword.

27. Concerning *Tobei nikki* (Diary of a Trip to America), Inoue mentions the existence of a second unpublished section kept at Tōkeiji, which was written with Nomura Yōzō (Umetarō 1870–1965). The two texts *Tobei nikki* and *Tobei zakkān* should not be confused. The 1893 *Tobei nikki* is included in SZ, vol. 10, pp. 189–224, while the 1906 *Tobei zakkān* is included in vol. 1, pp. 85–98.

28. Shaku Sōen. *Bankoku shūkyō taikai ichiran* (Tokyo: Kōmeisha, 1893 [second edition in December]). Nomura served as interpreter for Sōen during this first trip (Inoue 2000, p. 74), and he also introduced the Russells to Sōen in 1902 (Inoue 2000, p. 115). Concerning the biography of Nomura Yōzō (Umetarō), see Mori Kiyoshi, *Daisetsu to Kitarō* (Tokyo: Asahi shinbun, 1991), pp. 75–84.

29. This means that he actually spent two months and five days near the front.

30. Translated from English into Japanese by Kawakami Tetsuta, an employee of the publisher Min'yūsha (Inoue 2000, p. 169).

31. Inoue 2000, p. 156. The dedication to Sōen written by Suzuki Daisetsu in La Salle has the date January 10, 1907.

32. The most reliable source for the dates of Jikō seems to be Rikugawa Taiun, *Shinzenron* (Tokyo: Ryūginsha, 1968), p. 526. Rikugawa Taiun (1886–1966) was the disciple of Jikō and received his seal of transmission in 1940 after having also received the inka from Sōkatsu in 1935. The reading "Sumikiri" for Jikō's last name seems to be a mistake.

33. See Pei-yi Wu, *The Confucian's Progress: Autobiographical Writings in Traditional China* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

34. Konno Washichi, "Shaku Sōen no hito to shōgai: Shinshiryō, Shaku Sōen no Seiron tsūshin shōkai," *Kindai nihon kenkyū* 4 (1987): 195–218, p. 200. Konno praises the precision in Sōen's account of the addresses given at the World's Parliament of Religion, which were "going right to the essential." Unfortunately, Konno completely missed the fact that the author of these summaries was Nomura Yōzō.

35. Concerning Nagao, little was known except that he was born in 1894 in Aizuwakamatsu (Nagao, ed. 1931, p. 476) and was ordained in September 1909 by Sōen (Inoue 2000, p. 165). A picture dated 1918 with him is included in Inoue 2000, p. 270, and a list of his publications is appended to Nagao, ed. 1931, pp. 486–487. According to the same source, he was the abbot of Chōkōzan Eishōji, an impoverished temple in the Shizuoka prefecture, and was appointed proselytizing teacher (*fukyōshi*) at Engakuji in 1930. A lucky phone call to Eishōji connected me to his granddaughter, Nagao Mitsumi, who examined the funerary tablets to tell me the date of his death: March 4, 1965, at age seventy-one (seventy-two in the traditional count). Verbal communication dated August 5, 2008.

36. After having announced in January 1905 that he resigned his position of chief abbot of Engakuji and Kenchōji, Sōen moved to the nearby temple of Tōkeiji at the end of April. See Inoue 2000, p. 126. He thus became free to respond to the Russells' invitation to go to the United States. Concerning mostly the pre-Meiji history of Tōkeiji when it was a nunnery, see Sachiko Kaneko Morrell and Robert E. Morrell, *Zen Sanctuary of Purple Robes: Japan's Tōkeiji Convent since 1285* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006).

37. Distinct from the Matsugaoka Library (Matsugaoka bunko), which is located above Tōkeiji and is administrated by a foundation, with a residing director.

38. Inoue 2000, p. iii.

39. Original reproduced in Shaku Sōen, *Shin'yaku Shaku Sōen "Saiyū nikki"* (Tokyo: Daihōrinkaku, 2001), p. 274. Quoted in Inoue 2000, p. 46.

40. Nagao, ed. 1931, p. 5. Actually, Nagao is not entirely to blame (except for his lack of discernment in using sources), because in his introduction he reproduced the Sōen entry in the *Zenrin sōbōden* containing this mistake. See Nōnin, ed. 2002, vol. 2, p. 382. As Sōen's last direct disciple born in 1894, Nagao could not have witnessed any of these events and used this source, which in this case is totally unreliable.

41. Tamamura Takeji and Inoue Zenjō, *Engakuji shi* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1964), p. 699; Daihonzan Engakuji, ed., *Zuirokuzan Engakuji* (Kamakura, Daihonzan Engakuji, 1985), p. 75.

42. The latest reiterations are: in Japanese, by Yasunaga Sodō, "Kindai no shōzō: Kiki o hiraku," in the September 14 issue of *Chūgai nippō* (2006), p. 7; in English, by Morrell and Morrell, *Zen Sanctuary*, p. 139.

43. See the clear summary by Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, pp. 139–141.

44. Fukuzawa kenkyū sentā, ed., *Keiō gijuku nyūshachō*, facsimile edition (Tokyo: Keiō gijuku, 1986), vol. 3, p. 172. What is most interesting is that in the column indicating the guarantor (*shōnin*), who probably needed to be present with the student at the time of registration, we have the inscription "Kawai Kiyomaru, representative of Torio Koyata from the nobility." Kawai Kiyomaru (1848–1917) was a student of the retired general Torio, and while revolving in and around the Engakuji circle he became the advocate of an incredible amalgam of Shinto, Buddhism, and imperial ideology. Kawai later became active in the Society of the Great Way of the Great Japanese National Teaching as he "handled public relations for the group" (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, p. 233). Sectarian histories have "May" for the entrance at Keiō, which is incorrect. The same inaccurate information is found in Shaku, ed., *Ryōgakutsu*

nenjiden, p. 10; Tamamura and Inoue, *Engakuji shi*, p. 699; and Daihonzan, ed., *Zuirokuzan Engakuji*, p. 75.

45. *Fukuzawa Kankei Monjo* (hereafter abbreviated FKM) microfilm K4/A54 p. 24. Because of space constraints I cannot include all the details here, but these records give precise figures for attendance and grades. I would be happy to provide this information to those who are interested.

46. FKM microfilm K4/A55, p. 18.

47. FKM microfilm K4/A56, p. 24.

48. FKM microfilm K4/A57, p. 28.

49. Died in September 1899. Limited information about Keitoku is found in Nagao, ed. 1931, pp. 477–478. He was one of Ekkei's disciples and later obtained the certification of Kokan Sōho (1839–1903), the Myōshinji teacher with whom Nishida Kitarō practiced.

50. Arthur Lloyd (1852–1911). Lloyd was a British missionary sent to Japan in 1884 by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He remained there for almost twenty-five years. See Shirai Takako, *Fukuzawa Yukichi to senkyōshi tachi: Shirarezaru Meijiiki no Nichiei kankei* (Tokyo: Miraisha, 1999), pp. 163–175.

51. William C. Kitchin (1855–1920) taught English between October 7, 1885, and July 31, 1886, which corresponds to Sōen's period at Keiō. Kitchin, an American missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Church, arrived in Nagasaki on September 20, 1882. See Shirai, *Fukuzawa Yukichi to senkyōshi tachi*, pp. 181 and 184.

52. Letter dated October 9, 1885 (Nagao, ed. 1931, pp. 19–21; and Inoue 2000, pp. 40–41, excerpts).

53. Probably the series of textbooks by George Payn Quackenbos (1826–1881), including the *Elementary History of the United States*.

54. John Stuart Mill (1806–1873).

55. Probably the *General History of Civilization in Europe*, by François Pierre Guillaume Guizot (1787–1874).

56. *The Mission Field*, October 1885, pp. 308–310, reproduced in Shirai, *Fukuzawa Yukichi to senkyōshi tachi*, p. 178.

57. The name of the purported editor of the “Complete Works” is Matsuda Take no shimabito, obviously a pseudonym. The contents of most biographical elements contained in this anthology are identical to those authored by Nagao Daigaku (1894–1965), who was in his thirties in 1929–1930, and he is the most likely candidate for having composed this piece.

58. SZ, vol. 10, p. 283.

59. SZ, vol. 10, p. 283.

60. This text is contained in the first edition of *Bankoku shūkyō taikai ichiran* (A Glance at the World's Parliament of Religion) (Tokyo: Kōmeisha, November 1893), pp. 74–83. In the second, more concise, edition of the same text dated December 1893, it is included on pp. 39–44. The third version was published in the February 1894 article “Bukyō no yōshi narabini ingahō” (The Essential Principle of Buddhism and the Law of Cause and Effect), in the journal *Aikoku* (Patriotism), in the February 25, 1894, issue, pp. 17–19. Finally, the fourth version was included in SZ, vol. 10, pp. 152–155.

61. See Walter R. Houghton, ed., *Neely's History of the Parliament of Religions and Religious Congresses at the World's Columbian Exposition*, third edition (Chicago: F. Tennyson Neely, 1893), pp. 378–380; and John Henry Barrows, ed., *The World's Parliament of Religions* (Chicago: Parliament Publishing, 1893), pp. 829–831. The version published by Yokoyama in “Two Addresses by Shaku Sōen” in *Eastern Buddhist* is based on the latter.

62. The translation of this piece is usually attributed to Suzuki Daisetsu, but he could not possibly have written the final draft alone, as he had not yet been to the United States and his command of English was still limited. A letter by Suzuki dated July 1, 1893, mentions his struggle with the text without the help of appropriate dictionaries containing Buddhist terms. He also writes that the Rōshi promised to ask Nanjō Bun'yū or someone else to correct the English. See Inoue Zenjō and Zenbunka kenkyūsho, eds., *Suzuki Daisetsu mikōkai shokan* (Kyoto: Zenbunka kenkyūjō, 1989), p. 147. The final address was thus edited by a native speaker, but the rumor that Natsume Sōseki could have contributed to this was unfounded and was dispelled by Inoue 2000, pp. 90–94; Inoue and Zenbunka, eds., *Suzuki Daisetsu mikōkai shokan*, p. 464. Sōseki's brief stay at Kigen'in (a subtemple of Engakuji where Sōkatsu was the abbot) took place between December 23, 1894, and January 7, 1895, more than a year after the parliament. The final revisions appear to have been made by a “Dr. E. L. Hamilton from New York” (Inoue and Zenbunka, eds., *Suzuki Daisetsu mikōkai shokan*, p. 464). Further research is needed for precise identification of this Hamilton.

63. This term is understood in the sense it takes in the *Book of Changes*, where the first hexagram is glossed in the Tuan commentary as “Great is the indication of Qian's origin! The ten thousand things owe to it their beginning and all belonging to heaven”; Jing-Nuan Wu, trans., *Yi Jin*. (Washington, D.C.: Taoist Center, 1991), p. 219.

64. Shaku Soyen (= Sōen), *Zen for Americans: Including the Sutra of Forty-Two Chapters* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1993) mentions “This is an unabridged reprint of the 1913 edition entitled *Sermons of a Buddhist*,” but faithfully reproduces the 1907 *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot*; “Translator's Preface,” p. iv.

65. Shaku, *Zen for Americans*, p. v.

66. Unnumbered footnote in *Eastern Buddhist* 26/2 (1993): 138. Yokoyama mentions the other account of this trip, *Ōbei unsuiki* (Diary of a Monk in Europe and America, published in October 1907), as containing a “more detailed account of his 1905–06 journey.” This is true, but this diary is a text completely distinct from the piece he translated.

67. Ida Russell, often identified as “Mrs. Alexander Russell” was the first Western woman to practice Zen under the direction of a Japanese teacher. In the more extensive version of Sōen's talk, he emphasized the resolve of Ida and her three companions, in a way suggesting his strong admiration for the group. A genuine friendship seems to have developed as he also asked Ida to teach him how to read the Bible.

68. The dates for Ida Evelyn Russell are based on Susan Hill Lindley and Eleanor J. Stebner, eds., *The Westminster Handbook to Women in American Religious History* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, Lindley, ed. 2008), p. 189.

69. The translations are mine. Compare with Yokoyama's, pp. 138–148.

70. Allusion to verses in the *Lotus Sutra* attributed to the Buddha, “Now this threefold world is all my domain and the living beings in it are all my children”; T. 9.262.14c26–c27; Burton Watson, tr., *The Lotus Sutra* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 69.

71. Sōen, *Senteiroku*, p. 38. Concern for his health was apparently not only a figure of style, because Sōen had become sick after his trip as chaplain in Manchuria.

72. SZ, vol. 1, p. 87.

73. Sōen, *Senteiroku*, chapter 3, is entitled “Experiments in Abstaining from Alcohol and Tobacco,” pp. 68–76, and was first published in the magazine *Seinen no tomo* (Young People’s Friend) 1/7. There are several magazines with the same title, but it is likely to have been the one published from November 1907 under the editorship of the journalist Hani Yoshikazu (1880–1955), who also founded the magazine *Fujin no tomo* (Ladies’ Friend). I have not been able to procure this issue.

74. See Sahashi Hōryū, *Inoue Shūten* (Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 1982), pp. 101–111.

75. Moriya, Tomoe, “Social Ethics of ‘New Buddhists’ at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: A Comparative Study of Suzuki Daisetsu and Inoue Shūten,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 32/2 (2005): 295.

76. Inoue Shūten, *Hekiganroku shinkōwa* (Tokyo: Kyōbunsha, 1931), Postface; quoted in Sahashi, *Inoue Shūten*, pp. 8 and 97.

77. Asahi Journal, ed., *Nihon no shisōka* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1978), vol. 2, entry “Shaku Sōen.” Quoted in Sahashi, *Inoue Shūten*, p. 98.

78. Brian Victoria, *Zen at War* (New York: Weatherhill, 1997), p. 26.

79. The articles were published in the July 5 and November 22 issues in 1887, then in the April 25 and April 29 issues in 1889 of the *Jiji Shinpō*. See Konno, “Shaku Sōen no hito to shōgai.”

80. Details of how he was treated on the vessel *Werther* are found in Sōen’s *Saiyū nikki* (Diary of a Journey to the West), pp. 57–58. As a passenger in third class, three times a day the “meal” was a bowl of half-cooked old rice, thrown to him like to a dog, without a single vegetable or even a pinch of salt.

81. Galle is a small town located on the southwestern tip of Sri Lanka.

82. Nagao, ed. 1931, p. 68.

83. See Stephen R. Prothero, *The White Buddhist: The Asian Odyssey of Henry Steel Olcott*. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), pp. 85–115.

84. Shaku Sōen, *Sōen zenna* (Tokyo: Ōsakayagō shoten, 1916; reprinted in 1921 by Zenna sōsho kankōkai), p. 272. Contains a talk on “The Korean Situation” given to the Youth Group of an association called Enjōkai during its fall conference. Sōen shared his observations on the Korean society and family system, apparently based on his 1912 trip.

85. Torio Tokuan is mentioned above in relation to his sponsorship of Sōen’s studies at Keiō.

86. Takeda Mokurai, *Mokurai zenna* (Kyoto: Kenninji senmon dōjō, 1979; contains the reprint of three books originally published in 1907 and 1923), p. 28 of the third section of the book entitled *Zenshitsu zenna*, originally published in 1923.

87. T. 51.2076.326c05–06.

88. Victor Sōgen Hori, *Zen Sand: The Book of Capping Phrases for Kōan Practice* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2003), p. 586.
89. Kakuzō Okakura, *The Book of Tea* (New York: Kodansha America, 1990), p. 31. *The Book of Tea* was originally published in 1906.
90. The term *kaiji* is often used during the Meiji period in a sense similar to *kaikyo*, indicating a splendid achievement, an admirable act, or praiseworthy action, such as military success, rather than “a pleasant event,” as in modern Japanese. See, for instance, the letter dated February 15, 1892, sent by Inukai Tsuyoshi to Ōkuma Shigenobu, in Waseda daigaku shiryō sentā, ed., *Ōkuma Shigenobu kankei monjo 1* (Tokyo: Misuzu shobō, 2004), which rejoices in electoral victory. In another passage of Sōen’s same work, he uses *kaikyo* in a similar context. See Sōen, *Senteiroku*, p. 160.
91. The names of Kawakami Teishin and Onojima Hōdō, who joined the army at the same time as Sōen, are provided in Shaku, ed., *Ryōgakutsu nenjiden*, p. 64.
92. Reproduced in Sōen, *Senteiroku*, p. 126.
93. Sōen, *Senteiroku*, p. 160.
94. Shaku Sōen, *Gōma nisshi* (Kamakura: Tōkeiji, 1904), Foreword, p. 1a. The choice of this title actually comes from a calligraphic character that combines two characters—*gōma* (defeat demons)—that Sōen requested from Prince Sadanaru while they were on board the ship returning to Japan (Shaku, ed., *Ryōgakutsu nenjiden*, p. 71).
95. Sōen, *Gōma nisshi*, chapter 2, p. 11b.
96. Sōen, *Gōma nisshi*, chapter 2, p. 11b.
97. Entry for May 20, Sōen, *Gōma nisshi*, chapter 2, p. 13b.
98. Entry for May 20, Sōen, *Gōma nisshi*, chapter 2, p. 14b.
99. Entry for July 20, Sōen, *Gōma nisshi*, chapter 3, p. 35b.
100. Entry for July 21, Sōen, *Gōma nisshi*, chapter 3, p. 36a. Sōen first stayed at Buttsūji, near Hiroshima, with an old friend who called a physician. His diagnosis was that Sōen suffered from a form of chronic enteritis and needed rest; entry for July 19, Sōen, *Gōma nisshi*, chapter 3, p. 34b. It may have been caused by giardiasis, a parasite carried by contaminated water. The issue of Sōen’s health is complicated, as in November 1901 he had already had to spend two months in hospital for an unspecified “chronic disease” (*shukua*), which may have been a form of Crohn’s disease. See Shaku, ed., *Ryōgakutsu nenjiden*, p. 56, and Inoue 2000, p. 114.
101. Shaku, ed., *Ryōgakutsu nenjiden*, p. 72.
102. Diary entry of January 18, 1901, quoted in Inoue 2000, p. 111.
103. Shaku, ed., *Ryōgakutsu nenjiden*, p. 60. The other interpreter was Shigeta Yūsuke (Shinden Koji), who died in 1904. The group introduced to Sōen by Nomura Yōzō included other persons whose name in Katakana makes the identification difficult, mainly Mrs. Dreksler (?) and Mr. Haw (?). According to another source, the name of Mrs. Russell’s friend was, rather, “Dressel” (Mori, *Daisetsu to Kitarō*, p. 173).
104. Inoue 2000, p. 125.
105. Inoue 2000, pp. 130–131.
106. Suzuki Daisetsu’s Afterword to *Saiyū nikki* (Diary of a Journey to the West), reproduced in Sōen, *Saiyū nikki*, p. 276. Two letters from Sōkō addressed to Daisetsu

are included in Inoue and Zenbunka, eds., *Suzuki Daisetsu mikōkai shokan*, pp. 467–468.

107. This news appeared in the daily *Asahi shinbun* of June 16, 1937. Mentioned in Inoue 2000, pp. 132–133.

108. The title of the anthology is an allusion to the metaphor of the four thoroughbred horses and four thoroughbred persons included in the Pāli Canon, *Anguttara-Nikāya* IV.12.113; Nyanaponika Thera and Bhikku Bodhi, transl. and eds. *Numerical Discourses of the Buddha: An Anthology of Suttas from the Aṅguttara Nikāya*. (Walnut Creek, Cal.: AltaMira Press, 1999), pp. 105–106; transposed into the Chinese Canon (*Za ahan jing* 922; T. 2.99.234a16–b20).

109. Quoted in Victoria, *Zen at War*, pp. 98–99. Concerning Sōen, nothing new appears in Victoria, *Zen War Stories*.

110. The chapter is entitled “I suggest the Kaiser to engage in a world pilgrimage” (*Kaizeru ni sekai angya o susumu*). Sōen, *Kaijin kaiba* (Tokyo: Nisshinkaku, 1919), pp. 131–139.

111. Sōen, *Kaijin kaiba*, p. 135.

112. Sōen, *Kaijin kaiba*, pp. 107–108.

113. Sōen, *Senteiroku*, pp. 160–164. No date is provided for this chapter, but it appears to be a discourse made before going to Manchuria. It is expressed in a tone similar to the discourse published in the aforementioned April 1904 issue of the *Taiyō* magazine and mentions the fact that the Russo-Japanese War had just started. I suspect it was an address given to soldiers while Sōen was staying in Hiroshima’s military cantonment, where he spent a month giving lectures before embarking for the front. See Shaku, ed., *Ryōgakutsu nenjiden*, p. 64.

114. Sōen, *Senteiroku*, pp. 162–163. In this passage, Sōen mentions Nichiren and his expression “enemies of the Buddha” (*butteki*) while referring to the contrast between “gentle conversion” (*shōju*) and “forcing submission” (*shakubuku*).

PRIMARY SOURCES

A. MAIN WORKS BY SŌEN OR ATTRIBUTED TO HIM IN JAPANESE (BOOKS ONLY)

1889 January. *Seinan no bukkuyō*. Tokyo: Hakubundō.

1890 April. *Seirontōshi*. Tokyo: Kōkyō shoin. (SZ)

1893 November. *Bankoku shūkyō taikai ichiran*. Tokyo: Kōmeisha. (Second edition in December)

1894 February 25. *Bukkyō no yōshi narabini ingahō*. *Aikoku* (Patriotism), pp. 17–19.

1894 April. *Sōryōkutsu nenpu*. Tokyo: Tsukiji kappan seizōsho.

1894 September. *Daikaku zenji zazenron* (original text by Rankei Dōryū). Tokyo: Keisei shoin.

1894 September. *Zazenron wage* (original text by Imakita Sōon). Tokyo: Keisei shoin.

1896 November. *Teishō jūgyūzu*. Tokyo: Keisei shoin. (Reprint in 1897)

1897 August. *Busso sankyō kōgi*. Kyoto: Baiyō shoin.

1897 September. *Hōkyōsanmai kōgi*. Summer courses (*kaki kōshūkai*), co-authored with Ōuchi, Emura, and Takada. Tokyo: Kōyūkan.

- 1900 March. *Kongōkyō kōgi*. Tokyo: Kōyūkan. (Reprints in 1903 and 1934) (SZ under the title *Kongōkyō kōwa*)
- 1900 June. *Seiza no susume*. Ed. by Suzuki Daisetsu, comments by Seigo Hōgaku. Tokyo: Kōyūkan. (Reprint in 1908)
1901. *Kaki kōshūkai kōenshū*. Tokyo: Kōmeisha.
- 1902 June. *Zenkai ichiran kōgi*. Tokyo: Shōkakukai. (Reprint in 1918 by Kōyūkan)
- 1904 December. *Gōma nisshi*. Kamakura: Tōkeiji.
- 1907 April. *Kankattō*. Trans. and ed. by Kawakami Tetsuta. Tokyo: Min'yūsha.
- 1907 July. *Shinjinmei kōwa*. Tokyo: Kōmeisha.
- 1907 October. *Ōbei unsuiki*. Tokyo: Kinkōdō.
- 1909 February. *Senteiroku*. Tokyo: Kōdōkan.
- 1909 March. *Ichiji fusetsu*. Tokyo: Kōyūkan.
- 1909 September. *Mumonkan kōgi*. Tokyo: Kōyūkan. (Reprint in 1915) (SZ under the title *Mumonkan kōwa*).
- 1910 December. *Yūmō shōjin*. Tokyo: Horiba Kinjirō.
- 1912 July. *Zazen wasan kōwa*. Tokyo: Kōyūkan.
- 1912 July. *Bukkyō katei kōwa*. Tokyo: Kōyūkan.
- 1913 January. *Jūgyūzu kōwa*. Tokyo: Kōyūkan. (Reprint in 1916)
- 1913 January. *Shuyō no shiori*. Collection of talks given in Korea and Manchuria in 1912. (Book not for sale, published by Minami Manshū tetsudō kabushiki gaisha shomuka. Later incorporated in *Nenge mishō*)
1915. *Nenge mishō*. Tokyo: Heigo shuppansha. (Reprint in 1977 by Kokusho kankōkai)
1915. *Hekiganroku kōwa*. Tokyo: Kōyūkan. (Reprint in 1917 and 1933) (SZ)
1916. *Yo no hoka*. Tokyo: Kōyūkan (Series *Zendō sōsho*).
- 1916 October. *Sōen zenna*. Tokyo: Ōsakayagō shoten. (Reprint in 1921 by Zenna sōsho kankōkai)
1917. *Rinki ōhen*. Tokyo: Bunshōdō. (Reprint in 1935 by Daikyōdōzō)
- 1918 May. *En'un sosui*. Kamakura: Tōkeiji. (Reprint in 1999 by Yumani shobō in the series *Taishō chūgoku kenmonroku shūsei*, ed. by Kojima Shinji, vol. 4; Also included in Vol. 9. of SZ under the new title *Shina junshakuki*)
1918. *Kannongyō kōwa*. Tokyo: Kōyūkan. (Reprint in 1924) (SZ)
- 1919 May. *Kaijin kaiba*. Tokyo: Nisshinkaku.
- 1919 May. *Wagan aigo*. Tokyo: Hakubunkan.
1919. *Tatakeyo hirakaren*. Tokyo: Konishi shoten. (Reprint in 1925 by Seizankaku shoten, in 1929 and 1938 by Kyōbunsha shoten, and in 1972 by Mizuho shobō)
1920. *Saigo no ikkatsu*. Tokyo: Teikoku shuppan kyōkai.
1920. *Kokoro no me o hirake*. Tokyo: Fumondō shoten.
1920. *Jōri chōrai*. Tokyo: Nihon tosho shuppan.
1920. *Ryōga manroku*. 5 vols. Kamakura: Ryōgae.
1921. *Gedatsu no seikatsu*. Ed. by Nobata Kazuo. Tokyo: Kyōbunsha.
1921. *Ryōgakutsu kashū*. Ed. by Sasaki Nobutsuna. Kamakura: Tōkeiji.
1923. *Saikontan kōwa*. Tokyo: Konishi shoten. (Reprint in 1929 and 1934 by Kyōbunsha shoten, then in 1960 by Bun'itsu shuppan)
- 1927 February. *Motomeyo ataeraren*. Tokyo: Chūō shuppansha.
1928. *Zen no shinzui: Shōji gedatsu shingen kaihatsu*. Tokyo: Chūō shuppansha.

- 1929–1930. *Shaku Sōen zenshū*. 10 vols. Ed. by Matsuda Take no shimabito. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
1931. *Daruma no ashiato: Ishin denshin kyōge betsuden*. Tokyo: Chūō shuppansha.
- 1931 February. *Zen no kaibō: Niku to chi to kawa*. Tokyo: Jōkōkan shuppanbu.
1932. *Mā suware*. Ed. by Wada Kenji. Tokyo: Kyōbunsha shoten.
1933. *Jinsei akarui yowatari*. Tokyo: Seikōkan shoten.
1939. *Shisei ichinyō: Zenna*. Ed. by Ōta Teizō. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha.
- 1940 April. *Hyakumannin no zen*. Tokyo: Chōbunkaku.
1941. *Saiyū nikki*. Ed. by Inoue Zenjō. Kamakura: Tōkeiji (new edition in 2001).
1941. *Zen*. Tokyo: Bungaku shobō.
1941. *Hara o tsukure*. Tokyo: Chōbunkaku.
- 1941 May. *Daruma*. Zensōsho vol. 1. Tokyo: Bungaku shobō.
1957. *Zen no seizui*. Ed. by Nakaoka Hiroo. Tokyo: Seishin shobō.
2001. *Shin'yaku Shaku Sōen "Saiyū nikki."* Tokyo: Daihōrinkaku.

B. WORKS BY SŌEN OR ATTRIBUTED TO HIM IN ENGLISH (BOOKS ONLY)

- Shaku Sōen. 1893. "The Law of Cause and Effect as Taught by Buddha." In Houghton, Walter R., ed. *Neely's History of the Parliament of Religions and Religious Congresses at the World's Columbian Exposition: Compiled from Original Manuscripts and Stenographic Reports*. 3rd ed. Chicago: F. Tennyson Neely, pp. 378–380.
- Shaku Sōen. 1893. "The Law of Cause and Effect as Taught by Buddha." In Barrows, John Henry, ed. *The World's Parliament of Religions*. Chicago: Parliament Publishing, pp. 829–831.
- Shaku Sōen. 1907 (1906). *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot: Addresses on Religious Subjects, including the Sutra of Forty-two Chapters*. Trans. by Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki. Chicago: Open Court. (Reprint in Shaku 1993; also reprinted by Kessinger Publishing, 2006)
- Shaku, Soyen (= Sōen). 1993. *Zen for Americans: Including the Sutra of Forty-Two Chapters*. New York: Barnes & Noble. (First published in 1907 as *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot*)

C. MAIN BIOGRAPHIES OF SŌEN AND RELATED COLLECTIONS OF MATERIALS

- Inoue Zenjō and Zenbunka kenkyūsho, ed. 1989. *Suzuki Daisetsu mikōkai shokan*. Kyoto: Zenbunka kenkyūsho.
- Inoue Zenjō. 2000. *Shaku Sōen den*. Kyoto: Zenbunka kenkyūsho.
- Nagao Daigaku (= Sōshi), ed. 1931. *Sōen zenji shokanshū*. Tokyo: Nishōdō.
- Nagao Sōshi (= Daigaku). 1920. *Sōen zenji no menmoku*. Tokyo: Ryūbunkan.
- Nagao Sōshi, ed. 1923. *Sōen zenji to sono shūi*. Tokyo: Kokushi kōshūkai (reprint in 1993 by Ōzorasha).
- Nagao Sōshi, 1925. *Sōen zenji musetsushū*. Kamakura: Matsugaoka sanbō.
- Shaku Keishun (Taibi), ed. 1942. *Ryōgakutsu nenjiden*. Kanaoka mura, Shizuoka: Daichūji.
- Suzuki Daisetsu. 1992. *Imakita Kōsen: Gekidōki meiji no kōsō*. Tokyo: Shunjūsha. (First edition 1944)