

## INTRODUCTION

*Prosaic moderners, however, ask for something concise and directly to the point.*

—DAISETZ SUZUKI

As the other volumes in this series have amply demonstrated, Suzuki Daisetsu Teitarō (1870–1966) was arguably the preeminent Asian spokesman for the Buddhist religion to the West in the twentieth century. Suzuki brought forth an impressive array of communicative talents in pursuing this role and was not shy about using his native Japanese heritage, education, and religious training to shore up his bona fides in this effort. An important part of Suzuki’s legacy falls under the rubric of Buddhist Studies, the main focus of this volume. Unlike particular sectarian traditions like Zen or Pure Land, or the lively contemporary field of Comparative Religion where there is a broad sense of freedom as to what topics are deemed relevant, Buddhist Studies in Suzuki’s time largely centered on the philology of canonical texts and their exegesis, with a heavy focus on doctrine. Suzuki’s approach to Buddhist Studies followed this same path, at least before World War II. That is, he edited and translated classics and also presented summaries and studies of doctrines with examples of the influence of those doctrines in Chinese and Japanese tradition. What marks Suzuki as standing outside normative Buddhist Studies as a professional, academic discipline is the fact that he does not expand his text-critical apparatus after his *Laṅkāvatāra* and *Gaṇḍavyūha* studies published between 1930 and 1936. Note that the so-called Peking or “Suzuki” edition of the Tibetan canon published between 1955 and 1964 was a product of the Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute under the supervision of the Suzuki Foundation (Suzuki Gakujutsu Shinkōkai); there is nothing to suggest that it was edited by Suzuki himself, despite his name appearing as senior editor.<sup>1</sup> Although criticized for his idiosyncratic and somewhat shotgun approach in *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism* (1907), after WWII he returned to similar textbook-like explanations of Buddhist systems of thought as

defined by a set of specific doctrines that he selected from among canonical texts long considered representative by Japanese tradition.

Suzuki Teitarō was born the youngest of five children into a samurai-class family in 1870 in Kanazawa, the capital of Ishikawa prefecture, located north of Kyoto on the Sea of Japan. His father's family had been physicians to the local rulers for generations and were associated with Rinzai Zen. When Suzuki Teitarō was six, however, his father died, plunging the family into poverty. The Shin sect of Pure Land Buddhism is pervasive in this area, and his mother at some point joined an underground branch of this tradition (*hiji bōmon*) considered heretical. Suzuki recalled her taking him as an eight-year-old boy to a secret, candlelit ceremony where rhythmic chanting of *nenbutsu* would lead to religious experiences among individuals in the room. At seventeen he dropped out of secondary school due to financial hardship, but because of his devoted study of English and the Chinese classics, he secured work as an English tutor. Suzuki also had a number of interactions as a teenager with Christian missionaries that seemed to leave him with some degree of antagonism toward an arrogance he saw embodied in that tradition.

When he was fifteen, he was inspired by the new mathematics teacher at his school who also happened to be a student of Imakita Kōsen (1816–1892), a famed teacher of Rinzai Zen at Engakuji in Kamakura. This led him to seek out Zen training at a temple in the area. At the age of twenty, his mother died, after which he moved in with his brother in Kobe. With his brother's support, the next year he moved to Tokyo to study at what would later become Waseda University. The following year he joined his childhood friend Nishida Kitarō (1870–1945) as *senkasei* at Tokyo Imperial University, both of them majoring in Philosophy. In those days, the imperial universities had a dual admissions system based on the ranking of one's secondary education, and Suzuki was in the lower of the two ranks, today akin to a nonmatriculating "special student," meaning no chance of graduation and limited access to classes and library facilities.<sup>2</sup> Probably not enjoying his second-class status at the university, he was not successful as a college student. Instead, Suzuki spent most of his time at college pursuing assiduous Zen practice at Engakuji under Imakita and then Shaku Sōen (1859–1919) after Imakita died in early 1892.

Sōen met Paul Carus (1852–1919) in Chicago at the World's Parliament of Religions in 1893. Carus asked Sōen to send someone to work at his publishing house and exchange ideas with Carus and others. Sōen initially had another student in mind, but ended up sending Suzuki. After a brief stay in San Francisco in 1897, Suzuki moved to LaSalle outside Chicago to work with Carus at Open Court Publishing Company, where he remained until 1906. That year he met up with Sōen in San Francisco and they traveled together to the East Coast, where Suzuki acted as interpreter for Sōen's talks in Boston, New York, and elsewhere. This is when he met his future wife, Beatrice Lane (1875–1939). During this period Suzuki published *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*, marking the end of his tenure with Carus

and life in the States. In 1908 at the age of thirty-eight, Suzuki traveled to Paris, where he made handwritten copies of Dunhuang materials in the Pelliot Collection. He then proceeded on to London, invited by the Swedenborg Society to begin a project translating their materials into Japanese.

In 1909 Suzuki returned to Tokyo and found work as a lecturer of English at Gakushūin, an elite private school with deep ties to the aristocracy and the imperial family. In 1911, Suzuki sent for Beatrice, and they were married at the U.S. consulate in Yokohama soon after her arrival in Japan. At this time, 1910, he met Sasaki Gesshō, a Yogācāra scholar who managed to create a position for him at Ōtani University after Suzuki lost his position at Gakushūin. In 1921, at the age of fifty-two, under the leadership of Nanjō Bun'yū (1849–1927) as university president, Suzuki moved to Kyoto and began a twenty-year period as professor of Buddhist Philosophy at Ōtani. Nishida had established himself at Kyoto University in 1910. As part of his contract Suzuki negotiated for the establishment of *The Eastern Buddhist*, the first English-language Buddhist journal dedicated to Mahāyāna Buddhism.<sup>3</sup> The initial editorial committee included Sasaki, Yamabe Shūgaku, and Akanuma Chizen, but his wife Beatrice also played a major role.

During his time at Ōtani, Suzuki published a great deal in both Japanese and English. This included his English-language translation and study of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, which led to him being awarded a doctorate, his three-volume *Essays in Zen Buddhism* as well as *Manual of Zen Buddhism*, which sold widely. He was invited to speak at the World Congress of Faiths held in London in 1936; in attendance were Alan Watts and Christmas Humphreys, who would later devote considerable effort to spread the Suzuki view of Zen and Buddhism as a whole. Supported by the Foreign Ministry of Japan, this trip was extended so that Suzuki could also speak at a number of British and American universities. The notes from these talks were then collected and published as *Zen and Its Influence on Japanese Culture*, published by The Eastern Buddhist Society in 1938; the book was quickly translated into Japanese by Kitagawa Momoo for Iwanami and immediately sold out.

The tragedy of the war years, 1939–1945, was compounded by the death of his wife and the suspension of the university. In 1940 Suzuki returned to Kamakura and his residence in a corner of the Engakuji monastic compound, which remained his home until his death in 1966. There were no English-language publications from 1939 to 1945.

After the war, despite his age (he turned seventy-five in 1945) Suzuki returned to a remarkably robust career both in Japan and abroad, undoubtedly due to a combination of his widespread fame and an international hunger for a new paradigm of religious refuge, which many saw in Suzuki's often decontextualized approach to Buddhism. Within Japan, he somehow survived the war years with his reputation intact and achieved a position as the preeminent spokesman for Japanese Buddhism as a whole. Within a year of the war's end, the Court invited him

to deliver two lectures to the Emperor of Japan in April 1946. Already conscious of his international audience, Suzuki first published these in English; they are included here under the English title he gave them, *Essence of Buddhism*. Only afterward did he publish them in Japanese. In 1949 he was the first scholar working on religion to be awarded the National Medal of Culture (*bunka kunshō*), noteworthy in that the award was not for his work in comparative religion or Zen, but for his contribution to Buddhist Studies. That year he restarted *The Eastern Buddhist* and then in June went to Hawai‘i for a conference at the University of Hawai‘i that led to a lectureship there that fall semester. In 1950 he moved to California, teaching at the Claremont Graduate School for one year, and then moved to New York at the invitation of Columbia University, where he taught on and off between 1951 and 1957. Despite being in his eighties, in the 1950s Suzuki continued to travel extensively, giving lectures at various universities and conferences in Hawai‘i, the mainland United States, Mexico, and Europe, only returning to Kamakura in 1958 where he remained until his death in 1966 at the age of ninety-five. A great Suzuki archive is now kept at the Matsugaoka Bunko, the site of his residence.

#### SUZUKI’S EXPOSURE TO BUDDHIST STUDIES

It is this editor’s conclusion that the influence of Japanese traditional scholarship on Buddhism was heavily determinant of how Suzuki conceived his role as Buddhist scholar. Although the academic discipline of Buddhist Studies was originally conceived in the West as a methodology for studying the East, it dovetailed well with traditional exegetical scholarship of Buddhist doctrine across many Asian cultures whose origins date from Abhidharma studies in India. Known in the modern period as *shūgaku* or *kyōgaku*, this approach became highly critical in the Edo period when Buddhist seminaries sought to clarify the curriculum that was taught to their clergy in training, at times leading to heated debates over the authority of specific texts or interpretations, but this scholastic approach also went beyond narrow sectarian concerns to canonical materials as a whole. Such questioning led to the creation of critical editions of texts and treatises on what the authoritative readings of those texts should be, based on “higher criticism” of historical sources, and extended to systems of monastic training, meditative and liturgical practices, visual culture, and “services” performed for lay followers, including funerary rituals and institutional structures. This led to a great deal of published scholarship, at times producing polemic writings over the provenance of a text or the appropriateness of a particular hermeneutic that could even lead to physical violence between interpretive factions.

In the modern period, *kyōgaku* became the basis for *bukkyōgaku* (Buddhist Studies). Looking back at how both developed in the century between 1850 and 1950, we see that the parallels are striking, particularly the text-centered approach that almost entirely ignored material culture, social ethics, and almost anything of

a political nature such as institutional structure, positioning vis-à-vis government policies, financial accountability, and so forth. Starting in the late Meiji period, this background led to many Buddhist scholars in modern Japan doing text-critical work on texts at the core of the development of Buddhism in India *and* from their own sectarian traditions. For example, eminent scholars like Nanjō Bun'yū and Akanuma Chizen, known outside Japan primarily as Indologists/Sanskritists, also routinely published critical, influential works on texts representative of their own sectarian traditions.<sup>4</sup> Works by Japanese scholars on representative Buddhist texts grew robustly in the early twentieth century, and most of these scholars were supported by some form of sectarian affiliation. Suzuki's dependence on the scholarship of his Japanese peers is all too frequently overlooked in appraisals of his English-language oeuvre, but without it, his enormous output in the realm of Buddhist Studies would have been impossible.

In this way, *kyōgaku* methodology was applied to a much wider range of textual materials than one would see in Edo-period scholarship, from “pre-Mahāyāna” Āgamas to mainstream Mahāyāna sutras used by all schools of Buddhism, such as *Prajñāpāramitā*, *Huayan/Avatamsaka*, *Suvarṇaprabhāśa*, *Vajracchedika*, *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa*, and so forth.

A good example of how this worked can be seen in what amounts to a monograph summarizing the contents of the sixty-volume *Huayan jing/Kegonkyō/Avatamsaka Sutra* that Suzuki published serially in the first four issues of the first volume of *The Eastern Buddhist*, beginning in May 1921. He called this, “The Avatamsaka Sutra (Epitomised).” In a footnote on the first page of the first installment he explains there are three Chinese translations identified as different forms of the so-called *Huayan jing*, adding that they are long and repetitive; he then concludes the footnote with the statement quoted in the epigraph about “prosaic moderners” seeking concise presentations of teachings. He adds, “A Japanese digest of the ‘Sixty Kegon’ has been prepared by two competent scholars, Professors Shugaku Yamabe and Chizen Akanuma”; he names the publisher, and then concludes: “The English is by D. T. Suzuki.” Looking into this matter, what Suzuki apparently meant by this statement was that he had access to a Japanese-language summary of the sixty-fascicle Chinese translation prepared by Yamabe and Akanuma that he would be using as a guide to his selection of what to translate, but his efforts have gone into English rather than into modern Japanese. Under the direction of Kizu Muan, these two younger scholars produced a number of summaries and selected “highlights” from famous scriptures in the Chinese-language Buddhist canon for a volume published four years later called *Shin'yaku Bukkyō seiten* (New Translation of Buddhist Scriptures).<sup>5</sup> Suzuki followed their choices of which Chinese translation to use, and most of the material he translated can be found in the edited version of their material in that *seiten*.<sup>6</sup>

This fact is relevant to our understanding of Suzuki's oeuvre not only because it gives us insight into how the availability of detailed and historically nuanced

secondary scholarship on topics related to Mahāyāna doctrine made it possible for him to write so much on so many complex subjects, but also because it helps situate him within a certain tradition of scholarship motivated by decidedly religious, even missionary, zeal, and, just as importantly, it reflects his fondness for writing *digests*, summaries of “the main points” that define the philosophy and religious insight in the forms of Buddhism he chose to study. Some of these are far more erudite than others, and specialists in various subfields of Buddhist Studies often regard his repeated attempts to be comprehensive as problematic. Today, his writings on Indian Buddhism present a variety of problems for specialists, particularly his take on Yogācāra and his monistic assertions about “the will of the Dharmakāya,” which have been criticized as reductionist or Vedantic, yet his insight into the logic of *sokuhi* (“affirmation in negation”), a linguistic expression commonly found in Chinese translations of *prajñāpāramitā* materials, is undeniably brilliant and has proved deeply inspirational to scholars associated with the Kyoto School of philosophy.

Some of his notable responses to advances in Japanese scholarship never appeared in his English-language writing. Although this volume makes no attempt to represent his vast production in Japanese, three essays originally published only in Japanese have been selected for inclusion here because they stand out as noteworthy. First is a 1926 piece illustrating his reflective response to a prevailing theory among a number of high-profile Japanese scholars of Indian Buddhism in the early twentieth century that the Mahāyāna sutras were not *buddhavacana*, that is, they were not sermons actually given by the Śākyamuni. The second and third essays date from the 1940s—his theory of the logic of *sokuhi*, and his sense of mission in spreading Mahāyāna throughout the world.

Another way in which premodern *kyōgaku* permeates his approach can be seen in Suzuki’s choice of what to write about in explicating “Buddhism” itself. The near total absence of historical context in these writings is striking but again reflective of the traditional *kyōgaku* approach that limited its focus to texts and doctrines. Suzuki liked to say that Zen discourse represented Mahāyāna as a whole, which presumably explains the considerable time he devoted to Mahāyāna texts that played major roles in the formation of Zen doctrine, such as the *Awakening of Faith*, *Diamond Sutra*, *Laṅkāvatāra*, and the *Avataṃsaka*. His postwar work on texts in the Shin tradition also reflects similar statements about the centrality of Pure Land thought in the Japanese Buddhist tradition, a fact that becomes increasingly salient in the last twenty years of his life. In general, unless under a named topic that differs, Suzuki’s writings rarely venture outside the normative texts that Japanese traditions of Zen and Pure Land use, and his felt need to include Buddhist terms in Sanskrit (and at times Pāli) appears to suggest an agenda arguing that these particular traditions were representative of “mature” forms of Buddhism that somehow included India, despite the fact that historically Chan/Zen and Pure Land thinkers only used Chinese forms of Indic terminology.

Born in 1870, Suzuki came of age just when a whole host of changes were happening to the Japanese conception of Buddhism and how to study it that raised a great many questions but also provided unprecedented opportunities. From its inception as an academic discipline, Buddhist Studies has always oriented itself in a way that begins with the founding of the religion in India and its historical developments. Indeed, the founding of the discipline in mid-nineteenth-century Europe comes out of an engagement with Buddhist texts written in Sanskrit and Prakrit, or Middle Indo-Āryan. It is worth noting in this regard that prior to the Meiji period (1868–1912) Japan only had secondhand knowledge of India. Although there is mention of Indians reaching Japan in the Nara period, with the exception of Tenjiku Tokubē (1612?–1707?), there is no record of any Japanese person traveling to India, returning to Japan, and relating what he saw and experienced.<sup>7</sup> The embedding of Buddhism in Japanese cultural history as an international religion was first and foremost through the medium of the Chinese language, a historical process that greatly enriched the Japanese language conceptually and terminologically, but as modernization quickened, the received wisdom about the authority of the Chinese-language Buddhist canon became problematized. The seeds of this critical outlook can be seen in the Edo period when, perhaps initially influenced by *rangaku* and the Tokubē legend, Japan welcomed a series of significant changes in the conception and reverence for Buddhist scriptures. The most salient are the attempts by Jiun (1718–1804) to reach India through scholarship by compiling with his students a one-thousand-fascicle collection of Indic-language materials in Japan called *Bongaku shinryō*, Japan creating its first fully *printed* Buddhist canon, critical editions of Chinese and Japanese texts for what would become sectarian canons, the methodology of Confucian “evidential learning” (*kōshōgaku*, Ch. *kaozheng xue*) deeply affecting Buddhist scholarship, and Jiun’s contemporary Tominaga Nakamoto (1715–1746) arguing persuasively that all forms of religious or philosophical “thought” were heavily shaped by social and cultural conditions.

Thus there was already a significant move toward modernization of Buddhist scholarship prior to the Meiji Restoration.<sup>8</sup> It is also noteworthy that the first Japanese students to go abroad to learn how to read Buddhist texts in their Indic forms, namely, Nanjō Bun’yū (1849–1927) and Kasahara Kenju (1852–1883), went not to India but to England in 1876 to study with Max Müller at Oxford. Although there would be later Japanese individuals who did study in India, the examples of Nanjō and Kasahara suggest that the importance of the study of Buddhist texts in Indic languages was motivated just as much, if not more so, by the need to participate in the European discipline of “Buddhist Studies” as by the need to learn firsthand how Indians read Indian-language texts. In 1883, when Suzuki was just thirteen years old and avidly studying English, Nanjō published in English a breakthrough contribution to Buddhist Studies, *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka*. Not only was this the first English-language catalog of the

scriptures in a version of the Chinese-language canon (*Dainihon kōtei daizōkyō*) in the process of being edited for publication some forty years before the Taisho Tripiṭaka, but also in it Nanjō supplies his reconstructions of Sanskrit titles of hundreds of Buddhist texts only known previously in East Asia by their Chinese translations. This was a bold first step in linking scholastic knowledge about Buddhist traditions in East Asia with Buddhist traditions in India, and the fact that it was done in English by a Japanese scholar at a time when very few, if any, Western scholars of Buddhism knew Japanese, marks this as a powerful entry of Japanese Buddhist scholarship onto the world stage. Until it was superseded by Lancaster's catalog of the Korean canon nearly a century later,<sup>9</sup> Nanjō's catalog remained the standard, Western-language reference work for individual scriptures in Chinese-language Buddhist canons.

This history shows us the context of Suzuki's ambition to become a player in Buddhist Studies with facility in English. When his Zen teacher Shaku Sōen (1859–1919) was invited to the 1893 Chicago World's Parliament of Religions, he asked Suzuki to translate his talk on causality. At that event Sōen met Paul Carus, which inspired the latter to publish *The Gospel of Buddha* in 1894, which in turn led to a twenty-five-year-old Suzuki publishing a Japanese translation of *Gospel* only a year later.<sup>10</sup>

Suzuki was thus exposed to the newly emerging field of Buddhist Studies in a nonsectarian context at the university, for Nanjō was a part-time lecturer at the school and there was a flurry of Buddhist Studies going on while Suzuki was a student. One of the oddities of his career decisions was his choice neither to ordain as a Rinzai monk nor to pursue an academic career despite opportunities to do both. Not only did he not apply himself at university, but also when Carus arranged for him to study at the newly formed University of Chicago, he declined. Thus despite being deeply influenced by professional scholars working in both universities and seminaries, Suzuki's approach to Buddhist Studies is marked by a bold assertion of his own point of view, showing respect for but not adherence to any particular teacher or person of authority well-situated in a university program, monastic setting, institutional seminary, or even in the publishing world like Carus. At the same time he clearly saw the value and importance of the discipline of Buddhist Studies and did his best to absorb knowledge from people working in this field, for he was close to people who did Buddhist textual studies in Tokyo, Kamakura, LaSalle, and Kyoto.

#### TEXTS AND TEACHINGS

Let us begin this section with mention of what we do not find in his Buddhological writings: the political or economic aspects of the Buddhist tradition, concern for gender issues, visual culture, text-critical or linguistic problems, or even the materiality of the texts themselves. It is particularly noteworthy that Suzuki shows little concern for text-critical issues. Although he respects the fact that there were mul-

multiple Chinese translations of Indic texts, when he chose a text to work on, he seems to have accepted the received form in its canonical edition and does not ask where a text came from. In Suzuki's time this initially meant accepting the authority of the editions found in the *Dainihon kōtei daizōkyō* mentioned above; in the Shōwa period he shifted to using the *Taishō canon*.<sup>11</sup> Suzuki typically did not, for example, compare a text in its modern printed canonical form with the same work as preserved in the well-circulating popular editions known as *rufubon*, which might have shown him linguistic differences, even though we know he also used Edo- or Meiji-period xylograph printings. Either he did not notice discrepancies between these two forms or he simply did not care.

Given the enormity of the Buddhist canon, especially in Chinese, knowing which scriptures and which teachings in those scriptures Suzuki focused on tells us a great deal about his motivation for work in this area. Although today he is best known for his translations, studies, and editing of scriptures at the heart of the Zen tradition, looking through his diary one sees a wider range of interest. For example, on the fourth of October, 1927, in the morning he read the *Suvarṇaprabhāsōttama* with Izumi Hōkei (1884–1947) and in the afternoon he read the *Tannishō* with Imadate Tosui (1855–1931).

If we look at his publications, Suzuki's major textual work is found in three Mahāyāna scriptures. His English translations of the first two were the first published.

1. *Qixinlun*. A translation done during his time with Paul Carus in LaSalle: *Açvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* (1900).<sup>12</sup>
2. *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*. Published in three book-length monographs: *Studies in the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* (1930), a translation from Sanskrit called *The Lankavatara Sutra* (1932), and an *Index to the Lankavatara* (1933). A revised version of the *Index* with Tibetan added was published in 1934.<sup>13</sup>
3. *Avatamsaka-sūtra / Gaṇḍavyūha*. In the very first volume of *The Eastern Buddhist* beginning in 1921, Suzuki serially published summaries of sections of this sutra, as well as an article he called "Notes on the Avatamsaka Sutra." At that time, he reconstructed the Sanskrit title of the Chinese *Huayan jing* (Jpn. *Kegon-kyō*) as *Avatamsaka Sutra*. Then, in the 1930s, after working with Izumi Hōkei on a copy of a Sanskrit manuscript from Paris, he published "Mahayana and Hinayana Buddhism or the Bodhisattva-Ideal and the Śrāvaka-Ideal as Distinguished in the Opening Chapter of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*" (*The Eastern Buddhist* 6, no. 1 [1932]). Finally, with Izumi as coeditor, he published a four-volume critical edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* in Devanagari typeface.<sup>14</sup>

After the war Suzuki became internationally active as a spokesman for Buddhism and Zen Buddhism in particular. But this was also a period when he devoted

considerable time to Shin Buddhism, as seen in his work on the *myōkōnin* and his translation of the first half of Shinran's *Kyōgyōshinshō*. He also wrote a number of summaries or broad overview studies of Buddhism as a whole and Japanese Buddhism in particular, as seen in works like *Essence of Buddhism* (*Bukkyō no tai'i*) and *Japanese Spirituality* (*Nihonteki reisei*). In this postwar phase of his publishing career, among the three scriptures listed above, only the *Huayan* material reappears with any consistency; throughout the 1950s he had a number of publications in Japanese on it.

As the reader will see in the selections included in this study, in addition to the areas listed above, Suzuki wrote on all major strands of Mahāyāna doctrine except Vajrayāna, but he did so in the context of introductory essays, typically written on the level of a university textbook. Thus we find in his prewar writing boilerplate descriptions of Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha doctrines, and some expansive, often creative writing on the bodhisattva ideal and *prajñāpāramitā* logic of what he called affirmation in negation, alluded to above.

In this regard one of the most influential, and to some degree controversial, work is his 1907 book, *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*. At the time, no one had attempted a comprehensive treatment in English of the major teachings associated with Mahāyāna, and the book was not only widely read but it also has stayed in print consistently ever since. But the book is hampered by an odd perspective wherein Suzuki frequently uses Christian-like terms to frame his explications of doctrine, alienating some readers. The book also has a polemic tone to it, betraying an agenda to justify Mahāyāna Buddhism as equally authoritative and “genuine” in its Indian provenance as the Theravāda form being promoted so successfully by Dharmapala and Rhys Davids at that time. Louis de La Vallée-Poussin heavily criticized it in a review, and yet Suzuki never deemed to revise it, despite the book being reprinted repeatedly by The Buddhist Society of London (the copyright holder) over the course of his lifetime.

#### SANSKRIT PROBLEM

An unavoidable issue in considering Suzuki's contribution to Buddhist Studies is how to evaluate his access to Indic texts. Not only did his textual work involve translation from Sanskrit materials, Suzuki also had a penchant for dropping Sanskrit words into discussions of almost any topic in his English-language writing. His use of Sanskrit words and phrases is generally skillful and purposeful and shows an understanding of their role in traditional exegetical discourse, but misspellings are common. The orthographic mistakes by and large do not appear to have rattled him as they continued until his death.

It is rare to find an English-language essay of Suzuki's without some Sanskrit mentioned. But how and where he learned Sanskrit and other Indic languages used in Buddhist scriptures, and how much he could actually read of the highly