THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST

ROBERT N. BELLAH

It is extremely presumptuous to try to discuss so complex a subject as the religious situation in East Asia in so short a time. All I can do is raise some general considerations and give a few examples. I will try to give some idea of the order of complexity of the problems, but I cannot hope to give any solutions.

In speaking of religion today, I will be using an essentially Tillichian definition — religion as that meaningful structure through which man relates himself to his ultimate concern — and will not be concerned primarily with the largely moribund institutional structure of traditional religion in East Asia. It is the problem of how men in East Asia are attempting to make sense out of the reality in which they find themselves that I will be considering. Actually, in the case of China and Japan there is much in the situation which is the same as that which Professor Tillich discussed [recently] as being in the situation of contemporary Western man. For in China and Japan too, people are having to face the human problems of a rapidly expanding rationalization, mechanization and bureaucratization. I feel that both in the case of our society and East Asian societies, the rapid pace of modernization and industrialization holds enormous promise, as well as danger.

This new situation confronts us with enormous potentialities as well as constrictions. But, even the potentialities are deeply disturbing and raise profound questions of meaning.

There is another aspect of the modern situation, however, which we do not share with East Asia. For better or for worse, the modern situation grew up out of our own Western tradition. Whether you consider it a fulfillment or a perversion of that tradition or some combination of the two, still you cannot deny that that is where it came from and everywhere the roots are deep in our own past. In East Asia the case is completely different. The modern situation did not arise out of East Asian past, either as natural growth or as pathological aberration: rather it came from without. It came often sharply, even brutally, and it had no roots in the past. Now, for a hundred years East Asia has been inundated with modern Western culture, but inevitably because of the very nature of the modern West, not with our modern culture alone but with the whole Western tradition. The modern East Asian intellectual has to grapple not only with Einstein and Karl Marx, but just as deeply with Aristotle and Jesus Christ. So the modern situation has raised the problem of cultural identity in East Asia, as it has in the West. But, I think, in a far more shocking and disturbing way. For a man, in a sense, is his past. When he sees the past radically threatened his reaction may be, and in East Asia has been, extreme.

The starting point, I think, for any analysis of the ways in which East Asian societies have responded to the problems of meaning which the last hundred years have

presented to them, is to consider the religious cultural structure which had developed out of the East Asian tradition and which was still functioning as a more or less coherent system at the time when Western impingement began to intensify. We find that that religious cultural structure was defined and limited by a version, or rather several versions, of the cosmological myth through which men in the archaic societies of both East and West have everywhere related themselves to reality. By the cosmological myth I mean that set of symbolizations in which nature, society and self are seen as fused in a more or less compact unity. The cosmological myth was broken first in the West in the Mosaic revelation at Sinai which proclaimed the radical transcendence of God. In the symbolization of the radical transendence of God a sharp differentiation between God and world and between self and society occurs for the first time and gives rise to the possibility of a new kind of universalism and individualism. In the cosmological myth these differentiations tend to be blurred. Society is viewed as an integral part of eternal being and the individual has no place to stand from which to judge it. It is not that experiences of transcendence do not occur in societies based on the cosmological myth, but that the experiences do not receive the sharp objective symbolization which occurs in Biblical (and I must add Koranic) religion.

To call the religious cultural structure of East Asian society, as it can be discerned in the early 19th century, "pre-Mosaic," would be misleading if it caused us to overlook the richly symphonic development of profound

religious and cultural insights which has occurred over several thousand years in those societies. If, however, the term is used merely to point to the absence of certain of the fundamental differentiations which developed out of Biblical religion, then it would have some meaning.

One version of the East Asian cosmological myth, which had both Confucian and Buddhist antecedents, viewed the universe as an organic system of interdependent parts. In this view the individual was seen as receiving an endless flow of blessings from his parents, his ruler and, ultimately, from heaven and earth. In return he owes a debt of service to all from whom he has received. In particular, and very centrally in East Asian ethics, he owes Filial Piety to his parents and Loyalty to his ruler. A slightly different version of the cosmological myth stressed the fundamental unity of the essence of all things, again an idea with both Confucian and Buddhist overtones. In this version the individual who earnestly seeks for his own true soul will discover that it is the same as the soul of heaven and earth and all things. This quest for the true soul involves elements of mysticism, but it is not, in East Asia, a world rejecting mysticism. Having discovered his true self the individual is able all the more to operate in harmony with the social and natural context in which he finds himself. Both versions contain, and at certain times strongly, intimations of transcendence and universalism, but these intimations were not strong enough to break through the compact symbolism of man, society and nature. Therefore, the historical consequences of the various versions of the

cosmological myth tended largely to reinforce a society in which the basic social patterns were beyond question and the individual was submerged in a network of particular social obigations,

However profoundly they differed, both China and Japan began their modern experience still living in the power of cosmological symbolization. However different their modern experiences have been, the last hundred years have shattered, probably forever, their integrated cosmological symbolic structures, though elements of those structure survive in many new forms. The traditional symbolic structures have not as integrated entities been able to withstand the massive invasion of Western Cultural forms. The radical transcendence of Biblical religion was not the only factor which shattered the cosmological framework of East Asian civilization, though, as we shall see, it played a part in the process. There were also the new cosmological symbolisms of the modern West, the world immanent symbolisms of liberal utilitarianism and Marxian Communism. In a sense, we can almost say that in the last hundred years the pre-Mosaic East has met the post-Christian West. Those who see a deep historic resonance between Confucianism and Marxism as two examples of world immanent social salvationism are probably not entirely wrong. But in the last analysis, the differences are more decisive than the similarities. The modern Western cosmological myths have taken form against the background of the radical transcendence of Biblical religion. In their very structures they presuppose and imply it. Everywhere the new Western ideologies touch

the traditional East Asian symbolizations, they corrode and eventually destroy them. The traditional symbolic patterns have not been given up without a struggle. Indeed, at certain points in modern history they have even taken on a new vigor, as for example, in Chiang Kai-Shek's Confucian revival of the '30's or the revival of the Japanese spirit before 1945. But in both cases the renewed health proved to be unnatural and ill-fated; in the end, as disastrous as it was ephemeral. On the whole it seem safe to say that however many discrete traditional elements may survive, the overall integrated structure of traditional sybolization is irrevocably shattered.

I would like to trace briefly in a few examples some of the vicissitudes of that shattering process. Both because of limitations of time and of my knowledge, I will confine myself largely to examples drawn from Japan. One of the earliest positive reactions to the West in Japan (and China too) was the idea that borrowing from the West could be fruitful in the realm of means, while maintaining the integrity of East Asian civilization. The slogan "Eastern morality and Western technology" was widely voiced in both countries. But especially for those who were already of mature age when Western thought first came flooding into the country, this attitude was not so much a couscious slogan as an unconscious assumption. This assumption is to be discovered even in many of those who seem most radical in their reception of Western ideas. Take, for example, a statement from Kono Hironaka, a leader of the Liberal Party which emerged only a few years after the

opening of the country, in which he recounts the decisive influence which reading John Stuart Mill's "On Liberty" had on his life:

> I was riding on horseback when I first read this work. In a flash my entire way of thinking was revolutionized. Until then I had been under the influence of the Chinese Confucianists and of the Japanese classical scholars, and I had even been inclined to advocate an "expel the barbarian" policy. Now all these earlier thoughts of mine, excepting those concerned with loyalty and filial piety, were smashed to smithereens. At the same moment I knew that it was human freedom and human rights that I must henceforth cherish above all else.

But by "excepting" the two cardinal Confucian virtues of loyalty and filial piety, Hironaka was leaving intact the whole organic structure of society and the universe which they imply, and so, radically undercutting the possibilities of his own liberalism.

It is among the early Japanese Protestant Christians, I think, that we see the deepest assumptions of the traditional view questioned for the first time. Let us now turn to the account of Niijima Jō who is telling about what happened to him as a result of his early study of the Bible. He says:

> And Jesus Christ, who was the Son of God bearing on His body the sins of the world, delivered Himself up to death by crucifixion. That we designate Him the

> Saviour, I was also able to know. And when I happened to read these lines I shut the book, looked around, and asked myself who it was that created me, my parents? No! *It was not my parents, but God who created me*!

Niijima's "No!" with a single sharp blow shivers the whole crystaline structure of East Asian symbolization. It is not parents *and* ruler *and* heaven and earth to whom we owe obligations. It is in the first instance to God that we are obligated. Everything else flows from that.

In the case of Ebina Danjo, another prominent early Christian, we can see the same process from a different angle. Ebina was a young samurai warrior at the time of the collapse of the feudal system and the restoration of the Emperor in 1868. As a hereditary retainer of the Yanagawa fief he had been taught that loyalty to his feudal lord was his highest obligation, but because of the new situation his whole pattern of morality came into question. Speaking of his feudal lord he says,

> ...I had firmly decided to "offer up" my life for him. However, the Yanagawa fief was lost, the castle burnt, and my young lord had been killed. I felt terribly lonely. Because the young lord was dead, there was no one to whom I could offer my life, and this was the essence of my loneliness. To whom could I offer my life after this?

The answer to his question came in a strange way through an American schoolteacher named Janes in whose school

Ebina found himself not long after. Ebina describes what happened in his own words:

> One night I had an experience which changed the course of my entire life. This took place at a Bible study meeting at Mr. Janes' house. Mr Janes had prayed numerous times before, but for some reason be commanded us to stand that night. My friends rose one after another since they respected Janes, but I, feeling that I could not agree with the prayer, did not think it was right for me to stand. My indecision lasted for only a moment, but during that moment I suffered intensely. On the other hand, however, something was opening in my heart. This something was gratitude. Since it was natural to have obligations to one's lord and parents I thought it permissible to repay my obligations to "heaven" but to request anything of heaven was, in my opinion, a mistake. Nevertheless I had been told to stand. For sometime I failed to do this, but thinking that it would be all right if it were to thank "heaven" I finally stood. This being all that was required of me, I was convinced that even a Confucianist could do it.
>
> When Mr. Janes finished reading the Bible he became very serious and said that he would like to say a few words about prayer. I was deeply moved when he went on to say that prayer was our duty to the creator In that instant the light dawned on me. Ah! I had been neglecting my duty. I had done something unpar-

donable. If it were my duty I should bend my knee; I should bow my head; as a matter of fact I should be willing to do anything. It was exactly because God had created me that it was a mistake for me to exist for myself. Just like the Ptolemaic world I was self-centered, while God existed in the periphery around me to be used by me. Then, however, God became central and I became like the world of Copernicus. My way of thinking changed in the same way that the thought concerning the heavenly systems changed. When I reached this point I was completely and profoundly humiliated... however, hearing God's command I became a changed person. I became a completely changed being. Speaking of the inner self, it was at that moment that I brought about the restoration of imperial rule.

This, I think, is an extraordinarily interesting portrayal of the shift from cosmological to Christian symbolism. From thanking heaven as merely one alongside other objects to which gratitude is owed and a peripheral one at that, the obligation to God becomes absolute and is symbolized in the scientific vocabulary of astronomy which Ebina was also learning from Janes at the time, as the shift from Ptolemaic to Copernican thinking.

Though only a few Japanese became Christians, many underwent experiences similar to those of the young Ebina in finding that the rapid changes occurring in the years following the opening of the country called into quesion the traditional morality in which they had been raised. In

the face of this situation the conservative leadership of the country came forward with a reformulation of the traditional cosmological symbolism in what has become known as the Meiji Emperor System. This was an attempt to rephrase the old presuppositions in a new way and fit them to the modern context. This new ideology, interestingly enough, became evident especially in the events surrounding the promulgation of the Constitution of 1889. A constitution at all was, of course, an extremely modern thing. But in its preamble it is noted that it is the free gift of the sacred and inviolable Emperor who reigns for ages eternal. In the Imperial Rescript on Education issued in 1890, and henceforth read with great solemnity on certain ceremonial occasions in every school in Japan, the lineaments of the new ideology can be easily discerned:

> Know ye, Our Subjects:
>
> Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting, and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental character of Our Empire, and herein also lies the source of Our education. Ye, Our subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends, true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate arts, and thereby develop intellectual

faculties and perfect moral powers; furthermore, advance public good and promote common interests; always respect the Constitution and observe the laws; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State; and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth. So shall ye not only be Our good and faithful subjects, but render illustrious the best traditions of your forefathers.

The Way here set forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by Our Imperial Ancestors, to be observed alike by Their Descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages and true in all places. It is Our wish to lay it to heart in all reverence, in common with you, our subjects, that we may all attain to the same virtue.

October 30, 1890

Here we can see vividly how clearly cosmological elements, for example the merging of society and nature, implied in the phrase "Our Imperial Throne, coeval with heaven and earth," are juxtaposed with new ideas, such as "respect the constituttion." What seems to be happening is that the traditional cosmological symbolism is being reformulated especially around the person of the Emperor, who was by no means so central in the tradition itself, in order to provide a religious legitimation for the new Japanese state. In this structure the Emperor is not so much as analogue of the European king as of a fusion of European king and Christian God. Functionally, at least, this is the case;

though, of course, the Japanese idea of god, understandable only in terms of the divine human continuity of the cosmological myth, is very different from the Jewish-Christian notion.

What happened when the Christian who had found a transcendent focus of loyalty entirely outside the cosmological imagination first came up against this refurbished cosmological ideology is vividly illustrated in words of Uchimura Kanzō, describing what was to be a symbolic event of the first magnitude:

March 6, 1891

Since I wrote you last, my life has been a very eventful one. On the 9th of Jan. there was in the High Middle School where I taught, a ceremony to acknowledge the Imperial Precept on Education. After the address of the President and reading of the said Precept, the professors and students were asked to go up to the platform one by one, and bow to the Imperial signature affixed to the Precept, *in the manner as we used to bow before our ancestral relics as prescribed in Buddhist and Shinto ceremonies.* I was not at all prepared to meet such a strange ceremony, for the thing was the new invention of the president of the school. As I was the third in turn to go up and bow, I had scarcely time to think upon the matter. So, hesitating in doubt, I took a safer course for my Christain conscience, in the august presence of sixty professors (all non-Christians, the two other Xtian prof.'s beside

> myself having absented themselves) and over one thousand students, I took my stand and did not bow! It was an awful moment for me, for I instantly apprehended the result of my conduct. The anti-Christian sentiment which was and still is strong in the school, and which it was a very delicate affair to soothe down by meekness and kindliness on our part, found a just cause (as they suppose) for bringing forth against me accusations of insult against the nation and its Head, and through me against the Christians in general....

Eventually Uchimura did agree to bow provided everyone understood that the act implied only respect, and not worship which the principal assured him was the case. But the nationwide scandal which the event caused became so great that Uchimura was dismissed. Though the Christians on the whole equivocated and even Uchimura was not always clear on the fundamental issues, that brief, almost instinctive action of his revealed the truth about the new Emperor ideology and so became a symbolic act of great significance in modern Japanese history. Of course, the Meiji emperor system was not without its ambiguities, and it actually left considerable latitude for liberal democractic tendencies which developed in a number of areas up until about 1930. But after 1930 a virulent ideology of nationalism and imperialism which was to lead the Japanese people to the brink of total disaster found in the emperor system a ready-made starting point.

Japanese Christianity had social consequences out of all

proportions to the small percentage of the population which became Christian, and not only in the sphere of symbolic actions. In the struggle for popular rights and the equality of women Christians were often in the forefront. Christians were also active in the early attempt to form labor unions at a time when Japan was in the grip of the industrial revolution. And it should be noted that five of the six founders of the Japanese Socialist Party in 1902 were Christians. The sometimes unexpected consequences of Christian influence are well illustrated in this letter written by Kawakami Hajime from prison in the 1930's.

> I went to Tokyo to study at the age of twenty, after graduating from Yamaguchi High School. I had read the Analects of Confucius and Mencius, but had never laid hands on either the Buddhist scriptures or the Bible. The latter I read for the first time after going to Tokyo. But the moment I came across the passage "Whoever will smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to his the other also. And whosover shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away" (Matthew 5: 39-42), it had a most decisive effect upon my life. This was something beyond all reasoning. My soul cried out from within itself, "That's right. It must be so." Of course, I was unable truly to put this teaching into practice, but every time something came up these words stimulated me, encouraged me, and drove me on to "extraordinary" actions. Thus

the direction of my life was set toward a concern for others as well as for myself.

Two incidents took place before I moved from Tokyo to Kyoto. One was that I went and heard some speeches appealing for aid to the victims of copper poisoning at the Ashio Mine, and donated the scarf and overcoat I was wearing. Furthermore, after going home, I packed up everything but what I had on and turned it over to them.

He then goes on to tell how upset his mother was when she learned of this as she was herself in desperate poverty and working to put him through college. The second incident I will omit and go to the last paragraph of his letter.

Looking back I realize that almost thirty years have passed since then. You might as well say that my being here in prison at the age of sixty stems from those passages in the Bible. I was given Bibles by some people at Toyotama Prison, Ichigaya Prison, and here. But I personally feel that I may be closer to the spirit of the Bible than those people who gave them to me.

Why was Kawakami in prison? Because he was arrested in 1933 as an active member of the Japanese Communist Party. Up until his death in 1946 Kawakami remained a convinced Marxist and Communist even while conceiving of communist society as the fulfillment of the Sermon on the Mount. Of course Kawakami is a very special case and

yet he illustrates something of the eschatological significance which Marxism has had in modern Japan. Marxism, offspring, for better or worse, of the Christian West, has been in modern Japan, together with Christianity, the great challenger of the cosmological tradition. Marxism like Christianity has meant for many an opportunity to break out from the choking constriction of traditi on-bound social groups and to find true individuality in standing for universal principles.

Japanese intellectuals have in recent years grown increasingly critical of the communist countries and the Japanese generally have shown no greater proclivity to commit themselves to the Communist Party than they have to the Christian Church. But in the sphere of ideas Marxism has played a very great role, and only understandable in terms of Japaneses experience, not ours. Though not always with quite the clarity with which it is evident in the case of Kawakami, this role has had a strongly religious dimension.

The search for individuality which I have noted as being associated with the appeal of both Christianity and Marxism is a constant theme in modern Japanese literature. In a society in which the cosmological symbolism remains strong the individual tends to be merged in his social group. He often feels entrapped in a strangling network of social obligation. As his social roles become more differentiated and he becomes aware of a greater range of his own and world culture, his need to experience his own individuality increases. The theme of individuality, which as I have said, runs through modern Japanese literature is expressed much

more in the need for it than in its fulfillment. In fact, if we could characterize this literature with a single word, it would be despair and especially, despair about the individual. Such despair, as Professor Tillich points out with regard to Western literature, has a religious dimension. This becomes explicit in a number of writers. For example, Natsume Sōseki in one of his last novels has his hero recognize only three ways out: death, madness or religion. But for Natsume and for many other writers the religious way, which meant for him, as for many intellectuals, Zen Buddhism, remained closed. Nevertheless, the attempt to reformulate the East Asian tradition, this time to meet not so much the problem of social ethics as the subjective problem of the experience of individuality, was undertaken by Nishida Kitarō and achieved enormous currency in his philosophy.

The Nishida philosophy which exerted great influence in the '20's and '30's in Japan and is still very much alive today is enormously difficult and complex, and I can only give a preliminary estimate of it at this time. Nishida's first book, *A Study of the Good*, published in 1911, is in itself an amazing achievement. Basing itself squarely on the East Asian tradition, especially on that version which I said stressed the fundamental unity of the essence of all things, in Nishida as experienced in the practice of Zen meditation, it integrates with great sophistication an immense range of Western philosophical and religious thought from Plato to the German idealists, and from Jesus to the medieval Christian mystics. While it contains many rich facets and

diverse implications, I think one could still assert that Nishida philosophy is in the final analysis a neo-traditional synthesis formally similar to the Meiji Emperor System. This is not to say that I agree with the current opinion in Japan which would characterize Nishida philosophy as the intellectual orthodoxy of its day. It is too complex and open-ended a system to be called an orthodoxy. But its function nonetheless seems to me to have been to reformulate the traditional Eastern spirituality, suitably illuminated with Western insights, so as handle the increasingly deep crisis in meaning arising over the problem of individualty. I do not doubt that Nishida had a genuine experience of transcendence. but he caught it in a philsophical network which remained within the confines of the cosmological myth. For example, the following passage on God: (It is significant that he discusses "God," which itself gives a Western overtone to what he is saying)

> We call the foundation of this universe God. As I have stated above, I do not view God as a transcendent creator outside the universe, but I think He is directly the foundation of this reality. The relationship between God and the universe is not a relationship such as that between an artist and his work, but is the relationship between essence and phenomenon, and the universe is not a thing created by God, but is a "manifestation" of God. From the movement of the sun, moon and constellations to the inner workings of the human soul, among all there is nothing which is not a manifestation

of God; at the foundation of these things, through each one we are able to worship the spiritual light of God.

Here God has been captured within the cosmos as its "foundation." The implications of this conception for religious action and the solution of the problem of individuality on this basis appear in this passage:

> This kind of deepest religion can be established on the basis that God and man are the same substance, and the true meaning of religion resides in acquiring this significance of the union of God and man. In other words, it resides in experiencing in the foundation of our consciousess the lofty univeral spirit which operates, destroying the consciousness of the self. Faith is not something which must be given from without according to legend and logic, but is something which must be cultivated from within. As Jacob Boehm has said, we arrive at God through the deepest internal life (*die innerste Geburt*). At the same time that in this internal rebirth we see God directly and we believe in Him, herein we also find the true life of the self and feel unlimited power.

Unlimited power was precisely what the modern Japanese intellectual to whom the Nishida philosophy appealed did not feel. Nishida offered him the hope of a profound realization of himself together with a complete harmonization with his world. For many it was a very attractive offer. It is

difficult, however, to deny what present day Japanese critics assert when they say that the Nishida position tended to lead away from social responsibility at just the time when the balance between democracy and militarism was most delicate. And even leaving that aside, the question remains as to what kind of individuality has been experienced if the individual, in returning from his Zen meditation hall, finds himself enmeshed in exactly the same network of social constrictions as before he went to it.

Finally let me turn to one more Japanese thinker, Ienaga Saburo, born in 1913, and an influential intellectual in Japan today. Ienaga has been influenced by most of the currents we have discussed already, by Marxism and Christianity and the Nishida philosophy. Like Nishida, his religious position is a reformulation of East Asian positions with Western insights, but, unlike Nishida, he seems to have grasped radical transcendence and largely escaped the cosmological limitations. Speaking of himself he says,

> When I entered Higher School in the spring of 1931, just before the Manchurian incident, Marxism was still at its zenith. In the year I entered school there were two strikes arising from questions of student thought. Facing that atmosphere for the first time in my life and seeing that the nationalist morality which had been poured into me at home and at school was without authority, I felt that the ground on which I stood had crumbled. Seeking for something on which my spirit could rely, I took hold of philosophy. After the orthodox

> morality which had no basis outside of the historical tradition of the past had slipped from the seat of my heart, philosophy, which speaks of "what one ought to do," had for me a fresh fascination. Throwing away many years of educational precepts I was spiritually reborn. This is an incident which can be called the Copernican Revolution in my spiritual life.

Interestingly enough, it was German neo-Kantianism, as mediated through one of the leaders of the Nishida school of philosophy, which provided him with his philosophical rebirth. In his first year in the university (1934) he experienced, however, a new and deeper crisis, this time of a religious nature. "At that time, for various reasons, I felt beaten in mind and body," he writes. Faced with great anxieties about his future, he found that the "dry and lifeless university lectures without any real thought in them" could not save him from a feeling of despair. In addition, he was afflicted with steadily declining health. In this situation he says he experienced for the first time the meaning of a statement by a seventh century Japanese Buddhist: "The world is empty and false; only the Buddha is true". But he found his religion solution especially in the 13th century Buddhist leader Shinran Shonin who streassed the absolute incapacity of men to save themselves and the necessity for faith alone. This position Ienaga elucidates with quotes from Paul to the Romans. Since the war Ienaga has turned very much to constitutional and social reform problems. It is not always easy to see the

organic relation between the religious position, which he still holds, and his present social activism. Nevertheless, it would seem that his perception of radical transcendence, as mediated in one strand of Japanese Buddhism, is related to his social concern, and that he represents, at least, the possibility of reformulations out of the Japanese tradition which will not end in the cosmological *cul de sac*, but will genuinely contribute to the solution of the contemporary religious and social problems.

In conclusion, let me emphasize how fragmentary this presentation has been. I have elected to bring you a few concrete examples rather than a purely abstract general characterization. In a sense none of the examples I have given can be taken as typical. They are merely a selection from among the possiblities which have emerged in the modern Japanese experience. But whatever may be the case for the moment in China, it is precisely in its wealth of possibilities that the Japanese religious situation is to be characterized.

Kanji Glossary

Ashio 足尾
Ebina, Danjō 海老名弾正
Ichigaya 市ケ谷
Ienaga, Saburō 家永三郎
Kawakami, Hajime 河上　肇
Kōno, Hironaka 河野広中
Meiji 明治
Natsume, Sōseki 夏目漱石
Nijima, Jō 新島　襄
Nishida, Kitarō 西田幾多郎
Toyotama 豊玉
Uchimura, Kanzō 内村鑑三
Yanagawa 柳川
Yamaguchi 山口
Zen 禅