

The Individuation of the Self in Japanese History

Robert LEE

INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM OF THE SELF IN JAPAN

Modernization and the self. Although Japanese society has developed a modern economy and polity since the Meiji Restoration (1868) and has become a much more egalitarian instead of a strictly hierarchical society, on the level of primary personal relationships Japanese society has remained quite traditional. On this level, to be Japanese is to be involved in close, complex and enduring personal relationships with one's family, one's neighbors, one's company or school, or other primary groups. Tradition has reinforced such groups by requiring each member to subordinate his personal desires to the requirements of the group. In short, group values have superseded personal values; hence, what would be an act of extreme personal sacrifice in another society can be passed over in Japan as a dutiful but not unexpected act of group loyalty.¹ Thus, in contrast to western history, the radical individuation of the self—the development of a strong autonomous, centered self—did not accompany modernization in Japan. This study, therefore, as a socio-historical interpretation of Japanese religion, is an attempt to grasp analytically the problem of the individuation of the self in the modern Japanese experience.²

Analytically, these primary personal relationships, called *oyabun-kobun* (parent-child relationships) reveal a hierarchical

1. This understanding of Japanese society and social psychology is well documented in the works of such anthropologists as Nakane Chie (1967, 1970), sociologists as Robert N. Bellah (1962) and Ronald P. Dore (1967), and social psychologists as George De Vos (1973).
2. The general theory for the analysis of the historical process of the individuation of the self in this study is from Talcott Parsons' human action theory (1966) and its fuller development by Clifford Geertz (1973) and Robert N. Bellah (1970), especially the latter's "Religious evolution" (1964).

structure described by Nakane Chie as an “inverted V” (1970, p. 7). Here the superior person is seen as the representative head of the group and hence the source or channel of benevolence; the inferior person relates to the group and its head in gratitude and loyalty. Consequently, the lateral or egalitarian relationships remain weak, while the hierarchical or asymmetrical relationships are strengthened.

Originally a kinship relationship typical of archaic societies, this hierarchical system has been maintained by Japanese tradition and applied to all social situations in Japan for centuries. In fact, John Hall sees the *uji-be* social structure in ancient Japan as its prototype (1966, p. 7). The later *bushi* ideal of lord-retainer reflected the same superior-inferior relationship in medieval Japan. Today, schools, businesses, political parties, religious organizations and other social groups all continue this hierarchical form of social relationship (Nakane 1970, chap. 4).

The motivation for a Japanese to accept such close hierarchical group relationships and to give these a central position among his value preferences can be viewed from a psychological perspective. Through childhood socialization practices the Japanese individual is conditioned to putting the needs of the group ahead of his own; however, this same conditioning also makes him emotionally dependent upon the approbation of the group. That is, he needs the reassurance of the group as the external reinforcement of his own self image. This emotional or love-dependency upon the group or especially the leader of the group has been brilliantly analyzed by Doi Takeo (1962, 1971), who describes this dominance of love-dependency relationship in Japanese personality structure as the need to *amaeru*. According to Doi, this feeling of love-dependency, typical of an early stage of childhood socialization, instead of being displaced, persists throughout the Japanese adult life. What is important to note, also, is that this *amaeru* relationship, like the *oyabun-kobun* structure, is mutual but asymmetrical. Both the superior and the inferior partners need to cultivate *amaeru* relations—that

is, both feelings of dependence and feelings of being depended upon need to be established.

The self and religion. Historically these fictive kinship structures and love-dependency relationships not only reinforced each other but were reinforced by the nativistic religious symbols. Such ideas as the mythological origin and divinity of the emperor from the Sun Goddess line emphasized the sacred origins of the Japanese people. The correlative notion that all Japanese are members of branch families of the imperial line stressed the sacredness of the *ie* (family-lineage) and later the *kokutai* (nation). Further, the primordial myths related the Japanese people to nature, especially to the land and the natural environs of Japan itself. Thus, because nature (land and natural environs), the Sun Goddess and the divine emperor all were seen as sacred and the source of nurturance, benevolence and blessing, the Japanese people became ritually bound in hierarchical relationships in which the appropriate responses were grateful dependency and loyalty. In other words, the nativistic religious symbols that focused upon the divinity of the emperor, the land (*nippon*) and the nation (*kokutai*) all legitimated the hierarchical social and psychological structures described above.

Therefore, in contrast to the development in the West, modernization in Japan did not lead the Japanese to lose their traditional sense of a sacred community. Even after World War II, when the emperor renounced his divinity and Japanese society became somewhat secularized, such "modern" notions that nature is secular (infinite space) and that man is an interchangeable unit in a technological society remain inconceivable conceptions in Japan today.³ This persistence of the primary psycho-social structures reinforced by a cultural sense of the sacredness or particularity of one's own community and nature

3. For a trenchant analysis of the problem of the self in the West, see Lucien Goldmann 1964, esp. pp. 25-39.

has led Robert Bellah to describe this archaic feature of Japanese culture and society as the “ground bass” of Japanese religion and society.⁴

In contrast to this persistent cultural and social resistance to modernity, Japanese literature reflects great interest in “modern values.” Such terms as *dokuritsu jison* (independence and self-respect), *ningen no songen* (dignity of man), *jiyū* (liberty), and *byōdō* (equality) are all surely borrowings from their western equivalents. At the same time they reveal the modern Japanese consciousness of the problem of the self. The terms *dokuritsu jison* and *ningen no songen* must surely reflect the desire for the individuation of a personal self in a society in which group values overwhelm personal values. The term *jiyū* represents a direct attack upon the *oyabun-kobun* and *amaeru* socio-psychological structures that so much determine the individual’s role in society and thus prescribe his everyday actions. Finally, the term *byōdō* may be seen as a rejection of all hierarchical relations in general.

Nevertheless, as Ronald Dore has perceptibly noted, in spite of the fact that the issue of the individuation of the self “has been the center of ideological proselytization” (1965, p. 46), the problem of the self paradoxically remains unresolved in Japanese society today (1965, p. 44):

However, it seems to me a curious paradox that although in the ideological sphere there has been much more talk about the need for greater individualism, for greater independence, etc., than about the need for greater equality, in actual fact there has been more of a movement towards greater egalitarianism in practice in Japanese society than there has towards greater individualism.

This paradoxical situation in modern Japan in which, on the

4. According to the author, “ground bass” is the correct term and not “ground base” as printed in the original essay (1962, p. 35). For a detailed historical analysis of the “ground bass” in ancient Japan, see William Randall Huntberry, “Religion and value-formation in Japan” (1968).

one hand, there is much verbal assent to a more independent, free, personal self and, on the other hand, little freedom to realize such a self in everyday life describes the Japanese self-identity crisis. In analytical terms the inability of the Japanese to acquire a more independent self-identity is rooted in the undifferentiated character of the Japanese religious symbol system, primary social structure and personality system. As described above, the socialization process of the individual occurs in a society in which the traditional religious understanding of the self tends to coincide with the social roles prescribed in the normative (and sacred) social order. Furthermore, since the socialization process induces love-dependency rather than personal (ego) autonomy as the primary motivation, the process of the individuation of an independent personal self is doubly inhibited. Hence, in sharp contrast to the highly articulated preference for an independent self-identity, the normal socialization process in Japanese society leads to an identity diffusion, to a self-identity embedded in a sacred or quasi-sacred social order such as that found typically in what Bellah describes as “archaic” societies (1964, pp. 364–66).

Religious evolution and the individuation of the self. According to Bellah, the possibility for the development of an autonomous personal self, such as desired by many modern Japanese, arises historically for the first time in the context of historic or “world-rejecting” religions (1964, p. 367):

The identity diffusion characteristic of archaic religions is radically challenged by historic religious symbolization, which leads for the first time to a clearly structured conception of the self. Devaluation of the empirical world and the empirical self highlights the conception of a responsible self, a core self or a true self, deeper than the flux of everyday experience.....

In other words in the radical world-rejection of historic religion the believer not only negates his socially embedded (or archaic)

self-identity but by attributing value to a transcendent realm acquires a new self-identity independent of his social reality. Thus in historic religion, for the first time the believer clearly differentiates between the experience of the self (and the transcendent) and the experience of the society that acts upon the self. In this way” a core self or true self” arises as a self freed from the claims of the psycho-social order and as a self that acts in terms of personal integrity now rooted in “ultimate” reality.

In Japanese history, however, religious evolution and the individuation of the self are more complex than in the model described above. In addition to the nativistic, archaic elements Japanese religion acquired historic elements through the cultural diffusion of such religious traditions as Buddhism and later Christianity, both of which became indigenous, that is, “Japanese Buddhism” and “Japanese Christianity.” Although these radical world-rejecting and transcendent religious traditions did produce outstanding independent individuals, in succeeding generations these historic traditions did not always institutionalize a continuing religious faith and social order that would nourish an independent self-identity. In short, the historic elements in Japanese religion became what Bellah describes as a “tradition of submerged transcendence” (1962, p. 36). (This phenomenon will be discussed below.) Consequently, in the contemporary search for meaning many Japanese intellectuals have returned to their religious history in order to discover its transcendent elements.

In order to understand the modern Japanese search for personal meaning and identity, the remainder of this paper is directed to an historical analysis of two important religious figures who not only faced creatively the problem of the individuation of the self in Japanese history but have since become paradigms for many contemporary Japanese in their search for personal meaning. These two figures, Shinran and Uchimura Kanzō, represent two historic religious traditions— the Buddhist and the Christian— both of which through cultural diffusion have be-

come constitutive elements of Japanese religion and culture.⁵

HISTORIC RELIGION: HŌNEN AND SHINRAN

Although Buddhism was introduced as early as the sixth century A. D., early Japanese Buddhism functioned more like an archaic than like an historic religion. Almost from its inception in Japan until the twelfth century, Buddhism was related to the state primarily as a state-recognized and state-supported (that is, as civil) religion, which in turn served the state, especially the Kyoto court aristocracy, with elaborate rituals and ceremonies to insure the "prosperity and protection of the state." However, with the establishment of the Kamakura shogunate (1185-1333), a new Buddhism arose in this period that finally severed its ties to the court aristocracy, rejected the instrumental use of Buddhism to legitimate socio-political power, and instead became a world-denying religion. In the history of Japanese religion Kamakura Buddhism represents a high point, a breakthrough from an archaic religion deeply embedded in the Japanese socio-political order to an historic religion—a popularly-based religious movement in which the problem of personal salvation became central. In this movement Hōnen and Shinran were the outstanding leaders—strong, individual figures, indeed, charismatic figures in Weber's sense of the term.⁶

Hōnen and historic religion. The first clear breakthrough from archaic religion⁷ came in 1175 when Hōnen (1133-1212) a-

5. The following study is based upon my Ph. D. dissertation, "Religious evolution and the individuation of the self in Japanese history" (1974), which includes development of a sociological theory of religion and a lengthy historical analysis of religious evolution in Japanese history, with the stages focusing upon Shōtoku Taishi; Hōnen, Shinran and Nichiren; and Uchimura Kanzō.
6. Other outstanding charismatic figures who established different versions of historic religion in this period were Dōgen (1200-1255) and Nichiren (1222-1282). For "Historic religion in Japan—Nichiren," see my dissertation (1974, chap. 4).
7. Shōtoku Taishi (574-622) represents perhaps the first, although indecisive, breakthrough to historic religion; however, his efforts were immediately sub-

bandoned the “center for protection of the nation,” the Tendai monastery at Mt. Hiei, in order to establish the Pure Land teaching and practice as both independent of and superior to all other religious teachings and practices. Heretofore, Tendai Buddhism, as the official “nation-protecting” religion of Mt. Hiei, had stressed the virtues of all the Buddhist disciplines—including the necessity of attainment of Buddhahood—for the benefit of the nation. As a Tendai monk Hōnen had practiced the many forms of self-discipline taught at Mt. Hiei but had found himself incapable of freeing himself “from the chains of evil passions, whence come evil conduct” (Coates 1925, p. 184). Instead Hōnen found personal salvation in the Pure Land teaching of the original vow of Amida and the practice of the *nenbutsu*.

By teaching the exclusive path of Pure Land as the only effective mode for attaining personal salvation in the latter age of the degeneration of the Law (*mappō*), Hōnen clearly repudiated the official civil religion of Tendai Buddhism. For Hōnen in the age of *mappō* all the disciplines of self-effort for achieving salvation or protecting the nation were meaningless. In contrast, following the Pure Land teaching, Hōnen sharply distinguished between the Pure Land (*jōdo*), the land of enlightenment, and Japan, now seen as the land of defilement (*edo*). Further, Hōnen sharply contrasted the qualities of buddha nature or “buddha mind” (*bushin*) and human nature or “earthly mind” (*bonshin*) by maintaining that man and Amida could not be united in this life because Amida was on the “yonder shore” (*higan*) and man was on the “nearer shore” (*shigan*). Hōnen taught that the path of salvation was the process of sinful man’s leaving this impermanent world to join Amida Buddha in the “yonder” permanent

merged into the ground bass of Japanese religion and society. See Futaba Kenkō, *Kodai bukkyō shisōshi kenkyū* (“A study of the history of ancient Japanese Buddhist thought”), for a discussion of the establishment of two types of Buddhism in Japan, a *ritsuryō* Buddhism, a form of civil religion instituted by imperial decree; and anti-*ritsuryō* Buddhism, a more personal and voluntary religion, represented by Shōtoku Taishi. For “The rise of historic religion in Japan—Shōtoku Taishi,” see my dissertation (1974, chap. 2).

world. Hence, Hōnen in his own search for meaning transformed religion in the Kamakura period (1) from that concerned with corporate salvation to personal salvation, (2) from that focused upon the nation or defiled land to the Pure Land, and (3) from that dependent upon self-effort to that dependent upon the mercies of the eternal Buddha. Further, in his doctrine of radical negation of his age (*mappō*) and his world (*edo*), Hōnen not only rejected the “nation-protecting” Tendai philosophy which tended to collapse easily *nirvana* and *samsara*, but also provided the symbolic resources for the rise of a personal self-identity that was sharply differentiated from his social identity. In short, Hōnen led the breakthrough from the archaic tendencies of Japanese religion to a historic or world-rejecting religion.

Shinran and true faith. The simple devotional piety of Hōnen left many religious questions unanswered and led to the degeneration of the *nenbutsu* practice, culminating in the extreme of suicide in order to be born immediately into the Pure Land. However, Shinran (1173–1262), one of Hōnen’s disciples, wrestled with these questions and finally clarified the process of faith implied in Hōnen’s Pure Land teaching.

In his major work the *Kyōgyōshinshō* (“Teaching, practice, faith, enlightenment”) Shinran clarified the meaning of the *nenbutsu* practice, which had been left undeveloped in Hōnen’s teaching. Shinran, like Hōnen, affirmed the centrality of the practice of reciting the *nenbutsu* (*shōmyō nenbutsu*) and at the same time insisted that it was not the reciting of the *nenbutsu* many times (*tanen*) that was the cause of birth in the Pure Land. In contrast to Hōnen, who in his teaching tended to identify Amida and his causal power of the original vow with the practice of the *nenbutsu*, Shinran shifted the locus of the work of Amida’s causal power to the mind (heart) of the individual devotee himself. While for Hōnen the sincere invocation of the name of Amida Buddha was the vehicle to participate in the power of Amida and was thus the gateway to the Pure Land (Japanese

scholars designate Hōnen's teaching as *nenbutsu ihon* or "the *nenbutsu* is the cause"), for Shinran the sincere mind or the mind of faith was the cause for birth in the Pure Land (*shinjin ihon*).

In his chapter on "Faith" in his *Kyōgyōshinshō*, Shinran, as did Hōnen (both following the Pure Land tradition), differentiated the mind, that is, the subjective or personal nature of man into three aspects or "three minds": literally, the "sincere" or "true mind" (*shijōshin*), the "deep mind" (*jinshin*) and the "mind that desires birth in the Pure Land by transferring the merit of virtuous deeds" (*ekōhotsuganshin*). For Shinran these three aspects of the mind constituted the true cause for salvation or enlightenment. According to Shinran, the "sincere mind" is a seed or fruit of truth or reality as contrasted by falsehood or illusion; hence the "sincere mind" is "without a speck of doubt." The "deep mind," according to Shinran, is the mind filled with truth and is characterized by its unity, constancy, and loyalty to truth; hence, the "deep mind" is "without a speck of doubt." "The mind that desires birth," according to Shinran, is the mind that longs for birth in the Pure Land and hence is consciously awakened and full of compassion in its desire to transfer merit. This mind, is "without a speck of doubt" (1958, pp. 94-102). Thus Shinran defined true faith in terms of the "three minds," which is the one mind of truth without any doubt.

Shinran's soteriology. However, at the same time in his own personal experience Shinran, like Hōnen, was fully aware that the human condition, especially in the age of *maḥḥpō*, was filled not with truth but with falsehood. According to Shinran, "all human beings are vile and defiled...and have never once experienced the purity of mind, ...all are false and vain, flattering and cheating, with no truthfulness in their minds" (1958, p. 105). Like Hōnen, Shinran refused to collapse the sharp differentiation between Buddha nature and human nature, between truth and falsehood or between purity and impurity.

While Hōnen tended to emphasize this differentiation in space-time terminology, such as the future birth on the “yonder shore” in contrast to present birth on “this shore,” Shinran intensified this difference by internalizing the concept of *mappō* and seeing himself or his mind as “floundering in a sea of passion.” Therefore, for Shinran man’s personal nature was totally false and filled with impurity, thus totally incapable of becoming a mind of sincerity, faith and desire for birth in the Pure Land.

In sharp contrast to man’s incapacity in the age of *mappō*, Shinran then pointed to Tathagata Amida, who not only had achieved this perfect and true mind but in his mercy also offered this true mind to all men bound by the sorrows of this world. According to Shinran, in his original vow Amida himself in behalf of man perfected the “three minds,” that is, Amida himself vowed “sincerity” (*shishin*), “faith” (*shingyō*) and “desire for birth” (*yokushō*). Therefore, according to Shinran, Amida in his original vow transferred his true mind as a seed of truth to the mind of man; and thus the mind of man became a mind of sincerity, a mind “without a speck of doubt.” Also, in the original vow Amida transferred his deep mind to the mind of man; and thus the mind of man became filled with truth, that is, by “hearing” and “believing.” “Hearing,” according to Shinran, was one’s awareness of his own sin-ridden and lost condition; and “believing” was trusting “without a speck of doubt” in Amida’s vows. Hence, for Shinran, the deep mind of Amida Buddha transferred to man became in man the mind of deep faith (*shinjin*). Finally, the mind that desires birth and transfers merit Shinran interpreted as the activity of the mind of Amida Buddha, especially in his vows in which Amida not only achieved the virtues of a bodhisattva and therefore acquired the merit to enter the Pure Land, but at the same time vowed to transfer this merit to benefit sinful man. What was transferred by Amida Buddha to the mind of man took form as the desire for birth in Amida’s Pure Land—not, however, just for the sake of personal enjoyment or personal escape from the cycle of birth

and death (a self-centered motivation which Shinran rejected), but for the sake of birth in the Pure Land in order to "raise up a great compassionate heart," that is, in order to return to the world of birth and death to transfer merit to benefit mankind (1958, pp. 94-108).

In terms of Shinran's soteriology, even though he continued to reaffirm the practice of reciting the *nenbutsu*, he changed the meaning of this practice. Hōnen, in his emphasis upon the sincere invocation of the name of Amida, had taught that the *nenbutsu* was the one vehicle for man's future union with the Buddha in the Pure Land. Shinran, however, taught that this union with the Buddha already had taken place in one moment of thought (*ichinen*) in which Amida in his vows had transferred his true mind to man. Because man in this single moment of thought, initiated by Amida's vows, acquired the mind of true faith, he also had already attained the non-retrogressive state, that is, final assurance of birth in the Pure Land (1958, p. 123):

... in regard to true faith, there is in faith one thought (*ichinen*). This one thought tells the utmost fraction of time... in which faith buds in us. It is the realization of the unexpressible great joy that floods our mind. Therefore ... all beings who hear his name and blissfully trust in him, and think even once—which all is the result of the sincerest effort directed toward them by him—and who desire to be born in his country will at once be born, attaining thereby the non-retrogressive state.

Hence, for Shinran the practice of the *nenbutsu* was no longer a petition of a hopelessly lost person to the merciful Amida Buddha but, rather, an expression of gratitude for the mercies of Amida Buddha.

Shinran and the individuation of the self. Shinran in his wrestling with the ambiguities of the simple faith that he received from Hōnen did succeed in providing a rational basis for a strong, centered or autonomous self. He universalized the concept of

Amida Buddha, as not only the eternal Buddha and ruler of the Pure Land, but also as universal truth and power which permeated all individual beings. Hence, in making the radically transcendent Amida Buddha of Hōnen's teaching immediately immanent in every individual being in this world, he provided for his followers not only the symbols for a self-identity independent of the social order as in Hōnen's case, but also the basis for a meaningful existence in this world and in this life.

Yet, for Shinran, the meaning of human existence in this world was one of lonely freedom. In order to protect the absolute power of Amida and correlatively the total dependence of man upon Amida's power, he so stressed the impermanence of this world that he refused to legitimize any social relationships. Shinran taught that as each individual was personally selected by the mercy of Amida to achieve spiritual union with the Buddha, his bonds with other men were severed; thus he stood alone, an individual isolated from all other men. Hence, Shinran refused to institutionalize his movement. He refused to have disciples in the official sense (1962, p. 28):

I, Shinran, do not have even one disciple of my own. The reason is, if I should lead others to utter the *Nembutsu* by my own efforts, I might call them my disciples. But it is truly ridiculous to call them my disciples, when they utter the *Nembutsu* through the working of Amida Buddha.

Shinran even rejected traditional filial piety by refusing to utter the *nenbutsu* in behalf of his parents, since he could not save them until he became a Buddha in the next life (1962, p. 26).

In effect, Shinran for the sake of Amida Buddha relativized and thus desacralized both the traditional Buddhist social order and the quasi-sacred socio-political order. At the same time he offered a message of hope and meaning to people of all classes in a fearful age.

The problem of submerged transcendence. As an epilogue to the discussion of the life of Shinran, it should be pointed out that

in spite of the fact that Shinran refused to institutionalize his movement, his movement in succeeding generations did become highly organized according to the traditional Japanese (feudal) pattern by his lineal descendants, especially Kakunyo (1270–1351), Shinran's great grandson, and Rennyō (1415–1499), the eighth chief patriarch of Honganji, who is often called the second founder of the Jōdoshinshū. Shinran had urged his followers to make every act an act of thanksgiving to Amida Buddha; however, in later years these acts of gratitude became acts of obligation now redirected to Shinran's heirs, who were identified as Amida's official representatives on this earth. Thus, what was formerly a mutual bond of devotion between teacher and disciple—Shinran claimed to have no disciples but only fellow travelers—toward Amida Buddha became in a later age a personal (hierarchical) bond of feudal loyalty to Amida's representative on earth (Tsunoda 1958, pp. 211–212). Instead of the radical religious faith that led to a highly autonomous, centered self that Shinran represented, the later Jōdoshinshū organized itself in terms of a religious faith that led to the subordination of the personal self to the demands of group solidarity, that is, a return to the traditional archaic religio-social pattern.⁸ Thus by the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Shinran's original movement became a powerful religious organization that functioned as still one more feudal faction that militantly fought to maintain its independent existence among many other feuding feudal powers. In fact, their fanatic devotion won them the name *ikkō* ("single-minded") and sustained their independence in a century of warfare until the rise of power in Nobunaga, who in the later sixteenth century unified the feudally divided Japan by brutally wiping out any dissent especially by such groups as

8. The transformation of the radical personal faith of Shinran into symbols for collective solidarity in which the personal self is subordinated to group goals is well documented in Minor L. Rogers' recent Harvard Ph. D. (unpublished) dissertation, "Rennyō Shōnin 1415-1499: A transformation in Shin Buddhist piety" (April, 1972).

the *ikkō ikki*, the single-minded revolutionary sects of the Shinshū movement.

Thus the study of Shinran's life and religious faith illustrates the persistence of the phenomenon of submerged transcendence in the history of Japanese religion. Although the radical transcendent quality of Shinran's faith in Amida Buddha did lead to a temporary breakthrough of the archaic character of Japanese religion, his faith did not lead to the type of religious symbolization that would elicit the institutional or structural changes in his society needed to support a strong, autonomous, centered self. Instead, the radical transcendent quality of Shinran's faith became submerged in the ground bass of Japanese religion when succeeding generations of Shinran's followers interpreted the symbols of Shinran's faith to support the subordination of one's personal identity to the collective identity.

EARLY MODERN RELIGION: UCHIMURA KANZŌ

In this study early modern religion represents a further evolution in Japanese religion, a breakthrough from the tradition of submerged transcendence. In historical terms, additional input into the Japanese religious symbol system—this time from the West—provided the cultural resources not only for a personal faith and self-identity that is independent of society (now the nation-state) but also a faith that led to new social institutions that nourish an independent personal identity. In modern Japanese history one figure is outstanding for his personal independence and integrity, yet he remained all his life a patriot for his country. His extreme commitment to personal independence caused some western historians to label him a "failure" (Arima 1969, pp. 15–50) or an "enigma" (Howes 1965). Nevertheless, to many Japanese, especially in the post-Second World War period, Uchimura Kanzō (1861–1930) has become the paradigmatic hero of personal independence.

Samurai Christian. In college Uchimura, proud son of a samurai,

converted to Christianity.⁹ As a samurai he held on to the traditional *bushi* ethic, especially to loyalty as the highest virtue. According to Uchimura, loyalty was the unconditional fulfillment of one's role-obligations, whether as son to his parents (filial piety), as servant to his lord, or even as lord to his servants. Loyalty demanded the fulfillment of one's duties or role-obligation with sincerity and earnestness, without any expectations or recompense, and without any consideration of one's own life, safety or self-interest. In other words, for Uchimura loyalty required total self-dedication and self-sacrifice in order to *achieve* or fulfil the demands of one's role in society.

In his essay on the "Moral traits of the *Yamato-damashii* ('Spirit of Japan')" (1886)¹⁰ Uchimura described this traditional samurai loyalty, which he saw as an "inborn faculty" of the "Yamato-heart," as already "essentially Christian *in spirit*." Although in the past this loyalty had been blind, misdirected and even naive in its achievement, Uchimura firmly believed that this samurai loyalty in its purity of motivation was acceptable in the kingdom of Christ and that it needed only to be redirected to service in this higher kingdom.

However, for Uchimura loyalty to Christ was also different from all the traditional loyalties of the *bushi* ethic. Although loyalty to Christ involved the same purity of motivation as the traditional samurai loyalty, its orientation or goal for achievement was found not within the traditional social order of family, society and nation but in a transcendent order. Hence, for Uchimura loyalty to Christ required not only a surrender of the self to Christ but also a total self-dedication to the fulfillment of the "will of God," that is, to loyal actions that denied absolute value to family, society and nation. Thus Uchimura's loyalty

9. For a discussion of the characteristics of the Meiji elite who converted to Christianity, see Scheiner (1970, chap. 2-4).

10. Uchimura wrote this essay in August, 1885, in order to defray expenses for his vacation at Gloucester, Mass. (1932, II, p. 865). Also, see John F. Howes, "Two works by Uchimura Kanzō until recently unknown in Japan" (1958, pp. 25-31).

to Christ freed him from any socially ascribed identity, that is, from the ascribed role-obligations of his social order, and at the same time provided him a new identity in Christ, a personal self-identity independent of the social order. In other words, Uchimura's loyalty to Christ did not diminish his samurai spirit of self-denial and self-dedication but set these motivations and actions in a higher or transcendent context from which Uchimura could critically judge the nature of his loyalty (to Christ) both in his actions in his roles in the family, society and nation and in his motivations and aspirations in fulfilling these human roles in society. In short, in his loyalty to Christ Uchimura acquired an extremely sensitive conscience,¹¹ which in future years set him apart from his own countrymen.

Nation and conscience. With a Bachelor of Science degree from the famous Hokkaido Agricultural College in Sapporo and a Bachelor of Arts degree from Amherst College in the United States, Uchimura seemed poised, upon his return to Japan in 1888, to fulfill his loyalty to Christ in a significant career of active service to both Christ and the nation. However, he was immediately confronted by a series of setbacks that culminated in his famous *lese majesty* case of 1891.¹² After this low point in his life Uchimura turned to writing, first novels and essays, and then journalistic writing, which suddenly thrust him into fame and popularity. His uncompromising independence and loyalty to principle along with his grand style of satire, irony and wit established him as a "prophet," a moral and social critic of the political establishment. But in 1903, in opposition to imminent war with Russia, Uchimura, then at the height of his national popularity, resigned from his journalistic position as the "conscience of the nation."

11. In De Vos' psychological language Uchimura's guilt-loyalty syndrome ("I have sinned to God—loyalty to Christ") acquired superego functions in addition to the traditional ego (guilt) functions (1960, pp. 287–301).

12. For a full discussion see Ozawa Saburō, *Uchimura kanzō fukei jiken* ("The *lese majesty* incident of Uchimura Kanzō"), 1961.

Uchimura's decision to retire from active participation in the arena of national affairs cannot be seen as a withdrawal from "this-worldly" action for "other-worldly" action, but rather as a basic shift in priorities and strategy in his service to Christ and the nation. The necessity for this shift became increasingly clear to Uchimura when he saw that Japan's rapid process of nation-building was not being carried out in the spirit of the old samurai tradition, that is, in sincerity and righteousness. Instead, Uchimura saw that Japan was acquiring the worst features of western civilization—its materialism ("mamonism") and its policy of military, political and economic aggrandizement ("imperialism").¹³ For Uchimura Japan was trading away its samurai heritage (which for Uchimura was but one step away from true Christianity) for the decadence of the West. The depth of these evils in Japan became especially clear to Uchimura after the Sino-Japanese War (1894–1895), a war which he thought began "as a righteous war [but] ended as an avaricious war" (1932, XVI, p. 337). For Uchimura Japan had become an "immoral nation," "a dead corpse" under the Satsuma-Chōshū Government. Hence, for Uchimura the most urgent priority for the nation was not nation-building, nor more wars of expansion in the name of independence for Korea, but a revival of the traditional Japanese morality: "Let Japanese sincerity reassert itself, and there is yet hope for the establishment of the nation" (1932, XVI, p. 576).

A change in national priorities for Uchimura required also a change in his strategy or form of service to Christ and the nation. Because Uchimura felt that the Japanese nation was "immoral" and "dead," he abandoned the "nation" and turned to the Japanese "man," "a spiritual being, one that can rise

13. Note: In the late 1890's Japan's success in empire-building had vast public support, especially since Japan was seen as joining the select group of world powers as a respectable participant in the game of imperialist politics. See discussion by Iriye Akira, "Imperialism in East Asia" (1970, pp. 133–138).

above himself" (1932, XVI, p. 572). Thus by distinguishing sharply between the Japanese "man" and the Japanese "nation," Uchimura in effect differentiated between "man" as a personal self, a moral and spiritual being, and the "nation" as a social and political order. Hence, Uchimura redirected the strategy of his service to Christ and the nation from that of building a Japanese civilization that would reconcile the East and West to that of building a new civilization of moral (spiritual) men and women.

Uchimura's change in priorities and strategy and his differentiation between the personal-moral-spiritual order and the socio-political order became possible because Uchimura's theology, especially his optimistic view of history and divine providence, was also undergoing a radical change. Uchimura believed that "God is in history" and that "history is God in his self-revealing activity" (1932, XV, p. 630). Earlier he had coupled this idea of the immanence of God in history with the popular ideas of his times of "progress" and perfectibility by "great men"—that is, the notion that the improvement of the nation was possible by the dedicated efforts of great men. Earlier, Uchimura went so far as to attribute a special destiny in God's providence to the Japanese nation, that was a "divine humanity," with "a nobler motive than love of gain and empty honor" (1932, XVI, p. 27). But such an optimistic view of history and divine providence became untenable for Uchimura after 1895 since this view left too many incongruities in his own life unanswered. Uchimura could not reconcile his own series of personal setbacks or failures to "achieve" in his service to Christ and the nation with the popular doctrine of "progress" and "perfectibility." Nor could he reconcile the course of the nation-state in its military, political and economic aggrandizement with the doctrine of divine providence, since the Christian God was a God of righteousness and not of "mammonism" and "imperialism."

Because of these incongruities in his personal life and his public

service, Uchimura was forced to re-think his view of history and divine providence that had allowed him to identify the history of nations—whether those of western or eastern civilizations—with the history of the “divine humanity.” For Uchimura the latter was an old yet new civilization of moral (spiritual) men and women, a civilization that was announced “twenty-six centuries ago [by] a Jew by the name of Isaiah,” “given to us [in the Sermon] on the mount,” and “has been handed down in the book which Christendom has professed to accept as the veritable Word of God, but has never tried to make it an actuality” (1932, VX, p. 570, brackets added). The failure of this moral civilization to become a reality in Japan as well as in the West required Uchimura to take seriously a more radically transcendent view of divine providence, a view which had been urged upon him by his senior American friend, David Bell, who had regularly sent to Uchimura books and articles on the premillennial view of the second coming of Christ (1932, XX, pp. 277–278).

For Uchimura the premillennial view of history seemed to explain all the incongruities in the world. According to this view, the promised new civilization of the prophet Isaiah, of Jesus “on the mount” and of the Bible has been postponed until the second advent of Christ when “the Lord Himself will come down again to *convert* the world” (1932, XX, p. 277, italics in original), and thus usher in the millenium, the thousand year reign of Christ on earth. Hence, in 1894, in dire poverty and still in disgrace in the eyes of his countrymen, Uchimura found great comfort in an apocalyptic notion of a divine intervention into world history in which “the Lord Himself...will...convert the world.” As a Christian samurai Uchimura could now understand that his loyalty to Christ did not require that he, himself, in his selfless dedication had to “achieve” the conversion of the nation (a task which thus far he had failed in every attempt to perform) but rather that he should wait “in passive action” for the return of the Lord, who himself would inaugurate the new

civilization. Thus again in 1903, at the height of his popularity as critic of the nation, Uchimura realized that the satirical stab of the journalistic pen would not alter the destiny of the Japanese nation, since the future of world history in reality lay in the hands of divine providence and the second advent of Christ.

This apocalyptic notion of divine providence not only enabled Uchimura to transcend all the incongruities in his own personal life and in his world but also to accept them in all their ambiguities without either legitimizing or ignoring them. For Uchimura the premillennial view of history explained why "His elect ... must suffer" until Christ returned. In the meantime, for Uchimura loyalty to Christ required one to be "ready" and to be "a witness for him... amidst continual buffeting and revilings from [his] countrymen" (1932, XX, p. 278). Hence, Uchimura could be "in the world but not of the world."

The mature Uchimura. For twenty-five years since his conversion Uchimura as a samurai Christian had been waiting, sometimes not too patiently, suffering much personal abuse and national malignment, and preparing for the fulfillment of his loyalty to Christ in "the direct ministry." When the appropriate moment came, Uchimura immediately left "the nets to go fishing for men." For the next twenty-five years he was involved in the most active ministry as an independent Bible teacher.

Uchimura's full time ministry of the gospel was tremendously effective. Through his regular monthly Bible magazine, his regular Sunday Bible classes and special preaching and teaching missions Uchimura developed a considerable constituency of which he was the *sensei* ("teacher") or spiritual leader. He refused to organize his followers and even urged the most mature of his followers to begin their own Bible study groups. Periodically he disbanded his smaller and more intimate Bible groups and gave specific instructions to disband his larger group and terminate his magazine upon his death. Uchimura, who had

sought early to find for himself a Christian ministry that was spiritually and financially independent of both the foreign missionaries and the denominational churches, did succeed in establishing an independent Christian movement in Japan, a movement he called both a “Christianity without church” (*mukyōkaishugi kirisutokyō*) and a “Japanese Christianity.”

By *mukyōkaishugi kirisutokyō* Uchimura meant a Christianity based upon the principle of “no church” (or “non-church”). According to Uchimura, the negative (Chinese) character *mu* in the term *mukyōkai* (“no-church”) did not mean anti-church in the sense of despising or destroying the denomination churches in Japan but rather should be read as “without” (*nai*) (1932, IX, p. 210). Hence, according to Uchimura, *mukyōkai* Christianity was not a negative phenomenon in opposition to the missionary-sponsored churches but rather (1932, IX, pp. 211–213, parentheses and italics in original, brackets added):

“No-church” is the church for those who have no churchIn heaven there is no such thing as the church. As it is written in Revelation [21:22a], “I saw no temple (church) in the city (heaven).” Such people as bishops, deacons, pastors and teachers exist only for this world. In heaven there is neither the rite of baptism nor that of the Lord’s supper; neither teachers nor disciples.....

However, while in this world we do need a church of this world. Hence some men join churches built by the hands of men, and there they praise God and receive His teaching..... However, some of us are not members of such churches..... What is our church and where is it?

The universe which God created, that is, nature—this is the church in this world for us no-church [Christian] believers..... No-church is *the* church. Only those who are without church in reality have the best [true] church.

For Uchimura Christianity could not be confined to the limits of the institutional church because Christianity was a transcendent or universal religion, independent of particular historical realities. In fact, for much of Uchimura’s Christian life he lived

as a churchless Christian alone in his private meditations on the Bible, history and nature. Hence, for Uchimura Christianity was above all a spiritual and personal experience between an individual and his God. Such a religion for Uchimura was independent of all religious mediation, such as the sacraments, the priesthood (professional ministry) and all church programs. It was also independent of any national culture—whether that of western or eastern civilization; and it was independent of all political and social structures—whether they be national or ecclesiastical.

However, for Uchimura such a transcendent or universal religion was not an other-worldly experience. Such a religion was to be actualized in this world, for Uchimura was above all a samurai Christian and sought a Christianity engrafted on the “Spirit of Yamato”—a “Japanese Christianity.” For him Christianity was a life of disinterested loyalty to Christ and absolute obedience to the will of God, and loyalty to Christ was a religious experience of intense personal struggle—of a fierce conscience scrutinizing the most inner motives and aspirations of one’s loyalty and a reasoning conscience searching to discern the will of God.

This experience of disinterested loyalty and absolute obedience to the will of God became the *raison d’être* for Uchimura’s Bible classes. These meetings were not primarily for the purpose of imparting intellectual knowledge—although Uchimura was never hostile to the historical-critical study of scripture—but rather for the development of a generation of moral and spiritual individuals, great men of God, in short a “Japanese Christianity”:

When a Japanese truly and independently believes in Christ, he is a Japanese Christian, and his Christianity is Japanese Christianity..... A Japanese by becoming a Christian does not cease to be a Japanese. On the contrary, he becomes more Japanese by becoming a Christian. A Japanese who becomes an American or an Englishman

or an amorphous universal man, is neither a true Japanese nor a true Christian (1932, XV, pp. 578-79).

My friends are Hōnen rather than Wesley, Shinran rather than Moody. Those of the same religion do not necessarily have the same direction of faith. The heart with which I turn to Jesus is like the heart with which Hōnen and Shinran relied on Amida. It is not the heart with which English and Americans believe in Christ (1932, XVI, p. 130).¹⁴

Does Christianity lose by bringing the spirit of samurai into it? Was not Latin Christianity a happy fusion of the Christian faith and the old Roman spirit? Was not Luther's German Christianity a valuable and distinct contribution to Christianity? So then, pray be careful that you call your American or English Christianity a universal religion, and condemn my Japanese Christianity as national and sectional...(1932, XV, p. 579).

For Uchimura loyalty to Christ was to be actualized in service to both Christ and the nation. In the latter half of his life Uchimura discovered the form of that service in his "direct ministry" of establishing a "Japanese Christianity." Five years before his death he summarized his life in the famous "Two J's" statement, composed in parallel English and Japanese (1932, XV, pp. 599-600):

I love two J's and no third; one is Jesus, and the other is Japan.

I do not know which I love more, Jesus or Japan.

I am hated by my countrymen for Jesus' sake as Yaso¹⁵ and I am disliked by foreign missionaries for Japan's sake as national and narrow.

No matter; I may lose all my friends but I cannot lose

14. In sharp contrast to his earlier writings in which Uchimura preferred the direct, disinterested loyal action of the persecuted Nichiren (1932, II, pp. 320-348; XV, pp. 288-314), the mature Uchimura emphasized the grace (justification by faith) of Hōnen and Shinran as his exemplary religious ideal and his heroes of the past.

15. A derogatory term for a Christian.

Jesus and Japan.

For Jesus's sake, I cannot own any other God than His Father as my God and Father; and for Japan's sake, I cannot accept any faith which comes in the name of foreigners. Come salvation; come death; I cannot disown Jesus and Japan; I am emphatically a Japanese Christian, though I know missionaries in general do not like that name.

Jesus and Japan; my faith is not a circle with one centre: it is an ellipse with two centres. My heart and mind revolve around the two dear names. And I know that one strengthens the other; Jesus strengthens and purifies my love for Japan; and Japan clarifies and objectifies my love for Jesus. Were it not for the two, I would become a mere dreamer, a fanatic, an amorphous universal man.

CONCLUSION: EARLY MODERN AND MODERN RELIGION

Shinran. In terms of the history of religious evolution in Japan, Shinran's life and faith represent a remarkable breakthrough from the residual archaic tendencies in Japanese religion. Shinran's religion has not only characteristics of radical transcendence and correlatively the autonomous personal self of historic religion, but also characteristics that suggest a breakthrough to early modern religion, of which the Protestant Reformation is the single model (Bellah, 1964, pp. 368-369). Like the radical faith expressed in the Protestant doctrine of "justification by faith *alone*," Shinran's faith in the ultimacy of Amida Buddha had the similar effect of relativizing and negating every human reality in this world, yet without totally rejecting meaningful existence in this world. His absolute rejection of reliance upon any reality in this world enabled him to differentiate sharply his religion from the polity, from the social structure and even from traditional morality as in filial piety. At the same time, his religion became an inner mystic experience which gave meaning to life in this world in spite of the chaotic conditions of this world.

However, in sharp contrast to the Protestant Reformation

analogue, Shinran's religious faith did not lead to religious symbols that provided either the orientation or the motivation to transform this world. Although Amida Buddha as the symbol of radical transcendence represented universal truth and as the symbol of immanence represented truth internalized in the minds (or hearts) of individual beings, Shinran sharply curtailed any effort to use this symbol to legitimize any human action in this world. Instead, Shinran's teaching on Amida Buddha remained narrowly focused upon soteriology. Thus the universal principles derived from Shinran's conception of transcendent reality became immanent only in the lonely individual who found freedom from the ascriptions of the past but who lacked both the orientation and motivation for successful human action to transform this world as did the Protestant ethic.

Nevertheless, Shinran's significance is not exhausted by or limited to his age and society. His life and his teaching remain today as religious symbols, as cultural resources for a large group of modern Japanese seeking personal meaning in a very different historical milieu than Shinran's. Such diverse intellectuals as Uchimura Kanzō (1861–1930), a Christian and founder of the non-church movement; Kurata Hyakuzō (1891–1943),¹⁶ a popular novelist and playwright; Tanabe Hajime (1885–1962)¹⁷ and Miki Kiyoshi (1897–1945),¹⁸ both philosophers of the famed Kyoto school; Hattori Shisō (1901–1956),¹⁹ a Marxist political journalist and historian; and Ienaga Saburō

16. Kurata wrote a very popular drama in which he synthesized the best elements of Shin Buddhism, liberal Christianity and the naturalism of the Taishō era (*Shukke to sono deshi*, 1918).

17. Tanabe's post-World War II thought has strong religious overtones of repentance in which Shinran's thought plays an important role (Piovesana, 1969, pp. 145–158).

18. Miki's last and incomplete manuscript, written in prison, was a philosophical reflection on the life and teaching of Shinran (1946, XVI, pp. 511–577).

19. Hattori, a leading opponent to the Honganji teaching that showed Shinran in the line of "preservation of the nation" Buddhism, led the way to a critical reconstruction of the social history of Shinran (1950).

(1913–),²⁰ a historian; all have found in very different ways the life and faith of Shinran paradigmatic in their own search for meaning in modern Japan.

Uchimura Kanzō. If in terms of religious evolution Shinran represents the transition from historic to early modern religion, Uchimura represents the transition from early modern to modern religion. He clearly represents a case of not only the breakthrough from the ground bass or archaic tendencies in Japanese religion but also the breakthrough from the tradition of submerged transcendence. Furthermore, he is a clear case of the differentiation of the personal self from its ascribed social identity, of the development of a strong autonomous self, and of the establishment of a social mechanism for the nurturance and continuation of this centered self in succeeding generations.

Uchimura's own formative religious experience was very much shaped by the traditional *bushi* (samurai) values which were rooted in the archaic (ground bass) tendencies in Japanese religion and society. He accepted without question the traditional samurai pattern of relationships of disinterested loyalty and obedience to one's lord—with one major difference: the new Lord was Jesus Christ. Since the symbol Jesus Christ had no concrete reference in Japanese society, Uchimura's loyalty to Christ enabled him to find a personal identity independent of his social identity. In later years his systematic rejection of the denominational or visible church—traditionally seen as the body of Christ in western theology—allowed him to maintain his independent identity and critical stance against the denominational church, his own nation and even western culture of which he so deeply imbibed.

The religious experience that became normative for Uchimura

20. Ienaga saw Shinran as the major innovator that led to a "new Buddhism" (1950). See also Robert N. Bellah (1965, pp. 369–423), for a discussion of a "new cultural tradition" in which Shinran's life and thought play an important part in Ienaga's life.

was highly individualistic and spiritual; however, this experience was neither primarily mystical nor other-worldly but rather highly moral and this-worldly. This religious experience focused upon a great spiritual and moral struggle in which one's motivations and dedication were tested. Furthermore, such an experience was highly personal in that all forms of mediation between God and man were systematically rejected except one, the study of the Bible, which revealed the divine activity in human history. Hence the "proper" understanding of the Bible under the guidance of learned (lay) Bible teachers became the central religious activity in which all of Uchimura's followers participated. However, even this activity was viewed as instrumental for the developing of independent spirits with high moral principles.

Although Uchimura rejected all cultic and social support of his personal religion, such as formal corporate worship and organized congregational life, nevertheless, he provided a theological context for the individual Christian life in this world—namely, the premillennial view of history climaxed by the second advent of Christ. According to Uchimura, in the interim period before the second advent Christ's disciples were to be "witnesses," "the salt of the earth" or "the light of the world" individually, each in his own place in the world. Recent Japanese history has attested to the "witness," "salt" and "light" contribution of *mukyōkai* Christians to Japanese life, such as (Cary, 1956, p. 459):

...two [past] Presidents of the University of Tokyo... post-war Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, two distinguished Ministers of Education in post-war Cabinets, three Ambassadors in the foreign service, three prominent scientists, and many men prominent in the arts and professions as well as business.

Unlike Shinran's case, Uchimura's movement that succeeded him did not collapse or become absorbed into the social nexus. Like Shinran, Uchimura refused to allow anyone to succeed

himself, to continue his groups, or to continue his magazine. But unlike Shinran he encouraged his most mature followers to begin their own Bible study groups and magazines, thus providing a way to routinize charisma. In this way *mukyōkai* groups have since proliferated. Yet, even today, there are no formal interactions between groups, no membership lists on the national or local level. Leadership remains charismatic and based upon one's integrity, independent spirit, and power of Bible teaching. This movement by consistently following Uchimura's example of refusing to give the movement an infra-structure and by emphasizing the highly personal religious experience of God and man has resisted loss of its identity by absorption into the social structure.²¹ For example, during the Second World War when the denominational Christian churches in Japan became assimilated into the national polity, the *mukyōkai* Christians as individuals were outstanding in their witness against and rejection of the policies of the nation-state, often at the price of great self-sacrifice.

Religious evolution and contemporary meaning. As a socio-historical interpretation of Japanese religion, this study focuses upon one persistent religious issue in Japanese life and thought—the problem of the individuation of the self in a society whose infrastructures reinforce corporate over personal values—to show how religious symbolization provides man personal freedom to transcend the limits of his social identity and freedom to attribute and actualize those values that provide a personal identity. Analysis of this process of religious symbolization, given in the historical study of Hōnen, Shinran, and Uchimura Kanzō, shows that the process of religious evolution was severely compressed in Japanese history with the consequence that all the stages—archaic (ground bass), historic (submerged transcendence), early modern, as

21. For a recent sociological study of *mukyōkai* Christianity, see Carlo Caldarola, "Non-church Christianity in Japan: Western Christianity and Japan's cultural identity" (1971).

well as modern, according to Bellah's ideal-typical stages of religious evolution—remain salient in Japanese religion today. In other words, the problem of the individuation of the self continues to be a religious problem for the Japanese today, and the Japanese religious figures analyzed still function as cultural paradigms for those in search of personal meaning in modern Japan.

The problem of the individuation of the self or the locus of the self in the social order—a central issue in a sociological theory of religion—is also an important issue for a normative or reflective study of religion, as well as an existential religious problem in contemporary Japanese society as suggested above. For a normative study of religion, whether Christian theology or Buddhist philosophy, this socio-historical study of Japanese religion provides a critical understanding of the elements of Japanese religious symbolization that foster or inhibit the development of human freedom and a personal self. More abstractly, this study provides an analytical model of the structures of human existence that may provide the basis for a theological or philosophical anthropology which celebrates both the historicity and the freedom of modern man. According to Bellah, the ideal modern man is “a multidimensional self” that is endlessly revisable and open to creative innovation in every sphere of human action, because modern man not only understands the laws of the self's own existence, such as religious symbolization, but also takes responsibility for that symbolization that leads to personal human freedom, the freedom to attribute and actualize values in his own historical situation (1964, p. 371–72). Thus this socio-historical study defines the structures of human existence within which modern religious symbolization may provide contemporary meaning.

GLOSSARY

<i>amaeru</i>	甘える	<i>mappō</i>	末法
<i>bonshin</i>	凡身	<i>mukyōkaishugi</i>	<i>kirisutokyō</i>
<i>bussnin</i>	仏身		無教会主義基督教
<i>byōdō</i>	平等	<i>nenbutsu ihon</i>	念仏為本
<i>dokuritsu jison</i>	独立自尊	<i>ningen no songen</i>	人間の尊厳
<i>edo</i>	穢土	<i>oyabun-kobun</i>	親分子分
<i>ekōhotsuganshin</i>	廻向発願心	<i>Rennyō</i>	蓮如
<i>higan</i>	彼岸	<i>ritsuryō</i>	律令
Honganji	本願寺	<i>shigan</i>	比岸
<i>ichinen</i>	一念	<i>shijōshin</i>	至誠心
<i>ikkō ikki</i>	一向一揆	<i>shingyō</i>	信樂
<i>jūshin</i>	深心	<i>shinjin ihon</i>	信心為本
<i>jiyū</i>	自由	<i>shishin</i>	至心
<i>jōdo</i>	浄土	<i>shōmyō nenbutsu</i>	称名念仏
Jōdoshinshū	浄土真宗	<i>tanen</i>	多念
Kakunyo	覚如	<i>uji-be</i>	氏部
<i>kokutai</i>	国体	Yaso	耶蘇
<i>Kyōgyōshinshō</i>	教行信証	<i>yokushō</i>	欲生

REFERENCES

- ARIMA Tatsuo
1969 *The failure of freedom: A portrait of modern Japanese intellectuals.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- BELLAH, Robert N.
1962 Value and social change in modern Japan. *Asian cultural studies* 3: 13–56. Tokyo: International Christian University.
- 1964 Religious evolution. *American sociological review* 29: 358–378.
- 1965 Ienaga Saburō and the search for meaning in modern Japan. In *Changing Japanese attitudes toward modernization*, Marius B. JANSEN, ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Robert LEE

1970 *Beyond belief: Essays on religion in a post-traditional world.* New York: Harper and Row.

CALDAROLA, Carlo

1971 Non-church Christianity in Japan: Western Christianity and Japan's cultural identity. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California.

CARY, Otis, Jr.

1956 Uchimura, Neesima and Amherst— Recent correspondence. *Japan quarterly* 3: 439-459.

COATES, Harper Havelock and Ryūgaku ISHIZUKA

1925 *Hōnen, the Buddhist saint: His life and teaching.* Kyoto: Chionin.

DE Vos, George A.

1960 The relationship of guilt toward parents to achievement and arranged marriage among Japanese. *Psychiatry* 23: 287-301.

1973 *Socialization for achievement: Essays on the cultural psychology of the Japanese.* Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

DOI, L. Takeo 土居健郎

1962 *Amae*: A key concept for understanding Japanese personality structure. In *Japanese culture: Its development and characteristics.* Robert J. SMITH and Richard K. BEARDSLEY, eds. Chicago: Aldine.

1971 *Amae no kōzō* 甘えの構造 [The structure of *amae*.] Tokyo: Kōbundō.

DORE, Ronald P.

1965 New ideas and old habits. *International house of Japan.* August, 1965.

1967 Introduction. In *Aspects of social change in modern Japan.* R. P. DORE, ed. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

FUTABA Kenkō 二葉憲香

1962 *Kodai bukkyō shisōshi kenkyū* 古代仏教思想史研究 [A study of the history of early Japanese Buddhist thought]. Kyoto.

- GEERTZ, Clifford
1973 *The interpretation of culture.* New York: Basic Books.
- GOLDMANN, Lucien
1964 *The hidden God: A study of tragic vision in the Pensées of Pascal and the tragedies of Racine.* New York: Humanities Press.
- HALL, John Whitney
1966 *Government and local power in Japan, 500 to 1700: A study based on Bizen Province.* Princeton, N. J. : Princeton University Press.
- HATTORI Shisō 服部之總
1950 *Shinran nōto oyobi zoku 親鸞ノ一ト及続* [Notes on Shinran and addendum]. Tokyo.
- HOWES, John F.
1958 Two works by Uchimura Kanzō until recently unknown in Japan. *Transactions of the international conference of orientologists in Japan* 3: 25-31.
1965 Japan's enigma: The young Uchimura Kanzō. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. New York: Columbia University.
- HUNTSBERRY, William Randall
1968 Religion and value-formation in Japan. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.
- IENAGA Saburō 家永三郎
1955 *Chūsei bukkō shisōshi kenkyū 中世仏教思想史研究* [Studies in medieval Buddhist thought]. Kyoto.
- IRIYE Akira
1970 Imperialism in East Asia. In *Modern East Asia: Essays in interpretation*, James B. CROWLEY, ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- KURATA Hyakuzō 倉田百三
1918 *Shukke to sono deshi 出家とその弟子* [The priest and his disciples]. Tokyo.
1936 *Shinran 親鸞* [Shinran]. Tokyo.

Robert LEE

LEE, Robert

1974 Religious evolution and the individuation of the self in Japanese history. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.

MIKI Kiyoshi 三木清

1946-1951 *Miki kiyoshi choshakushū* 三木清著作集 [The collected works of Miki Kiyoshi], Vol. 1-16. Tokyo.

NAKANE Chie 中根千枝

1967 *Tate shakai no ningen kankei* タテ社会の人間関係 [Human relations in a vertical society]. Tokyo.
1970 *Japanese society*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

OZAWA Saburō 小沢三郎

1961 *Uchimura Kanzō fukei jiken* 内村鑑三不敬事件 [Lese majesty incident of Uchimura Kanzō]. Tokyo.

PARSONS, Talcott

1966 *Societies: Evolutionary and comparative perspectives*. Englecliff, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

PIOVESANA, Gino K., S.J.

1969 *Contemporary Japanese philosophical thought*. New York: St. John's University Press.

ROGERS, Minor L.

1972 Rennyō Shōnin, 1415-1499: A transformation in Shin Buddhist Piety. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.

SCHEINER, Irwin

1970 *Christian converts and social protest in Meiji Japan*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

SHINRAN 親鸞

1957-1961 *Shinran shōnin zenshū* 親鸞聖人全集 [The complete works of Saint Shinran], *Shinran shōnin zenshū dōnin henshū* [Edited by the editorial committee for the complete works of Saint Shinran]. Tokyo.

Individuation of the Self in Japanese History

- 1958 *The Kyōgyōshinshō or the teaching, practice, faith and attainment*, YAMAMOTO Kōshō, transl. Tokyo: Karinbunko.
- 1962 *The tanni shō: Notes lamenting differences*, FUJISAWA Ryōsetsu, transl. Kyoto: Ryūkoku University.
- TSUNODA Ryūsaku, et. al. comp.
1958 *Sources of Japanese tradition*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- UCHIMURA Kanzō 内村鑑三
1886 Moral traits of the *Yamato-damashii* ("Spirit of Japan"). *Methodist review*, Vol. 68—5th series, II: 56–72.
- 1932–33 *Uchimura Kanzō zenshū* 内村鑑三全集 [The complete works of Uchimura Kanzō], Vol. 1–20, SUZUKI Toshirō 鈴木俊郎 ed. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.