The book is basically a chronological narrative of Tsuda’s life. She arrived in America at the age of seven and spent most of her time in the care of the Lanmans. Charles Lanman, writer and artist, was a secretary with the Japanese Legation at the time, and the childless couple were clearly captivated by the precocious little girl. In late 1882, after becoming completely accustomed to the American way of life and graduating from high school with extremely good grades, she returned to Japan unable to speak, read or write Japanese properly. She experienced incredible reverse culture shock and intense frustration when she realized that government policy had changed and that there was no immediate official opening for her talents. (Of course Tsuda’s difficulties with the Japanese language—which the government had probably not anticipated—cannot have enhanced her employment prospects, although Furuki says nothing about this.) She helped at home, did some English teaching in a mission school, acted as governess-cum-companion to the wife and daughter of Itō Hirobumi, and in 1885 finally obtained a government post teaching English in the newly established Peeresses’ School. While this gave her a good salary and high status, she became dissatisfied with the school’s goals, which were limited to the production of suitable wives and mothers for the new Meiji elite.

In 1900, after two further periods of study abroad, Tsuda started her own school in order to provide a high level education for a core group of women who would go out into society to improve the general position of their gender, and thus contribute to the development of society as a whole. With
careful planning and financial and other support from both within Japan and the United States, the school soon developed a good reputation, becoming the first institution for women’s education to receive government recognition as a senmon gakkō (1904) and exemption for its’ graduates from the need to take examinations for certification as teachers (1905).

While Furuki’s biography must be welcomed, it would be difficult to call it the definitive work. The author is a graduate of Tsuda Juku who now teaches there. Although her close involvement with the university gives her valuable insights into Tsuda Úme’s achievements and special access to all kinds of information, it also makes her too involved with her subject. The epilogue, an open letter to Tsuda that describes highlights of the college’s history since her death, particularly struck this reader, a complete outsider, as embarrassingly self-indulgent, not because the information itself seemed irrelevant but because of the self-congratulatory tone.

The author’s admiration for Tsuda unfortunately leads her to criticize other Japanese women of the time. For example, she supports Tsuda for not marrying and joins her in criticizing Ōyama Sutematsu, one of her fellow pioneers in the United States, for doing so. The Japanese-language biography of Tsuda by Yamazaki Takako (Yoshikawa Kō Bunkan, 1962) describes Ōyama’s involvement as first adviser and then trustee of Tsuda’s school and her role in searching for someone to take over after Tsuda’s retirement, although she herself was unwell at the time and died soon after (pp. 258–60). Furuki, however, implies that the two women had little to do with each other during this period (p. 111).

Indeed her blanket assertions that work and marriage were “incompatible” (p. 53) and “mutually exclusive” (p. 56) for Japanese women at the time need some qualification, since this was clearly not so in the case of women less privileged than Tsuda and not necessarily so even of women in Tsuda’s social class. (Hatoyama Haruko (1861–1938) would be one example of an elite female who was able to combine marriage with a career in women’s education.) Only passing reference is made to women outside Tsuda’s immediate circle who were active outside the home in the Meiji and Taishō periods.

Furuki refers to the “unusual step” taken by Tsuda in helping to form an anti-geisha society in 1887 but does not link this to the more general anti-prostitution activities of the Tokyo Women’s Reform Society (Tokyo Fujin Kyōfukai) begun around the same time. Tsuda may have belonged to this (see Furuki p. 76; “The Attic Letters,” p. 249), but even if not, the Christian affiliations of many of its members surely make it relevant to a consideration of the nature of Tsuda’s life. In fact the book would have benefited from more sustained treatment of a number of issues, including the nature of Tsuda’s relationship with the new social elite of Meiji Japan and her hostility to the early feminists. Furuki states that Tsuda has been criticized for helping “to liberate a very limited number of women” but is content to dismiss this criticism without giving it any real consideration (p. 138).

Tsuda’s Christian faith is another aspect that might have been examined at greater length. Only a year after her arrival in the United States, Tsuda suddenly expressed the wish to be baptized, quite without any pressure from the doting Lanmans, who were committed Christians. The Lanmans obtained the approval of the Legation, and arranged for her to be baptized by a minister without denominational affiliations. He was greatly impressed by her commitment and general level of mental development. Furuki’s analysis of the probable motives behind Tsuda’s conversion is interesting, but there is no investigation of its effect on her life as a whole.
In particular, there is no reference to the difficulties experienced by Christian teachers and educational establishments from the 1890s, after the Uchimura fukei jiken and Inoue Tetsujirō's subsequent attack on Christianity as incompatible with the Imperial Rescript on Education. Tsuda was not in Japan during this period, but it is inconceivable that she was not affected by these events; indeed in an essay published soon after the Sino-Japanese War, which Furuki does not mention, she argued that patriotism took the place of religion for the Japanese, that if Japanese women became Christians, they would therefore be unequalled among Christians the world over in their spirit of self-sacrifice and endurance, and that Christianity would not extinguish Japanese patriotism but deepen it still further (see Yamazaki, pp. 148–9 and Yamazaki's analysis of Tsuda's Christianity, pp. 234–5). Furuki does cite the strength of Tsuda's patriotic feeling, but she should have mentioned its effect on her Christian faith.

Furuki repeats the common misunderstanding that “the ban against Christianity had been lifted in February 1873” (p. 6) and that it had been “legitimized” (p. 8), when only the public notices proclaiming the ban had been removed. There are also some structural problems with the book. For some reason, the analysis of Tsuda's handwriting (pp. 37–8, 51) and her interesting criticisms of missionaries for their luxurious Western style of life and distance from the Japanese are taken up twice (pp. 46, 52–3). Careless sub-editing means that on several occasions information is given more than once (p. 73 and footnote 20, p.161, for example).

The “attic letters” are so called because they were found quite by chance in 1984 in the attic of the main building of Tsuda College; Furuki suggests that they had been hidden there for safety during the Second World War. The letters to Adeline Lanman cover the period 1882 to 1911 and amount to thirteen hundred pages when transcribed into typescript. The editors have selected a third of this total for publication here. The letters provide all sorts of illuminating insights with regard to Tsuda herself, her social attitudes and Christian faith for example, and the complex interaction between the American values instilled by her upbringing and her instinctive identification with her own country. She is sensitive to both American criticisms of Japan and Japanese criticisms of America but also realizes the near impossibility of getting Americans and Japanese without her cross-cultural experience to appreciate each other's point of view.

The earliest letters are particularly fascinating, as they record Tsuda's first impressions of Japan on her return, her courageous efforts to readapt to Japanese life (table manners, bowing and especially speaking). The letters are also of great interest for the vivid picture which they give of the elite social circle in which Tsuda moved, particularly during the Rokumeikan period, which she both enjoyed and criticized as extravagant.

Unfortunately, the inadequate editing much reduces the value of the book. Footnotes rarely give more than a person's full name and it is not clear why some people are identified and not others. On p. 36 “General Saigō” is identified as “Takamori Saigō” (1828–1877), best known as leader of the unsuccessful Satsuma Rebellion, but it must be his brother Saigō Tsugumichi (1843–1902), or his ghost, since the letter is dated 1883. More serious than this is the lack of any index, even of names. Since there are nearly 500 pages of quite small print, this is really regrettable.

Women today, both in Japan and in the United States, are able to choose the sort of life which they pursue. Their decisions are not always easy, since so many paths are possible; but to have the opportunity, even
now, to make such a choice is to be extremely privileged. For a Japanese woman of her time, Tsuda Ume was even more privileged. She made her choices with courage and steadfastly carried them out. Furuki’s admiration for her is fully understandable. But it is sad if admiration for one brave woman leads to detraction of those who trod other paths.

Recreating Japanese Women, 1600–1945
Gail Lee Bernstein, ed.

Reviewed by Elizabeth Gano, Tokyo

THIS VOLUME IS A compilation of multidisciplinary essays that strives to define the various roles of Japanese women from the Tokugawa era to the end of World War II. The book describes the various forces and agents of change that have influenced Japanese women and their lives through essays drawing on original source material as varied as poetry, folklore, religious teachings, government publications, screen plays, newspapers, and magazines.

In the general introduction, Bernstein states that Japanese women were never a monolithic, unchanging group. Rather, numerous forces affected the state of women (such as their position in the family, changes in society, prevailing social/religious values, and political, legal, and economic institutions). As these forces changed over time, so did the status and role of women in Japanese society. This premise is basic to any historical study, but the unique contribution of this book is its specific concern with the “creation” of the female “gender” for Japanese women. According to Bernstein, the study of “gender creation” assumes that gender, unlike sex, is a “socially constructed and culturally transmitted organization of our inner and outer worlds” (p. 2). This study distinguishes between sex roles, which are seen as biologically determined, and gender roles, which are seen as sociohistorical conventions that define masculine or feminine behavior.

Going beyond description and analysis, this book sets out to actively “reconstruct” Japanese women’s ideals of femininity. It attempts this through reexamining the processes by which women were trained to emulate feminine ideals and the ways in which the actual behavior of women diverged from these ideals.

This book describes the diversity that has characterized the lives of Japanese women since 1600. While the primary task assigned to Japanese women over the centuries has been the preservation of the family system, the means by which they were expected to perform this task has varied throughout history. The essays in this book define and focus this primary task and describe some of the many factors that influenced the lives of Japanese women. They illustrate how official ideology laid out by the state, scholars, the community, the media, society, and women themselves have defined traditional feminine virtues and thus the female “gender” in Japan.

The book is divided neatly into two sections. Part One covers the Tokugawa era (until 1868) and Part Two carries on from the Meiji Restoration until the end of World War II. Part One begins with three essays on the experiences of women within the family system and how this experience shaped gender construction during the Tokugawa period. The topics covered include the division of labor in the household (the productive and reproductive work of men, women, and children), the life-cycle of farm women (their roles of wife, daughter-in-law, and mother), and geronticide and the mortality rate of elderly women. The three remaining essays in this section examine the lives of...
three untypical women and how they diverged from the feminine ideals of the
Tokugawa era (Jion-ni-kenke, a disciple and teacher of the Shingaku movement, the
poet-painter Ema Saiko, and Tatsu’uma Kiyo, a female entrepreneur in the sake
brewing industry).

Part Two begins with an analysis of the
Meiji state’s policy towards women
(1890–1900), with a focus on its promulga-
tion of the ideal woman as “Good Wife,
Wise Mother.” This is followed by a
description of women leaders in the Taishô
era (especially Yosano Akiko), their discov-
ery of the “meaning of the female gender” and
the emerging “New Women.” The next two
essays focus on the increasing autonomy of
middle-class working women and on the
activism among women laborers in the tex-
tile industry during the Taishô and inter-
war years.

The increasing “empowerment” of
women is a theme developed in an essay on
the “Modern Girl” in the media, which
described them as a symbol of the crisis fac-
ing the traditional family system and the
nation at large. This section of the book con-
cludes with two essays on Japanese women
during the War. One examines how govern-
ment policies during these years promoted
motherhood and reproduction as the ideal
role for women, and how policies protected
and glorified working women of childbear-
ing age during national mobilization and
conscription. The other examines wartime
films and the images they project of women:
the ideal Japanese woman is usually house-
bound, the pillar and preserver of family
solidarity while the men are away fighting,
an image which may not have correspond-
ed to the actual lives of most Japanese
women during this time of national crisis.
The book concludes with an Afterword that
compares the gender construction experi-
ences of Japanese and Western women.

This book is a monumental study of
Japanese female gender definition since
1600. Although the original sources are
rather limited on some topics, the book pro-
vides a number of insights into the lives of
Tokugawa women in the farming and mer-
chant classes as well as the masses, thus
presenting a more balanced picture of
women during this period. These essays
demonstrate that some Japanese women
could overcome traditional constraints and
find many ways to work alongside men in
productive labor, and that some even became matriarchs of successful families.

The essays do not tell us for what pro-
portion of Tokugawa women this was true.
The extensive involvement of the state in the
process of gender construction was particu-
larly illuminating in Part Two of this volume.
Several essays clearly describe how the
Meiji and Taishô eras were a period of tran-
sition and experimentation for Japanese
women as well as the nation at large. The
essay on “The Meiji State’s Policy Towards
Women” is valuable for its focus on state-
sponsored policies for gender definition.
The article juxtaposes the Western model
of home as a moral sanctum against the
Japanese policy of home as a public place.
The family was regarded by the state as a
building block of national development and
stability. By designating the family as pub-
lic domain, the state claimed women—as
pillars of the family—for its own purposes.
This analysis of women in the context of
public versus private life was particularly
illuminating.

The essay on the “Modern Girl as
Militant” places the Taishô Era “modern
girl” (stereotyped as promiscuous, apolitical,
and unemployed) alongside the experi-
ences of militant Japanese working women.
The author subtly shifts her images so that
the modern girl emerges as the militant:
challenging the existing structures not in
class struggle but in adopting new fashions
and entering new job fields. While this
glossing of all modern girls as militants is
rather thin, they can be seen as a symbol of
change. This essay gives fresh insight into this period of transition for Japanese women.

The chapters in Part Two clearly expose the fallacy that Japanese women have always been passive, subservient, house-bound, cherry blossoms in a vase. To the contrary, it is shown that their confidence and autonomy have grown with their increased education and their participation in the labor force. Some Japanese women have taken political and social stands in spite of government opposition and manipulation for centuries.

One of this book’s most valuable insights is the extent to which economic imperatives, state policies, and sociocultural norms have and continue to influence gender definition in Japan. But its greatest contribution is its documentation of how Japanese women have played an active and vocal role in the dynamic and ongoing process of their own gender definition. This collection of scholarly essays is well worth reading.

『性差別する仏教—フェミニズムからの告発』
[Gender Discrimination in Buddhism: A Feminist Indictment]

大越愛子，源 泰子，山下明子
Ogoshi Aiko, Minamoto Junko, and Yamashita Akiko
Kyoto, 1990.

Reviewed by Mitani Takayasu, Matsuyama

The feminist or women’s liberation movement which began in the United States in the 1960s, spreading to Europe as well as to Japan and other Asian countries, has been called the second women’s liberation movement to distinguish it from the one in the second half of the nineteenth century. The earlier movement strove to rectify gender-based discrimination through reforms in the legal system, such as the fight for women’s suffrage. The second feminist movement has attempted to dismantle patriarchal systems based on sexist ideology as expressed in the maxim “women are inferior to men and their place is in the home,” a belief common to nearly all societies that support the visible fabric of those social systems. At the same time, it has aimed to liberate from those inner constraints women who have unconsciously accepted such systems. In order to do so, modern-day gender-based role divisions must be demythologized and a very radical, causally rooted theory is needed to negate authority and the very power structures that sustain it.

The authors of this book skillfully reveal, from a fundamentally feminist stance, the structure of the deeply embedded gender-based discrimination found in the religions of Japan, particularly Buddhism and the so-called new religions founded after the Meiji Restoration. The value of this book does not end there, however. As long as religion serves “as the center of the cultural paradigm rooted and structured therein and dominates all world views, sense of values, views about humankind, and morals which form the structure of social systems, sexual norms and the process of the formation of the self,” the disclosure of the deep-seated gender discrimination found in religions constitutes concurrently criticism of that same society and culture through its clarification of the structure of that discrimination. The intent of the authors lies here. Because, at a glance, Buddhism seems characteristically highly egalitarian and world-denying, it is more difficult to identify its structure of discrimination than that of Christianity. This work clarifies that very structure of discrimination by exposing this invisible trait.

Three authors have contributed the three parts that comprise this book. In the first part, Ogoshi Aiko explains theoretically the gender discrimination found in Buddhism
from both the aspects of paternal and maternal principles. Despite Buddhism’s apparent de-patriarchal nature, in its very essence it is a highly male-centered religion. The author views Buddhism’s basic nature via four cultural paradigms: 1) denial of language; 2) denial of gender; 3) denial of the female; and 4) denial of this world. Next she analyzes the patriarchal structure found therein. This patriarchal structure, however, originates in the renunciation and separation from the rich and fertile Indian maternal principle. Even this paternal religion, because of its characteristic denial of everything, “needs another enforcing principle to support it in reality” in the creation of a cultural paradigm. (p. 63) Buddhism sought this support in the maternal principle. The problem lies in the Japanese understanding of it.

In confronting this maternal principle, Buddhism in Japan, that is Mahayana Buddhism did not undergo the process of establishing the self through the “slaying of the great mother,” to use the Jungian Erich Neumann’s term. Rather, to borrow Julia Kristeva’s words, it chose to nullify self by passive abjection. (p. 64) Hence, the philosophy of emptiness, through which was established the psychic ground which makes everything relative, equal, vague and inclusive. This is the Japanese maternal principle whereby the “individual is repressed by totalitarianism, where the individual’s self-nullification is positively accepted and self-subordination from one’s heart” (p. 86) is practiced as though it were entirely natural. It is Japanese women who have been forced to internalize such repressing principles.

The author of the second part of the book, Minamoto Junko, traces the nature of the maternal principle through the context of Japanese Buddhist history and further elucidates the problem by focusing on sexual love. In ancient time, women in Japan were held in awe and respect. Why? Women brought forth life and their sexual love was considered sacred, bringing rest and tranquility to others. (p. 95) The maternal principle of reproductiveness was still operating. (p. 152) However, from about the time that Buddhism entered Japan, this understanding underwent a change.

Buddhism is a religion that denies sex to the extreme. Denial of sex desexualizes men and women but at the same time unifies sexuality. Moreover, unification means integration with the dominant sex. In Buddhism the male sex became the only sex, thus eliminating the female sex. Women had to dismiss their sexuality and become male before they could ever be reborn in the Pure Land, or paradise, Women could attain Nirvana only by denying their femaleness and transforming themselves into men. Behind this philosophy that only the male could be accepted into paradise is the thought that the female is defiled, impure. We see that, although the gender-based division of roles in Christianity is dualistic according to the differences between male and female, in Buddhism the duality is based on the degree of purity between male and female. In the former, it is possible to establish selfhood and find joy in dedicating oneself to a man, but in the latter one can only live and always in the dark, by self-negating service.

Denial of femaleness follows a peculiar course in Japan. It is the mother-child relationship the psychoanalyst Furusawa Heisaku has termed the “Ajase complex.” (p. 153) The thinking developed that a woman’s salvation could be obtained by denying her sexuality and becoming a mother. (p. 158) The ideal woman is a “devoted mother” who kills her own ego and only desires to nurture her son assiduously. The Buddhist mother, loathing the fact that she is a woman, is a powerless mother who entrusts her son with her salvation from womanhood. But because it is the mother’s powerlessness that serves as the motive for her
son to follow in the Buddha’s path, mother and son are religiously united in an interdependent relationship. Thus the term “devoted mother,” the ideal type of woman. Over time, the belief in Kannon (Avalokitesvara, Goddess of Mercy) came to be aligned with this ideal. In this manner, Japanese women were blocked from developing into independent and mature persons and were only permitted to enter into dependent mother-child relationships, with no possibility of equal relations with men.

In the religions which developed in modern times, however, a number of women raised their voices in protest against the social system of paternal family rule. These were the women founders of the new religions: Nakayama Miki of Tenrikyō and Deguchi Nao of Ōmotokyō. The third part of the book shows why so many women founded popular religions and why these popular religious groups could only develop in very similar ways. The author Yamashita Akiko analyzes these women religious leaders’ struggle for liberation and the limitations of and subsequent reverses experienced by these religions.

Physically as well as spiritually forced to bear the burdens of the female role in a social system based on paternal rule of the home, it was possible for women to be freed from this world only at the level of the other world. Only at that level could women establish their own selfhood. “Divine possession” was not an escape from this world; it was an unavoidable fight that had to be fought in order to assure selfhood. The teaching of Nakayama Miki and Deguchi Nao cannot be delimited to “divine possession”; in their teachings lies an egalitarian philosophy rooted in the female principle. For that very reason, many people turned to these teachings. Their work grew out of the confrontation with the traditional spiritual climate of Japanese maternal society. Outwardly, they resisted the ideology of State Shinto which held up the emperor as the apex of the state; inwardly, they confronted the head-of-household rule by eldest son. Nakayama Miki rejected the “impurity of women,” preached the equality of men and women, and developed her own human creation myth. Deguchi Nao developed an androgynous philosophy of man and woman being in a counterpart of companion relationship transcending the discriminatory teaching of “reborn male.”

Contrary to the intention of their teachings, these women religious founders found it necessary, in the name of survival, to sidle up to the imperial state system in order to grow during that period of merciless suppression by government authorities. Reiyūkai preached the practice of honoring the ancestral spirits of both spouses, a new practice that suited the modern married couple and family. It is indeed a teaching greatly welcome to women, but this religion still does not approve of both spouses working and asserts that the happiness of family life comes from the realization of gender-based role divisions.

Almost all of the new religions, including the above, are at present used by corporate labor management, thereby contributing organizationally to the Japanese form of capitalism. They are not actively anti-establishment. In this way, the father-as-household-head society founded on gender-based role divisions continues to function today. This book helps us understand how “Japanese sectarianism, the philosophy that formulated the Japanese corporate entity, which is rooted in Buddhism and which in turn supports the maternal principle, has rejected the independence of the individual and how all manner of women’s selfhood, including their sexuality, has been ignored, estranged and eliminated.” (p. 241)

The construction of a philosophy going beyond the principles of a Japanese corporate body and Japanese maternalism is anticipated. From this perspective, we can see that this book is not simply a fullscale cri-
tique of Buddhism by feminist thinkers but a significant work that offers a new viewpoint to contemporary thought.

Lastly, I would like to raise a point about the use of the Japanese word せい in this book. It is sometimes unclear whether the word is used to mean gender, sex or sexuality. I find a certain Japanese vagueness when one word expresses all three concepts. In the process of analyzing the vagueness of the meaning of the Japanese word せい, feminist thinkers might possibly discover new forms of discrimination related to gender.

[As Our God Alone Will Lead Us: The 19th-Century American Women’s Foreign Mission Enterprise and Its Encounter with Meiji Japan]
Kohiyama Rui

Reviewed by Mitani Takayasu, Matsuyama

It is no exaggeration to say that the modern education of women in Japan was begun by Protestant missionary women. In particular, the involvement of American women is remarkable; they founded many schools for women throughout the country—the so-called “mission schools.” Most of these schools, while struggling through rough times, have consistently undertaken the education of women from the early Meiji period to the present. Some of these institutions have developed into comprehensive schools which include colleges. It is impossible to overrate the contributions to modern Japanese education made by these women.

There are major obstacles, however, in trying to learn about the scope of their work. Although each school has records of the accomplishments of individuals and compilations of collected letters, there is no published work that “places in history the group of people called women missionaries explaining [their accomplishments] as social fact.” (p. 1) This book should be noted for the remarkable job it has done in filling that very gap in modern Japanese Protestant history and for the author’s command and skilled analysis of the great amount of source material.

Kohiyama is not a theologian. Graduating from International Christian University (ICU) and going on to obtain her master’s degree in American studies at the University of Minnesota, she then returned to her alma mater to continue study at the doctoral level. She is strongly interested in feminism. This book is a somewhat abbreviated version of the doctoral dissertation she submitted to ICU. The author’s viewpoint as a student of American studies constitutes the prime characteristic of the book. Previous research concerning missionaries has concentrated on their “evangelizing” and “faith”; the central themes were theology and dogma, their manner of faith in God and the manner of their calling. Here the author does not interest herself in such theological aspects. She has tried to focus on the women missionaries’ sense of morals, outlook on women and education “not by explaining the existence of women missionaries in terms of Christianity, but rather by [regarding] the broader social and cultural context [they came from] with Christianity as a base.” (p. 6)

Even missionaries are products of their own time. Their faith and calling cannot be discussed apart from the sociohistorical background of the time. Why did so many women missionaries come to Japan all the way from across the Pacific and so soon after the Civil War? In order to find the answer, we need an analysis of the women’s mission societies that sent and supported them. We must also understand the cir-
cumstances of the American churches of that time and, further, the peculiar view of women in nineteenth-century American society. Nor can we overlook the relationship between perspectives on life and work held by relatively highly educated middle-class women and those held by women missionaries. Seen through the light of this broad and multifaceted understanding, we must dismantle our stereotypic impressions of “pious Christian women who resolutely crossed the seas and accomplished great works as the founding of women’s schools” and see the actual lives of these people who women and missionaries.

Let us examine concretely the component chapters of this book. The first chapter positions participation in overseas mission work by women within the context of the history of white middle-class nineteenth-century American society and primarily the northern regions of the United States. In contrast to the men working in the materially oriented society, these nineteenth-century middle-class women, identifying themselves as “truly feminine” by being “pure, obedient and domestic” as well as “pious,” were relegated to the home as “housewives” in the name of gender-based role divisions. From this position, however, these women strengthened their own standing and increased their social voice as “protectors of virtue.”

Kohiyama describes the process of the birth and development of the nationally based American Women’s Foreign Mission Enterprise, which became the parent organization that sent women missionaries overseas. During the period right after the Civil War, with its ensuing industrialization and urbanization and further expansion of the frontier, the male work force was short; as though to make up for the gap, there was an increase in the number of women who worked at low wages. With the expansion of public primary school education, there was an increase in the number of women teachers. It is not possible to separate these phenomena from the professional choices made by women missionaries.

The second chapter focuses specifically on the Women’s Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church. The author provides details of its organization, philosophy and policies; we learn that its growth during the twenty years from 1870 relied on the unremunerated services of the leisureed class of urban married women. Pure and obedient, and pious, these women-of-the-home had spiritual goals that transcended the secular world and they worked with great dedication and deep love for their families, sparing no self-sacrifice. They were capable and useful but had to be unobtrusive and cooperative.

In the third chapter, we see how this ideal of nineteenth-century American woman was expected of wives of overseas missionaries and, by extension, how it influenced the way women missionaries were supposed to behave. Yet single women were expected to be professionally capable beyond the above-mentioned heroine-like qualities. Because they could not be ordained, women missionaries could not be involved in the glorious work of founding churches, training pastors and translating the Bible; all they could concern themselves with was education, medical care and direct evangelism. (p. 145) These women found an outlet for their activity in the backward condition of women’s education in Japan.

In order to comprehend the real lives of women missionaries, it is necessary to analyze closely the work of specific persons. Kohiyama relates what women of the Presbyterian and Dutch Reformed denominations—particularly Mary Kidder and Maria True of present-day Ferris Jogakuin and Joshi Gakuin, respectively—tried to convey and cultivate in Japan in the early Meiji period. Because of the restrictions on
their activity, women missionaries had a difficult time. They were limited not only by the discrimination against women in premodern Japanese society but also by the conservative view of women held by their male missionary colleagues. Sometimes they were unavoidably the targets of criticism and confrontation by married women missionaries. At the same time, the image of “Republican motherhood” developed in America was also the ideal sought by Japanese women. Missionary women showed that they would remain within the confines of the conservative thinking about women in their own country but, simultaneously, they expanded to the maximum degree possible the scale of their ideals.

What was the result of the work of these women missionaries? After analyzing those who sent them and those who came to Japan, we need to analyze the part played by those who received them. Without that, the totality of the women missionaries’ work cannot be grasped. The last chapter introduces three Japanese women who received direct tutelage from women missionaries. Two are the beloved students of Mary Kidder: Wakamatsu Shizuko, translator of F. H. Burnett’s Little Lord Fauntleroy and the first writer to use a colloquial literary style; and Sasajo Toyohisa, an early activist in the Japan Women’s Christian Temperance Union. The founder of that Union, Yajima Kajiko, had been greatly influenced by Maria True.

These Japanese women were social activists, each with her own style. Concurrently, they had limits—the very limits experienced by the women missionaries. The missionary women voluntarily kept their characters in check and internalized the image of being very able but restrained, assertive but kind. But in terms of evangelical strategy in their mission work in Japan, there were times when they had to stand in confrontation to the missionary men. Their “womanhood” always swayed between a conservative posture and the practical demands that could only be realized by breaking out of that conservatism. This same tension could be seen in the Japanese women they taught. Some became radical activists, seen by others as “hussies.” In many cases, American womanhood was understood only as a model for the Japanese “good wife and wise mother.”

The difference between nineteenth-century American womanhood and the Japanese “good wife and wise mother” is that of having or not having a sense of “piety” toward an absolute being transcending the secular world. A “good wife and wise mother” can preach about morals that should be observed in any religion, even Christianity. (p. 286) Such an ideal can be easily altered, however, according to the convenience of the government in power. This is very clear when we note how, in a later period, the “mother of a warring nation,” one obedient to the state, came to embody “good wife and wise mother.” Here lies the difference with “Republican motherhood.” Nonetheless, it is a fact that the American women missionaries contributed in major ways to the higher education of women in Japan and to their psychological selfhood and economic independence. They also cultivated women’s sense of social responsibility.

Kohiyama has succeeded in making a comprehensive and epochal presentation of the work of American women missionaries active in the early Meiji period from the perspective of feminist history; the abundance of sources to document what has been set forth is staggering. How have the seeds sown by these women been reaped now, one hundred years later? How does their influence stand now? by and large, almost all Christian churches in Japan are rather cool toward the “feminist movement” and it is clearly true that the dedicated service rendered in churches by the women—in all their “purity, obedience and
Marion Kilson

Reviewed by Alison Young, Tokyo

Modern historical scholarship has increasingly recognized that the lives of women comprise half the picture of human history. Considering that the story of her great grandmother, Mary Jane Forbes Greene, must surely be worth telling alongside the already published biography of her husband, Kilson became interested in reconstructing the life of this Meiji Era woman who was cofounder of the Japan Mission of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) in 1870. In approaching the subject as an anthropologist, Kilson’s intent is to present her life story as representative of the other women of her generation who participated in the foreign missionary movement, thus illuminating the general through the particular.

The preface begins with an honest appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of this particular study within the scope of its late nineteenth-century historical context, as well as the methodological problems encountered because of limitations in the sources available for research. It goes on to offer a brief historical overview of studies portraying the experiences of American Protestant women in the foreign missionary movement. This grounding in the modern history of scholarship on Protestant women does much to put this modest study in context. Without this setting, its straightforward anthropological approach would make less compelling reading.

Chapter One provides a brief history of Protestant missionary activity in the Meiji Era and sets the scene for the forty-one year period of service the Greenes spent in Japan. Their arrival in 1869 coincided with the opening of Japan to foreign influences, and their newly formed Japan Mission rode the crest of Japanese interest in Christianity through the 1880s. From this high point they witnessed the sudden and radical decline in membership in the churches they had helped to found, ending in widespread indifference to Christianity expressed by the majority of Japanese people they had come to convert.

Details of Mary Jane Greene’s life are unfolded, beginning with references to her early family life and educational experiences. Kilson undertakes a reconstruction of her worldview and major life themes, drawing on such sources as college essays, journal entries, letters and other relevant material from the period. A coherence is achieved by this approach, for rather than presenting a simple chronology of life events, Kilson’s aim is to construct a picture of her subject within the world in which she lived.

The picture is rounded out by treatment of significant relationships in her life, including her husband and eight children, with whom she corresponded regularly after they returned to the U.S. for schooling as teenagers. Also examined are relations with the women and men within their missionary community and contacts with friends and supporters in America, as well as friendships with Japanese people in many contexts. Kilson has gleaned from Greene’s letters and journal entries an inter-
esting array of opinions and impressions. In the final chapter, she considers some of these responses to Japan and her perceptions of sociocultural differences in the Meiji Era, and aspects of her role as a mediator between Japanese and American cultures. Fluent in the Japanese language, she faithfully studied Japanese literature throughout her life in Japan. She and her husband adopted many customs of the culture, from offering their guests slippers at the door, dressing their grandchildren in Japanese clothes to celebrate the new year, to displaying the Japanese flag next to the American flag on holidays. Kilson concludes that Mary Jane Greene was herself significantly transformed by the culture she sought to transform.

Supplementary to the text are three appendices: a chronology of milestones in her life; biographical details of her eight children; and selected writings of Mary Jane Greene, chosen to illustrate her life in Japan.

Liquid Life: Abortion and Buddhism in Japan
William R. LaFleur
Appendix, chapter notes, bibliography and index.

Reviewed by Stuart D. B. Picken,
International Christian University, Tokyo

The book is extremely interesting, and offers many original insights and valuable observations, but, as the author confesses, it also contains parts to which readers may have objections, for example, learning from Japan. I wonder indeed, if these are the parts to which objections will be made. That the reader must decide for himself or herself.

The volume is in three parts, dealing respectively with generic concepts created in Japanese culture, historical traditions on abortion and natalism followed by a concluding section on the contemporary situation and the issues surrounding abortion in its wider world context. Taking these in turn, part one as a basic resource on a new topic in the study of Japanese religions is by far the most careful and least controversial. The opening section sets the tone by illustrating that behind the image of the Daibutsu in Kamakura, there is another world of Buddhism represented in La Fleur’s argument by the Hase-dera which is devoted to Kannon, a figure in the Buddhist pantheon associated with healthy childhood, along with another figure of Indian origin, Jizo, whose task it is to protect the souls of miscarried, aborted or stillborn children. The temple states that there are 50,000 such souls under the protection of Jizo. The existence of Jizo suggests to the author that people feel the need to “do something” after an abortion. The temple caters for natural (miscarriage) and induced abortions as well as for stillborn infants. The central category may rank numerically highest, but the others exist, and the temple has provided pastoral comfort in all cases.

On page 26, the author refers to abortion as “horrifying and abominable” a judgment that sets the tone of some of the subsequent discussion. I think in the early stages, instead of suggesting that the book has a slant, the author might have spent more time discussing the origins of those rituals which “fit into that piece of bricolage” which he perceptively analyses as the Japanese moral posture in the world, something constructed out of various elements and embodied in ritual. He is very sensitive to the complex meanings that survive in ritual, especially in Japan, and this itself is a valuable insight that religion experts usually ignore. Greater study of Japanese rituals as the work of a bricoleur culture would be a
substantial redress to many of the negative views taken of Japanese religion and its lack of “doctrine and ethics.” If La Fleur is right, they are present in ritual, and with that idea, I would heartily concur. The remainder of the first part consists of a discussion of numerous aspects of the development of the moral bricolage, the complex value system which is set forth in the rituals under discussion. The image of water, the role of the mizuko, the language of “return,” the process of social birth and death and the various discussions are extremely constructive. The research, argument and analysis makes this by far the most valuable part of the book.

The central part is devoted to historical processes that emerged during the Edo period. The issues center on the demographic problem of Edo as it expanded. Miscarriages must have been greater in number and therefore the need for some kind of mental assuage must have grown accordingly. His argument crystallizes into the conclusion that during the Edo period, a kind of tacit understanding about abortion came into being, for which Buddhism provided a pragmatic cover. He argues that the Malthusian doctrine does not apply to Japan, and that therefore abortion became the only effective method of population control.

He attributes the ideal of fecundism, something greater than natalism, to the Kokugaku (National Learning) scholars and to revived Shinto ideals. The Meiji ideology of ukoku-kyōhei, (a nation strong in wealth and military power) implied a population big enough to produce a large army. This was encouraged out through the precept that having children was a religious obligation, something that Buddhism could not enjoin. The anti-mabiki (culling) stance of Confucian moralists of the Edo period was not supported by Buddhists, and so neo-Shinto thought is held responsible. But in this regard, was Japan really different from the blood/soil nationalism of nineteenth century European nations, and was Shinto not manipulated into that scenario? Further, it could also be argued that the pragmatism found in Buddhism may also have Shinto origins. These points aside, the historical material is again well assembled, and will be of enormous value to anyone interested in either Japanese religion or in a well-researched but less trodden path of Edo life.

It is certainly refreshing to read this kind of essay in contrast to the stereotyped and arid studies of the “Village headship in X-mura: a model of Edo political life” or “The world of X: a samurai’s diaries of Edo life, 1727–1738” type. Too much antiquarian or biographical study has been misnamed “history.” La Fleur’s work is history in the fullest sense. The one problem I have is that Professor La Fleur explicitly takes sides from the beginning. The discussion in the central part is sometimes obscured through being punctuated in places by an unfocused polemical attitude, some convoluted sentences that hinder direct meaning from coming through and some odd cases of logic. Concerned scholarship is justifiable. Emotional scholarship is dangerous.

The odd reference to Marx, for example, spoils a good discussion. Like the question of whether or not the Edo period was the least typical of Japanese history (p. 69), it is irrelevant and gets in the way of understanding. The Edo period lasted three centuries, and its influence lingers into a fourth. To think of Japan other than it is of no help in coming to terms with what actually is. In this vein, Marx was wrong, he claims because Japanese women got round the state’s rules. The fact that they had to get around the rules proves that the Marxian analysis of religion in society was basically correct. But why waste time arguing with Marx? The author seems to want to deal with too many side issues, and this is what confuses the main issues from time to time. Contrasts with China are interesting, but are really
extended footnotes that have been built into the text. I cannot stress too much the value of much of what is written, but it is partly spoiled by that kind of polemical approach that is in danger of losing the idea of the forest amidst the trees.

The third part takes off into the modern situation, and again contains much clever analysis and well-researched insight. The idea of “soul possession” (on a par with kitsune-mochi?) has a big impact on religious organizations and compelled them to invent rituals to prevent revenge. If this is so, it shows that beneath the Buddhist exterior, the roots of Japanese folk religion remain as strong and healthy as ever. This could shift the ground of the argument to the point where it is not Buddhism versus Shinto, but the use of Buddhist rituals in a bricoleur way to deal with a primitive fear. Buddhism’s links with death are long and deep, and therefore, it is not surprising that the links are there. A little more discussion of Amida and Jizo would have opened up this issue. So much for the limitations.

The book has three great merits which outweigh the problems I have raised. Firstly, it is a superb attempt to relate an issue in the field of Japan studies to the wider academic world outside, showing that in some cases, what is true in Japan is true elsewhere, but that sometimes it is not (for example Malthus). It is not narcissistically “Japanological,” but tries to see Japan studies in obiter visa. The author is clearly excited about what he has seen, and rightly so, but is a little overwhelmed and tries to deal with too many issues that are of no direct consequence. But his insights are always suggestive, which heightens the frustration.

Secondly, it argues most convincingly that there is a complex value system at work in Japan, the result of the bricoleur mentality, and that moral issues are dealt with, not verbally, but through the symbolic power of ritual, and further that this system has as its goal, the preservation of social order. To those interested in social, political and economic value systems, this is a model for thought. Behind apparently moral positions that are recognized as such in the west, there is always a hidden, and different agenda in Japan. Seichô no Ie (House of Growth), for example, attacks abortion, according to the author, not on right to life grounds, but on neo-Shinto grounds. It shows how far religious movements in Japan may have to go in order to accommodate government inspired social norms. It also underlines the point that similar ideas found in Japan and the West may not necessarily share common or even similar presuppositions.

The conclusion is a return to learning from Japan, and particularly Japan’s pragmatism which the author declares Americans seem to have erroneously viewed as their own philosophy. He raises the issue of population control and even the question of how the mizuko kuyō might be transferred to Christianity. He seems to return to a more objective stance on the problem, and offers some provocative comments.

In short an abundance of riches, that calls for time, effort and serious reflection which, I think, is very worthwhile.

**Japanese Religion and Society: Paradigms of Structure and Change**

Winston Davis


Reviewed by David Reid, Seigakuin University, Tokyo

**WHAT MAKES A BOOK WORTH READING?**

Someone has suggested that in the world of scholarship a book can be considered
“good” if it provides the reader with new information, or with new ways of understanding previously available information, or both. By these criteria, Winston Davis’s *Japanese Religion and Society* is superb. I have lived in Japan for most of my adult life, and have specialized in the study of Japanese religion and society. Without qualification I can say that I have learned from this book. It has given me not only information about Japan but also some provocative insights into ways of thinking about this information. What more can one ask? Actually, I think there is a bit more that one can ask, but before taking up this matter, I want to say a word about the author and what he has attempted in this book.

Winston Davis, Wilson-Craven Professor of Religion at Southwestern University, spent four years in Japan teaching at the Kwansei Gakuin University Faculty of Sociology. He is well known as a perceptive fieldworker and theoretician because of his 1980 book *Dojo: Magic and Exorcism in Modern Japan.*

This new book brings together eight rewritten and updated articles, the earliest of which was first published in 1977, the latest in 1989. Each article has here become a chapter, and the chapters are divided into four parts: the structure of religious groups, the dynamics of social conflict, the dynamics of social and economic change, and secularization and national identity. What holds them together is Davis’s consistent effort to formulate paradigms for understanding.

In chapter 1, “Japanese religious affiliations: Motives and obligations,” for example, he uses Alfred Schutz’s distinction between *in order to* motives and *because* motives to construct a typology of religious affiliations that helps to explain Japanese syncretism. Again, in chapter 4, “The Weber thesis and the economic development of Japan,” he argues that the role of religion in Japanese economic development is better understood not as a matter of “positive enablement” (the stance taken by Weber and subsequent Weberians) but as a matter of “passive enablement,” an argument he advances by adapting the market theory of Karl Polanyi. Chapter 5, “Buddhism and modernization,” carries the passive enablement argument forward by showing how prewar Japanese Buddhism, with an eye to its own survival, acquiesced in government policy by silence and ambiguity even when policy (e.g., militarism) contradicted Buddhist principle (e.g., non-killing). Davis here introduces his participant-observer study of Ittōen, a utopian community that idealizes the ethos of the feudal village while drawing heavily on the Buddhist tradition. He sees it as an example of the revitalization of the values of premodern Japan, “a feudalistic morality in the context of a capitalist economy.”

Davis does not hesitate to challenge any theory that leaves, in his view, important dimensions of Japanese existence unaccounted for. As over against Durkheim and those who would explain society and culture in terms of structure and function, and as over against Marx and those who would explain society and culture in terms of conflict, Davis regards both consensus and conflict as “partial” theories. Hoping to take advantage of both, he identifies his own position as one of “conflict structuralism.” This interest in the explanatory power of conflict for understanding the structures of Japanese society and culture forms the background both to his study of pre-Meiji pilgrimage and to his study of conflict within the Japanese Christian “community.” With reference to Christianity, his chapter “The cross and the cudgel” is an examination of conflict within the United Church of Christ in Japan (which he often abbreviates as “Kyōdan”). His assessment is that the conflict is not between a “church faction” and a “society faction,” or even between ‘conservatives’ and ‘progressives.’ It is a vigorous conflict among progressives who are divid-
ed over whether or not physical force will be allowed to overturn democratic procedures” (p. 104). Here he makes an ethical indictment that is blunt and to the point: “….most church members simple [sic] remained indifferent to the problems of the Kyôdan and to the larger issues of faith and society. The moralism the Kyôdan had inherited from both Confucianism and Protestantism discouraged most members from seriously considering problems that could not be solved by, or reduced to, personal piety” (p. 107). To the extent that this charge holds true, it implicitly calls for serious reflection about what it means to shape socially responsible Christian community in Japan.

In “The secularization of Japanese religion” Davis draws attention to the difficulty of treating Japanese religions as systems of belief, though it is precisely from such a context that the idea of secularization arose. He states that “religious praxis (shugyô) and feelings (kimochi) and not belief per se form the core of Japanese religion” (p. 236). I would put the matter a little differently, but I think that Davis is on the right track. What disturbs me is that instead of presenting support for this view, he simply passes it off for a self-evident truth. It may be true, but it is hardly self-evident. At this point there is an unfortunate logical gap in his argument. Davis suggests that secularization in Japanese culture is to be understood not as decline in religious belief but as shrinkage in the scope and practice of religious customs—a worthy suggestion indeed.

The final chapter, “Japan theory and civil religion,” reviews the general tone of the plethora of books and articles on what it means to be Japanese. He points out that many of the functions of the prewar civil religion are now being taken over by the symbols, values, and imagery employed by the writers on Japan theory. The main difference, as he sees it, is that the prewar civil religion was “religious” whereas the postwar civil religion is more secular. One could quibble with this characterization, for it is difficult to clarify the sense in which the ostensibly non-religious pre-1945 civil religion was in fact religious and the presumably secular post-1945 civil religion less religious, particularly when he claims that the latter may “give birth to a new religious self-understanding.” It is hard to quibble, however, with his interpretation of Japan theory as part of “an ongoing search for a new national identity by a people whose economic enterprise has recouped what generals, gods, and a divine emperor previously lost” (p. 270).

At the beginning of this review, I noted that even if a scholarly book offered new information and new ways of understanding previously available information, as this book definitely does, there is still a bit more one could wish for. I refer to readable style. Many years ago Adolf von Harnack criticized Ernst Troeltsch for his Satzunghheuer, or “monstrous sentences.” Japanese Religion and Society is written in a way that makes heavy demands on the reader. In part, this results from the nature of the material and the erudition of Davis’s wide-ranging scholarship. With this I have no quarrel. After all, Davis is not writing for children. In part, however, the difficulty one experiences in reading this book springs from its “monstrous sentences.” This is not always true, to be sure. Once in a while an insight is couched in vivid imagery, as in the statement “dichotomous configuration theories of modernization have the tendency to smother the historical specificity of religious change under the soft pillow of sociological abstraction” (p. 231). Here the image redeems the rest of the sentence. There are many sentences, however, with no redeeming image. In these cases the reader must simply grind ahead, taking the surprising number of typos in stride.
I want to say unequivocally, however, that this is a book eminently worth reading. Probably nobody will accept unconditionally all of the author’s “paradigms.” But becoming newly aware of the significant and timely problems to which he directs our attention, and seeing how he goes about fashioning paradigms of understanding, is an educational experience. All who read this book will find themselves indebted to Winston Davis.

Patriots and Redeemers in Japan: Motives in the Meiji Restoration
George M. Wilson

Reviewed by J. Mark Ramseyer, University of Chicago

GEORGE M. WILSON promises an intellectual history of the Meiji Restoration. Although he delivers a brilliant book, it is also a bit oxymoronic. Whatever the restoration may have been, it was not primarily an intellectual event. Although serious intellectual changes ensued, the event itself seems more a cross between coup d’etat and revolution. People seldom win coups and revolutions by ideas. Although they invent elaborate ideologies to justify killing the people they do, they usually win them by guns and bombs. Neither do they usually organize the guns and bombs for ideas. They organize them for wealth and power, and convince their followers to fire the guns and plant the bombs by promising them the same. Often with a ideological gloss, to be sure, they promise their followers lower taxes, higher wages, and land redistribution.

Not so Wilson’s Meiji Restoration. The men who headed it fought neither for power nor for wealth. According to Wilson, they fought to “redeem” the realm. He could be right, of course, though readers who have seen the homes of early Meiji leaders may wonder. Those men may have had altruistic motives, but some of them paid themselves handsomely for their efforts. If it was all a matter of redemption, then at least for the Meiji oligarchs redemption was a well-paying job.

Wilson also claims from the outset that the restoration leaders acquired “legitimacy” by invoking the emperor (Chapter 1). He would be hard put to find a more tired “fact” about Meiji Japan. Yet sometimes tired facts should just retire. Consider first how the Emperor might have benefited the leaders. If the “legitimacy” he gave them made any difference, it should have lowered the costs involved in taking and retaining military control. That Wilson never shows us. Consider too whether this “legitimacy” was hard to obtain—whether manipulating the Emperor (a) was difficult, or instead (b) was something any of the serious pretenders to the government could have done if they could just win militarily. If hard, Wilson should tell us why it was hard, and how the eventual victors successfully obtained it. If (as seems more likely) any of the plausible pretenders could have manipulated the Emperor, Wilson should tell us why anyone cared. Suppose that any Japanese group able to win the military battles could have captured the imperial symbol. If so, then if Group “A” rather than Group “B” eventually invoked the Emperor, that fact conveyed no independent information to the public. It told people only the obvious point that “A” had beaten “B.” Unless the people swore blind obedience to the Emperor (unless, in effect, they were fools), they would not have deferred to “B” out of reverence. They would have deferred to “A” because it controlled guns and bombs.

These are questions of emphasis. Whatever the ultimate significance of
redemption and legitimacy in the restoration, Wilson writes some brilliant social and religious history. In the course of this book, he also examines the Japanese conception of time (Chapter 2), the shape of Tokugawa feudalism (Chapter 3), the motives of the various participants in the restoration (Chapter 4), and several millenarian sects (Chapters 5 and 6). He does his finest work with these social and religious groups. He nicely describes the Tenrikyō and Konkōkyō sects (Chapter 5), for example, and draws a delightfully amusing picture of the “ee janai ka” movement of 1867 (Chapter 6). The peasants and merchants in the movement cross-dressed wildly and danced orgiastically. In the process of throwing a grand party, Wilson argues, they helped build the social and political basis for the radical changes that accompanied the restoration.

All that makes this a great book. Unfortunately, Wilson analyzes very few things straightforwardly. Instead, he packages his account in heavy-handed “theory.” The theorists he chooses are (mostly) the certifiable intem—some of the fanciest darlings of the modern academy, and the men with the most obscure polysyllabic neologisms. Throughout the book, he scatters in bold typeface their bite-sized quotations: from (the very French) Michel Foucault (p. ix), to (the not French at all) E.P. Thompson (p. ix), to (the out-of-date) Claude Levi-Strauss (p. 43).

Count the bold type a blessing. During the Cultural Revolution, Chinese scholars often began their books with the words of the Chairman. When they printed his words in red, readers knew which sentences to skip. So too with Wilson’s quotations. Mostly, these are zen koan look-alikes. One quotation reads: “But a storm is blowing from paradise” (Walter Benjamin, p. 95). Another tells us: “The meaning of an event is the sense of its forthcoming interpretations” (Paul Ricoeur, p. 1). No doubt many readers will enjoy this. Some of the rest of us will hope we are better people for reading it, wonder why we suffer indigestion for eating things that are good for us, and begin to suspect that maybe—just maybe—George Bernard Shaw had a point after all when he claimed that fifty million Frenchmen can’t be right.

Wilson never makes clear what this high-status theory does, other than cloud an otherwise excellent historical monograph. In Chapter 4, for example, he divides bakumatsu actors into four groups: westerners, bakufu officials, “popular revivalists,” and “imperial loyalists.” Fair enough, though hardly surprising. He then proposes to describe each group through a “matrix of motivational determinants” (p. 69). Obfuscure enough for most of us already, but he now assigns each group a “story line” (comedy, satire/irony, tragedy, and romance) and a season (spring, winter, autumn, and summer). He adds to that a “cognitive strategy” (organicist/integrative, contextualist/dispersive, mechanist/integrative, and formist/idiographic/dispersive), and tops it off with the “Trope, Rhetorical Prefiguration” for each group: Synecdoche/integration, irony/negation, metonymy/reduction, and metaphor/identity (p. 69).

Back to the restoration, most readers will plead. What does all this tell us about why the Meiji Restoration took the shape that it did, why it happened when it did, or how the ultimately successful group managed to beat its competitors? What indeed. At times, Wilson seems to consider these an outdated (and perhaps slightly philistine) set of questions: “The approach offered in this chapter,” he says half-way through the book, “tries to play down the historian’s old favorite explanatory scheme—the one based on cause and effect” (p. 68). We can thank him for ignoring his own rhetoric in the bulk of his book. There, he asks exactly these “old favorite” questions. And he answers them well. Only when he takes his
rhetoric more seriously will some of us find ourselves turning perversely anti-intellectual. “Nothing in the annals of Japan before 1868,” writes Wilson, “prepared those who thought in historical terms for the divorce of time from history that accompanied the Meiji Restoration” (p. 25). Merci, monsieur.

And “the indigenous provenance of the premise did not soften the blow to continuity struck when the central myth of Japan’s history had to end, if it were to be used” (p. 26). Sometimes, we could use more old favorite explanatory schemes.

The Creative Edge: Emerging Individualism in Japan
Miyanaga Kuniko

Reviewed by John Gano, Tokyo

In The Creative Edge, Miyanaga presents a dream, some interesting life-stories, and a jumbled assortment of idiosyncratic concepts and tenuous inferences. The book begins with an ingenuous renunciation of the author’s claim to scholarly objectivity: “This book grew out of my conviction that if ever there were a time when individualism could spread actively in Japan, it would be now.” It wraps up its unsurprising conclusion in the second sentence, “My research...confirmed my personal feeling” (p. xv). While this dream of the dawn of Japan’s “active individualist movement” is refreshingly candid, it does shift the burden of critical analysis and evaluation from the author to her readers.

Miyanaga addresses a fascinating question: is Japanese society becoming more individualistic? She notes that traditional Japan was not a monolithic “groupist” society but tolerated individualistic elements at its fringes. She also cites interesting interviews with four contemporary Japanese fashion designers and over a dozen manager-entrepreneurs of smaller firms which might reveal a surprising degree of independence and individualism to readers not in contact with these milieu.

The author’s dream is that the rising importance of design in the manufacturing process will force the Japanese “mainstream/core/large corporate/Ritual Man” to become more accepting of the “fringe/peripheral/small and intermediate business/Individualist” and thus build a new Japan that imports more foreign goods and boosts domestic economic growth, as well as being more tolerant and humane. There would be little to criticize if the book stopped at this. However, it has been encouraged to much grander ambitions, with disappointing results.

The fundamental failing of this book is that it makes no significant contribution to knowledge. The author clearly wishes that individualism is growing in Japan, but the only empirical evidence she cites is a dozen-odd interviews with rather likely individualists. The fact that the author interviews four fashion-designers (including some who have held Paris shows) and find them to be individualistic is hardly surprising. But it is ludicrous for her to then attempt to generalize from these four cases to the 710,000 small and intermediate-sized Japanese businesses. The reviewer discovered that one kon'ya-processor in Fujioka has created orange-flavored kon'ya-snacks for children! But this does not answer the question of how many kon'ya-processors in Gunma Prefecture are becoming motivated to work by the desire for individual artistic self-expression. How much more tenuous to generalize about all Japanese small and intermediate-sized enterprises.

Although this book lacks conceptual clarity, some sifting reveals a basic scenario
that can be reframed by the following five assertions:

1. Traditional Japanese society had feudal groupist “cores” and individualistic roles for “dropouts” on the “periphery.”
2. Modernization through centralization encouraged the group while Westernization strengthened the legal and economic potential for the individual.
3. The two camps persist today with Core corporate culture expounded by scholars of the “modern culture of technology” such as Chie Nakane, and “the active individualist movement” of which “the first champions …were those who led the fashion industry in the 1970’s.”
4. The coexistence of the “core-groupist” and “periphery-individualist” spheres is being replaced by a Hegelian dialectic struggle between them as individualist entrepreneurs evolve “from subculture to antithesis” (p. 49).
5. Finally, there is no doubt about which side wears the white hats and will win in the end as “individualism and independence have high potential both domestically and externally …[and] The position of individualistic entrepreneurs is much stronger today than it appears on the surface of Japanese society” (p. 25).

It is unfortunate that the credibility of this historical-interpretive scenario is shot through with the idiosyncrasy of Miyanaga’s concepts. Having defined individualists as “peripheral” characters in Japan’s groupist society, she then maintains that the entire younger generation (shinjinrui) of Japanese (hardly a fringe) is more individualistic than that of its parents, because, “the emphasis of their social orientation has shifted from the work ethic to family life, and from loyalty to the task group to that of loyalty to their own private groups” (p. xvi). It does not appear to matter that this mass of younger Japanese are simply as conformist to their generation’s groupist norms as the older generation of Japanese is to theirs; the shinjinrui’s smaller-group orientation qualifies them as demi-heroes, the “passive individualists.” Could it be that “active individualists” are just being individualists together? After elaborating the dichotomy of “active individualists” versus “passive individualists,” the author then insists that “active passivity” [sic] is an inalienable Japanese cultural trait (p. 95). Following a 1988 quotation from Kyong-Dong Kim that “modernization of latecomer societies should be seen as a dialectical process,” the author asserts two paragraphs later that, “to date, this perception of development has not been articulated as a dialectical theory” (p. 3)

These self-contradictions become torturous when the author firmly maintains on one page that “the cohesion of a homogeneous Japanese group is the result of controlled social process, not a spontaneous manifestation of innate “Japaneseness,” and yet on the facing page firmly maintains that “the individual member of a [Japanese] group projects his deep emotional conviction in group homogeneity into Japan as a nation. This projection has been crucial to the formation of a sense of Japanese nationalism” (pp. 16–17). The reader wants to cry out: Which view do you hold? Top-down formation by the controlling state or bottom-up projection from Japanese nature? Surely not another confused concept such as “natural controledness”? The tragic end of the author’s intellectual waffling occurs in the conclusion where Miyanaga backs off from her book’s main assertion of a dialectical struggle between the individualist periphery and the groupist core and equivocates, “the relationship of individualistic entrepreneurs to the mainstream society may be seen as either complementary or as dialectical” (p. 129).

These criticisms of Miyanaga’s book are not directed to her work alone. This is just
one example of the subjective Japanese scholarly rumination that so often is mistakenly published as a work that meets international academic standards. Foreign readers who have no image of Japan beyond the stereotype industrial monolith may be interested by this book’s stories of individualistic Japanese, but those who accept its concepts or conclusions would be dreaming.

**Japanese Social Organization**
Takie Sugiyama Lebra, ed.

*Reviewed by Robert L. Ramseyer,*
*Hiroshima*

*Japanese Social Organization* is a collection of seven chapters by seven scholars whose academic credentials in anthropology or sociology are impressive. I picked up this volume for review with a sense of anticipation.

In the first chapter Theodore C. Bestor reports on his observation of a Tokyo neighborhood, showing how people in this community invent “tradition” and then use that tradition as an authority to bolster their own positions. The concrete example with which he deals is the autumn festival of the local Shinto shrine. “Thus by accentuating the traditional—most dramatically but not exclusively through the festival—local events serve to imbue Miyamoto-cho and those vying for standing and control with the legitimacy that tradition so amply bestows” (p. 44).

Takie Sugiyama Lebra, editor of this collection, contributed the second chapter. After a lengthy opening section in which she shows that the former nobility (*kuge kazoku*) tended to cluster in certain Tokyo neighborhoods and associated mostly with each other, she goes on to show that the spatial layout of their homes was directly related to hierarchical relationships among household members. That is, members were limited to certain areas according to their status. She further relates this to what she calls the “dyad,” the fact that the holder of symbolic prestige (formal status) and the person who had decision-making power were two different people. Since a correlation between the arrangement of living space and status relationships of household members is common in a great many societies, I could not help wondering why Lebra saw this as an interesting or significant topic for further research.

In chapter three, Mary C. Brinton uses published statistics from Japan and the U.S. to compare the life courses of women in these two countries. She focuses on education, employment and marriage and finds that Japanese women have less room for independent, individual decision-making than do women in the United States. Specifically, Japanese women leave school, enter and leave employment, and marry at more nearly the same age than do American women. Her thesis is “that contrasts between the structure of the life course in Japan and the United States reflect differences in the structure of basic social institutions in the two cultural settings” (p. 80). She concludes, “Japanese women’s life course transitions are characterized by irreversibility, age-incongruity, and low variance in timing across individuals” (p. 100). One might have thought this self-evident.

In chapter four, Diana Bethel reports on a study of a home for the elderly in Hokkaido. At any given time it has 75–80 residents who live 3 to 4 to a room if they are single. Couples are given smaller private rooms. She finds that residents, who could feel themselves victimized in a society where children are traditionally supposed to care for their elderly parents, form a new society within the institution, which then gives...
them a base for a new sense of personal esteem and security. “Roles relinquished as part of the aging process in the main-stream age-integrated society are replaced with new roles and sources of self-affirmation” (p. 131). Again, hardly surprising. Tomoko Hamada’s essay deals with the ways in which Japanese corporations handle the transfer of Japanese personnel between corporate headquarters in Japan and overseas subsidiaries (US). Not surprisingly she finds that “the Japanese firms’ approach to multi-nationalization derives from and is an extension of the relational dynamics of the interorganizational alliance between the parent firm and its subsidiaries in Japan” (p. 139).

The sixth chapter, authored by Jennifer Robertson, is nominally a study of the Takarazuka Revue, but becomes an attack on what most people in Japan probably see as the appropriate role for women in Japanese society, “good wife, wise mother.” Takarazuka provides a sort of fantasy alternative to, and thus undermines this conventional female role which society, as a giant malevolent conspiracy, tries to force on all women in Japan. The final chapter, by Patricia Steinhoff, deals with the Rengo Sekigun purge in 1972, in which twelve members were tortured, beaten, and killed by their fellow members. Steinhoff insists that this “resulted from very ordinary social processes enacted by quite normal individuals” (p. 195). And concludes, “The processes of scapegoating, deviant labeling, and becoming a victim are the same, whether the event is the holocaust, the My Lai massacre, the mistreatment of racial minorities, or the tiny Rengo Sekigun purge.”

To that extent, the purge could have happened anywhere, and it could have been committed by anybody” (p. 222). It would have been helpful if Steinhoff had told us how she defines “ordinary” and “normal.” Steinhoff is a good story teller and as a good story teller she is extremely selective in the data which she chooses to include. She says that her story is based on autobiographies, trial records, prison interviews, and correspondence. Nevertheless there is too much in this chapter which belongs to historical fiction rather than to reliable scholarly writing, as, for example, when she tells us what people were thinking, what their motives were, etc. She does not say that this is what they said or wrote later, or that other participants said that they thought, at the time, that this is what someone else was thinking; rather she informs the reader that this is what such and such a person felt or intended at the time, even the leader of the group who committed suicide in prison in 1973, presumably without being interviewed by Steinhoff.

I laid this volume down with a sense of frustration and disappointment. Surely these scholars could have done far better than this. Most of these chapters seem to be tidbits, leftovers from research published elsewhere. But why publish so much that is trivial or self-evident? True, one can often find a few valuable pieces when sifting through a collection of discarded materials and that is true of this volume as well. If you are willing to take the time and effort you will find something helpful here, not much, but something.

**The Christian Tradition: Beyond its European Captivity**

Joseph Mitsuo Kitagawa

Reviewed by Joseph S. O’Leary
Sophia University, Tokyo

JOSEPH KITAGAWA compiled this collection of essays shortly before his death. The book
falls into three parts: (1) a critical survey of Christian missionary activity in Asia; (2) an account of the problems of Asian Americans; and (3) a discussion of the present prospects for a global, pluralistic Christianity. I shall comment briefly on each of these in turn.

The focus of Kitagawa’s view of Christian missions and the younger Asian churches is the colonialist mentality. He finds vestiges of this in surprising places. Interreligious dialogue, for example, may be “a convenient gimmick to camouflage the bankruptcy of the all too simple missionary approach of the Western churches” (p. 36). A tragic effect of colonialism is that the Asian churches have become Western ghettos, often seen as “faded carbon copies” (pp. x, 21, 37, 225) of the parent churches. Japanese Christians are seen as lagging in their responses to their social context—the peace movement, refugees, aesthetic-cultural matters—while their theologians are more familiar with Rahner and Pannenberg than with Asian thought. Under the “gentle tyranny” of a “Barthian glorification of the church” combined with an “abominable ignorance concerning Christian groups in other parts of Asia” (p. 78), Japanese Christians continue to regard Western theology as universally normative, a situation which Kitagawa deeply laments. This section ends on a radical note, as Kitagawa invokes the fumie scene in Endo Shusaku’s Silence: “The act of liberating Jesus from petty orthodoxy, making it possible for Jesus to carry his cross and share the pains and torments of the people, is somewhat reminiscent of Zen Buddhists’ way of killing man-made Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and scriptures if they stand in the way of satori” (pp. 86–7).

Kitagawa’s account of the experiences of Asian Americans is perhaps the most interesting section of the book. He tells of the disappointment experienced by the children of Japanese immigrants, who felt themselves to be American, and rejected their parents’ culture, only to discover as they grew up that society did not endorse their self-perception, and that an “invisible establishment” had set firm barriers to their advancement. “Hostility in the social sphere does not become noticeable until adolescence” (p. 101). Miscegenation laws, refusal of citizenship to those of “Mongolian” extraction, and refusal of service by barbers, restaurants, hotels, are among the more blatant forms of discrimination which Kitagawa recounts with sadness. He has had “sleepless nights” (p. 119) thinking about his experience of being incarcerated as an “enemy alien” during World War II. The mass evacuation was carried out so ruthlessly by the U.S. military that even foster-children in white homes were swept off to the detention centers. Evidently this experience lies at the root of Kitagawa’s keen sense of the horrors to which discrimination and presumptions of racial or religious superiority can give rise. Though he has discovered that in the U.S. the principle of non-discrimination demands a long struggle for every particular application, he does not seem to harbor any bitterness, perhaps because he knows that things are no better anywhere else, and are likely to be far worse.

Convinced that “the European captivity has made Christianity hermeneutically illiterate” (p. 247), Kitagawa pleads for a global theology, which will begin with an effort by Christians to get outside the “autobiographical” perspective and see themselves as they appear in the eyes of others. The question such a theology puts to its own and to other religious traditions is: how genuinely have they “incorporated the full substance of underlying, invisible spiritual reality” (p. 281)? Christianity is to understand itself as part of the wider interlocking entity we call religion. Only then will interreligious dialogue cease to be “simultaneous monologue” (pp. 36, 254, 277). But Kitagawa is
slow to draw explicitly theological consequences from this vision of Christianity as one religion among others; he sometimes gives the impression that it affects Christianity as seen from the outside while leaving its internal “autobiographical” understanding intact.

His account of why Christians have resisted such an understanding of their place in the history of religions sometimes savors of sociological or psychological reductionism. When he decries people’s “misguided conviction that their autobiographical understanding of the inner meaning of their own religion alone has ultimacy, finality, and universality” (p. 236), does he do justice to the conviction of ultimacy that we find in the Buddha or Saint Augustine, for example? “The church often ends up distorting sacred experience and faith by resorting to yesterday’s experiences as the soteriological formulas for today and by superimposing [sic] such dead formulas (dogmas and canon laws) on the faithful” (p. 146). Can dogmas be equated with canon laws? Are the dogmas of Nicea and Chalcedon simply “yesterday’s experiences”?

I found the appeal to Paul as a religious pluralist unconvincing: “although he proclaimed the ultimacy of the God of Jesus Christ (monotheism) as his autobiographical affirmation..., he readily acknowledged the existence of plurality of religions in the Mediterranean world, of which Christianity was one—based on the outer meaning of Christianity (monolatry).” This claim is supported by I Corinthians 8.5–6: “there are many “gods” and many “lords”—yet for us there is One God...and One Lord,” a text which is said to express “the principle of coincidentia oppositorum” (p. 167; also viii, 7, 67, 189, 199). That Paul came to terms with religious pluralism as a social fact does not imply any recognition of a parity or interdependence between the Gospel and other cults. Such a prooftext suggests that all Kitagawa is pleading for is sensitivity to others’ mistaken beliefs, but surely he wants to go further than that.

Kitagawa’s denunciation of the error of Christendom in moving from inner monotheistic conviction to the social imposition of a single religion seems based more on its destructive effects than on any clear account of a more enlightened theological alternative. His numerous allusions to imperium and sacerdotium in the Middle Ages give the impression that his effort to get “beyond the European captivity” has become bogged down in a quarrel with Europe. The critique of Constantinianism is a wellworn theological theme, which scarcely needs to be re-aired at such length. In general, it seems to me that a firmer theological underpinning is required for Kitagawa’s global vision. The vision itself will be attractive to most Christians who seek to come to grips with religious pluralism.

Severe editorial rearrangement and abridgement would have enhanced this text greatly and won a wider audience for Kitagawa’s views. Though the style, despite some unidiomatic constructions, is always clear and readable, readers will find their patience taxed by the numerous repetitions and a certain desultoriness in the progress of the argument, which too often substitutes sweeping historical surveys for theoretical elaboration. The recurring items (in addition to those noticed above) include an opaque five-line quotation about Hegel (pp. 181, 216, 238) and an undeveloped comment on “a peculiar Western convention of dividing human experience into a series of semiautonomous pigeonholes” (pp. 5–6, 34, 44, 144, 214 [“serious” instead of “series”], 235). A few oddities: “ultraism” for “altruism” (p. 20), “the house I go tonight” (p. 45), “the British Roman Catholic, John Newman” as author of “Lead Kindly Light,” which is said to contain “Christology and ecclesiology” (p. 149), “Clement VIII” for “Clement VII” (p. 177). “Salmon Rushdie”
Kitagawa was an eloquent and influential propagator of the ideals expressed in this book. But it was not given to him to work them out as a full-fledged theoretical program. The value of the book lies in its breadth of vision, its convincing identification of the role of the religious traditions today and of the problems they are having in assuming this role, and the author’s burning concern for the creation of solidarity among human beings. His criticisms of historical Christianity from an Asian perspective should contribute to deepening people’s awareness of global and interreligious interdependence.

**In the Way: A Study of Christian Missionary Endeavours**

Kenelm Burridge


Reviewed by John F. Howes

Obirin University, Tokyo

This seminal work should be read by anyone with an interest in missions, for it Burridge analyzes the process by which Christians follow the injunction to spread their faith to all the corners of the world and what happens when they try. As a result, to borrow the words of a senior missionary to Japan, Burridge “makes me proud of my profession.” He centers on the person of the missionary as an individual. Missionaries go in “the way” as set forth in John 14:6, but find themselves frequently “in the way” of those who try to live out their lives within the societies to which the missionaries go. This daily tension defines the missionaries and the success of their work. One can best start to understand the importance of Burridge’s findings through a summary of what he says.

**THE ARGUMENT**

The enormity of Burridge’s task and his systematic approach to it does not facilitate summary and his frequent challenges of preconceptions keep the reader alert. He warns the reader from the start when he notes the involvement of anthropologists with “missionaries as persons, respected, and what they do, disliked” (p. x). These mixed emotions are met “with courtesy mingled with a certain guardedness...” by the missionary who typically has “been in the area for some years before an anthropologist arrives.... Hence this book: an attempt to understand and to create understanding” (p. xi). Burridge later introduces his own conclusions which so differ from those of many other anthropologists. “One day, perhaps, all those who enjoy the parts of the Euro-Christian heritage may come to acknowledge how much the world owes to those men and women who are or have been Christian missionaries” (p. xi).

Context indicates that Burridge’s findings clearly result from an arduous inquiry into an intellectual and spiritual problem of great personal importance.

Missionaries are seen as individuals (Burridge’s emphasis), men or women “who, standing apart from a given moral order, attempt to transcend it and communicate to others the vision of another and more satisfying moral order...and give themselves over to the critique and transformation of other peoples’ business” (p. 3). In this identification with missionaries with what might be called “heroic individuality,” Burridge builds upon his earlier work, *Someone No One: An Essay on Individuality*. (Princeton, Princeton University
Press, 1979). This important theoretical study concludes that Christianity alone among the world’s religious traditions enjoins its adherents to stand apart from society and judge it radically from the point of view of their faith. Missionaries as individuals try to implement their beliefs among those who have grown up in cultures with radically differing assumptions.

Though missionaries rest secure in the spiritual origins of their own motivation and in the hope that they can convince others to share it, they see too much that needs to be done to concern themselves with religious questions alone. Most of them go to underdeveloped areas. There they tend the sick, teach, and counsel, all the time in basic disagreement with the religious assumptions of those among whom they work. They get in the way. Some, like Annie Lock who worked among Australian aborigines, die with no apparent effect on history. Others, like Francis Xavier and Albert Schweitzer, leave a distinct imprint on later events. Those who write about missionaries tend to adopt one of two extreme positions; hagiography, which views missionaries only in the warm reflection of their perfectionist aims or, in contrast, damaging stereotypes. These commend little and criticize much, based largely on the undeniable truth that missionaries hope to improve what they encounter wherever they go.

An introduction to the cycle of missionary activity follows. Burridge starts with Christianity as a faith among the other faiths of world history. From decisions made by His followers shortly after Christ’s death, Christianity has devoted itself to good works for others and so automatically tried to increase its influence. Themselves changed by the faith they have embraced, Christians try to change others whom they meet. They do not agree on attitudes toward society, “largely because in the reach towards God…and back again into culture, the emphasis on events and their meanings allows for, even demands, variations in expression and interpretation” (pp. 49–50). This acceptance of differing attitudes toward society results in part from the individuality of the missionaries. Each tries to change the moralities of those whom he encounters based on his understanding of the Bible. The combination of Christian individuality and contact with society makes Christians seem contrary to those who also try to mold society beginning from quite different assumptions.

Each missionary starts with a personal sense that one is led into the profession, some feeling that it is a simple culmination of their voyage toward maturity and others coming after lengthy struggle with their consciences and wills. The decision taken, they then must move out into society and begin the constant compromise that their affirmation entails. Missionaries try to convert individuals who will found communities of Christians that then must exist within the secular society. The resultant communities resemble the Amish or Hutterite groups in the Americas, but those in the new Christian missions differ from the inhabitants of these other small Christian enclaves in their desire to change the world around them. As the missions flourish, they tend to lose the insularity that resulted from their initial common devotion. The new Christians and their missionary leaders move on to form a local church at every step forced to compromise with the society around them.

Included among the compromises is a balance between the need for devotion to preserve one’s own faith and affirmation of the secular society to assure a livelihood. If the new community moves to assure its economic strength, secular society usually takes over its work. If it tries to remain true to its devotional roots, it discovers tensions between the devotional roots and societies’ attitudes. Their workshops, schools and hospitals provide a model of a new earth
and tempt those working in them to forget devotions. Too great tension leads to millennial movements. More commonly, either secularism or an attempt at renewed devotion results. The difficulties which culminate in either direction result in part from differing perceptions of evil which accompany the desire to deepen devotional wellsprings while working in society. In the subsistence community before missionaries arrive, sin is seen as resulting in appropriate misfortune, but in the complex society associated with the modern world no clear relation between wrongdoing and misfortune seems to exist. A conscience, independent of social constraints, must lead the individual to make up his or her own mind about evil. Only then can the Christian concept of forgiveness come into play. Marriage takes special place among the ethical problems new Christians face. In theory polygamy would seem desirable since it offers women the chance to specialize in the tasks of homemaking and child care as well as an enlarged sense of family security for the children. Yet Christians agree on the need for monogamy and its virtues.

The changes introduced by the missionary often result in the early enthusiasm and subsequent disenchantment of new Christians. Governments move in to take over the secular aspects of missionary communities, seeing them as unwelcome competition. Missionaries “exist to make themselves unnecessary” (p. 146), yet they find themselves constantly tempted to exercise their secular skills at the cost of increasing their own spiritual strength. Sometimes they find themselves experiencing metanoia, in this case arriving at a new understanding of the society to which they have gone, even as they encourage change away from that culture in others. Predictable personality changes among the converts lead to them express their new individuality in ways that shock other members of their society.

The tensions generated by the new faith foster millenarianism movements through which converts attempt to realize their new aspirations in society. At the same time, secularization sets in among both the missionaries and the converts to whom the new faith gradually seems less central. The missionary tries not to impose his values, but with little success. As the numbers of Christians increases, the local society begins to shape the new Christian group in subtle ways. This is as it has been since the beginning of Christianity. Missionaries try to change only those things which inhibit the development of the faith, and they act with care in the knowledge they may harm rather than help. But act they must, particularly in the case of caste differences which militate against the universal ideals of Christianity. As in the need for monogamy, missionaries agree that adaptation to local cultures cannot include anything which violates the central importance of the individual.

One would think that with two thousand years of experience there could be some science of missionary work, some accepted norms or standards by which the beginning missionary could pace his or her activities or others could judge them, but no such standards exist. “Missionaries are men and women of action, doers. Whatever the theory or principle of it they have to put it into action, speak to and engage with people as Jesus did” (p. 202). “What is really involved in a “missionary culture” is change, people changing: evoking varieties of subjective judgments” (p. 205). Such a profession resists categorization. Early missionary writings started the analysis of societies that would be developed and continued by anthropologists. As opposed to missionaries who constantly do what circumstances seem to require, anthropologists “reveal structures of order….The mystery of people and the intricate complexities of their lives are subservient to…elegantly articulated structures” (p. 216). In the early twentieth
century, as missionaries faced increasingly complex tasks and anthropologists refined their tools of analysis, the two groups drifted apart. The anthropologist never advocated change, the core of missionary activity. Missionaries in their constant activity responded to immediate needs. The ad hoc nature of their work makes any systematic missiology impossible. If one could be constructed, it could have no conceivable use, for the missionary always deals with unique individuals in the random situations of life. An accepted missiology would signal the end of the Christian leaven that has affected societies for two millennia, as missionaries communicated “the meaning and inspiration of Jesus Christ, putting on the new man” (p. 232).

Burridge concludes with the observation that what sets missionaries apart is a “devoted and indomitable perseverance” (p. 234), and that they seem to arise “from a peculiarly significant interaction between Christian commitment and the imperfections of culture or society” (p. 235). A “good measure of the missionary achievement is that so much of their work...has been appropriated by those who are not or do not think of themselves as Christians” (p. 244). They themselves know their own weaknesses and the numerous times that failures force them to start their whole enterprise anew.

ANALYSIS

With this broad summary in mind, we need to consider the methodological difficulties of this work and the applicability of Burridge’s ideas to Japan. Reflection on what Burridge has written leads to the conclusion that the information contained here is refreshingly new. Studies of mission are usually undertaken from within the faith, so authors never question the relation between articles of belief, how they work on individuals, and how they in turn interact with other members of society. This one-sided approach completely ignores the relation between believers and members of the broader society implicit in the Christian message from the beginning. Any work which attempts to deal with this larger question opens fertile new ground and exposes its author to numerous hazards, as Burridge realizes.

His analysis relies on bimodalities, similar to the logic of a computer, breaking down problems which cannot be dealt with on a black-or-white basis to their components until one can deal with them in terms of simple on-off. His major pairings include distinctions between devotional and affirmative reactions to the Christian imperatives; subsistence and complex societies; personality types that contrast the doer with the analyzer; the differing professional assumptions of the missionary and anthropologist; the Appolonian and Dionysian expressions of devotion; the distinction between the person and individual; and the link between metanoia and mutual metanoia as the missionary communicates his faith. A reviewer would like to give further meaning to these distinctions, but to delineate the differences and how they work on the human psyche is Burridge’s main point. Any attempt to summarize the distinctions would involve a restatement of Burridge’s whole case. One can simply encourage those whose interest is whetted to get the original, where they can see the graphic representation of the relation between the various opposites in the diagrams presented on pages 63, 84, and 160. Here let us refer briefly to the results of these polarities as they work on individuals. The necessary maneuvering between them creates psychic tensions both within both the missionary and the converts.

The mere mention of these dualities may suggest to a reader some of the more arid analyses favored by social scientists, but Burridge spares his reader this pain.
Instead, he introduces numerous references to the writings of missionaries themselves, studies of their work or references to them in literature. These specifics illustrate his theoretical points and with them produce a rich text which helps the reader understand the strains which each pair of polarities induces. One cannot help, as a result, but share Burridge’s enthusiasm for the inventiveness displayed by missionaries as they grapple with the results of their intervention in the field. Far from what is familiar to them, they lack the psychic props provided by seminaries or colleagues for those who pursue their ideals closer to home.

Although Burridge’s methodology clarifies many issues, the monumental nature of his task introduces its own difficulties. Let us look at three. Burridge writes for two audiences: the secular anthropologist and the convinced Christian. He has difficulty providing sufficient background information for each of them. One runs into numerous examples, particularly on pages with references to Biblical narratives. Burridge assumes a knowledge of the Bible far greater than a non-Christian could be expected to have and beyond the power of many Christians. Consider the following sentence, for example: “The decision of the first Christians after earnest debate in Jerusalem to carry their message outside the confines of Jewry and into the gentile world was hardly won” (p. 42). These words open the section on the history of Christian missions. No other information identifies to what Burridge refers. A secondary work mentioned in the next sentence would probably take the reader back to a Biblical reference, but few readers have that work close at hand. A simple reference to Acts 2.1–8.3 would have enabled both the inquisitive anthropologist and the Christian tentative in his knowledge of the Bible to locate the context upon which the succeeding discussion rests.

If anthropologists have to stretch to understand references to Christianity, those interested in Christian mission find themselves struggling to follow allusions to secular concepts. Take the case of the word “metaculture” which, according to the index, occurs thirty times. A senior American scholar who had worked with the church in China and Southeast Asia since 1936, and written numerous books on Old Testament studies found himself mystified by the concept when he read Burridge’s work. Here are some of Burridge’s references, taken at random, to the word. “I have called Christianity a metaculture because while the main elements of the faith are reasonably consistent and uniform, their inculturation or emergences into culture differentiate into denominational, sectarian, and culturally diversified versions, which then become ‘religions’” (p. xiv). “The relevances of the metaculture become, as they must and should given that necessary affirmation of the world, inculturated or dressed with culture, a religion” (p. 154) ”a metaculture, a faith, in principle independent sociocultural conditions…” (p. 180). Having read the book a number of times, I conclude that Burridge writes out of his experience as an anthropologist against the anthropologist’s definition of culture as the sum total of the ways that a given group of people order their lives. A metaculture then, for one who thinks in terms of Greek or Latin prefixes, is something, to follow Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, “more comprehensive: transcending” (p. 745) culture. Thus, when introduced into a community, Christianity as a metaculture takes the new believers beyond the elements of their native culture. In contrast to this expression in anthropological terms, one who works from Christian assumptions of mission sees in Christianity itself the basis of a new culture. To qualify it with the word “meta” seems to rob it of the central position that it takes in their lives.
Last, one should note that Burridge requires his readers to bring to their encounter with him a rich vocabulary and a willingness to expand it. Try, for instance, “Tetragrammaton” as in “are not so distant kin of the Tetragrammaton” (p. 163), undoubtedly a technical term for Biblical scholarship but otherwise not a part of most readers’ working vocabularies. Although a reviewer mentions these points as a necessary component of a review, one does not want to dwell on the numerous points of this sort which appear, after all, simply because they provide Burridge with the necessary shorthand to cope with the complex issues that define his task.

While perhaps slowed by Burridge’s cramped prose, the reader will enjoy the unexpected humor. For instance, he describes the way that the dynamics of missionary work confound the thought patterns of ecclesiastical bureaucrats by comparing their encyclicals on mission to “the elegant and unsinkable Titanic, a triumph of collected skills steaming into an iceberg” (p. 200). And finally, the reader will thank Burridge for his careful proofreading. Only one typo, on page 171, intruded itself into my consciousness.

One who has grown up with missionary assumptions will find numerous glimpses of understanding, perhaps akin to what Burridge calls “metanoia,” as he works through the analysis. I for one first found myself concerned with the problem of the relation between missionary and anthropologist as a graduate student between 1950 and 1953. The kinds of questions anthropologists ask came naturally to mind, so that I sought out chances to discuss them with students of anthropology. I learned that missionaries were considered to have very little of value to say about native cultures. Yet what the students of India said about Indian rural society resembled very much the conversations that took place around the dinner table in our Chicago home as I grew up. At that time I heard that my grandfather, John Forman, was the one, among his sibling set of children born to a pioneer missionary to India, who specialized in rural evangelism. Only long after my graduate-school days did I discover that the authors of the great seminal anthropological study on Indian rural society, *Behind Mud Walls*, William and Charlotte Wiser, had gone to India recruited by my grandfather as young missionaries and had done their study while living in the same missionary compound with him. All this comes to mind as one reads Burridge on the relation between missionaries and anthropologists and how they began to drift apart early in the twentieth century.

**BURRIDGE’S HYPOTHESES AND JAPAN**

On first glance Burridge seems to say relatively little that resonates with missionary experience in twentieth-century Japan. A few months ago I described his conclusions for over an hour to a number of senior Protestant missionaries in Tokyo. As I finished, one of them commented that what I had discussed did not seem to fit at all the experience of his life work. Reading Burridge once again in the light of this remark leads to the conclusion that Japanese society in the nineteenth century quickly appropriated Christianity within its accepted societal categories. A few years after the arrival of the first Protestant missionaries in 1859, converts were demanding control of the young church, and the missionaries were agreeing with them. Early local control of the church distinguished the Japanese Protestant experience from that in many Asian countries. After World War II, the period covering the experience of those I had addressed, missionaries dispatched by mission boards to Japan came dedicated to serve the local church as its leaders felt appropriate.
The early control of the Church by native leaders was paralleled by government bureaucratic inclusionist attitudes toward Christianity. The Meiji Constitution of 1889 guaranteed freedom of religious belief “within limits not prejudicial to peace and order, and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects.” (Hugh Borton, Japan’s Modern Century, p. 494) but official concern over unruly converts and their desire to change society led the police to use force to control them. The distinction that Burridge makes between “subsistence” and “complex” societies would seem to explain how the Japanese government systematically strengthened community pressure to ensure state control of what seemed to them radical Christian ideas. Some leaders influenced by Christianity paid with their lives as a result. In contrast to these outspoken reformers, most Christians had before World War I become an accepted part of society. One feels that Burridge would say that the Japanese church in return for the acceptance it craved had sacrificed its ability to act as a leaven in society.

In contrast, take the recent example of a couple of young obviously non-Japanese persons performing a street show on a Sunday afternoon in Yokohama’s Chinatown. They might, if they stopped to consider Burridge’s message, relate more to it than the senior missionaries I addressed. Painted up and dressed in the billowing pantaloons of circus performers, they continued their skit until they had gathered together a small audience before they switched into their evangelical message. Their poor Japanese made one wonder how much they might be communicating, but their energy and enthusiasm left no doubt as to their commitment. A thoughtful meal with them after their afternoon’s work might have produced reflections more in line with the missionaries with whom Burridge talked in his field work.

And finally, to observe new converts to Christianity among contemporary young Japanese is to notice how they have become individuals, and begin to urge further individuality among others, losing their unquestioning respect for traditional constraints. One can imagine how the enthusiasm of their new faith will cause problems for those who have converted them, their families and themselves. They will become “in the way,” at least until the constraints of adult Japanese responsibilities close in on them.

Burridge would not be surprised. He would note, one supposes, how the phenomenon of young Christians who seem to grow through Christianity on their way to adulthood demonstrates how Japanese society has in its own way provided a place for Christianity in the development of thoughtful young people. Though at first glance he thus seems to provide little of direct relevance to contemporary Japanese experience, Burridge provides all those interested in Christian growth with a stimulating and provocative look at what happens to Christians and their faith when they seriously try to provide a spiritual leaven for those they meet.
Book Notes

Japanese Women Writers in English Translation, Volume II: An Annotated Bibliography
Claire Zebroski Mamola

This handy reference work is divided into four sections: Fiction Writings (pp. 3–34), Non-Fiction Writings (pp. 35–322), Listing of Specialized Works (pp. 323–428), and Dissertations (pp. 429–436). In preparing this bibliography, Mamola tried “to locate, read, and annotate everything written by native Japanese women which has been translated or originally written in English” (p. ix).

Researchers will find the concise summaries of several hundred articles to be particularly useful; the information provided is more than adequate for deciding whether a work is important enough for a specific topic to warrant reading the full original. JCR readers will be interested to know that 71 of the 500 annotated entries were published in the Japan Evangelist and the Japan Christian Quarterly, an indication of the important role played by our predecessor journals in making the work of Japanese women available to English readers. This is a useful reference work, but it is not completely free of errors. The work of at least one man inadvertently slipped into the volume.

Fundamentalisms Observed
Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, eds.

Fundamentalisms and Society: Reclaiming the Sciences, the Family, and Education
Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, eds.

These two works are Volumes 1 and 2 of the Fundamentalism Project directed by Marty and Appleby at the University of Chicago. Under the auspices of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, an international and interdisciplinary team of scholars is attempting to understand the worldwide resurgence of fundamentalist movements and their impact on society. Japan receives attention in both volumes. Volume 1 contains a essay by Winston Davis on “Fundamentalism in Japan: Religious and Political.” He explores both the civil religion of wartime Japan, which he regards as a case of “symbolic regression” brought on by the challenges of modernization and westernization, and New Religions as fundamentalist movements.

In Volume 2, Helen Hardacre contributes an essay on “The New Religions, Family, and Society in Japan,” exploring the social impact of new religions on their members’ understanding gender and family, and in relation to such issues as family planning, abortion, and divorce. Three other volumes are in preparation.

Mark R. Mullins
Meiji Gakuin University, Tokyo