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Abstract

Takakura Tokutaro was a Japanese Christian who lived during the years 1885-1934. Despite having played important leadership roles within the Protestant Church in Japan during the 1920's and early 1930's, his name is scarcely known outside limited Japanese theological circles. This thesis seeks to give Takakura some of the recognition which his place in the Christian Church deserves.

Takakura was reared as a young boy in a small, mountain town in Kyoto Prefecture. He then attended school during a period of politically-cultivated nationalism. These years were highlighted by the granting of the Meiji Constitution (1889), the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education (1890), and major wars against China (1894-1895) and Russia (1904-1905). In 1906 Takakura began legal studies at the prestigious Imperial University in Tokyo, a major step towards fulfilling his lifelong dream of becoming a high-ranking government official.

However, by the end of the same year Takakura had been baptised into the Christian Church; and, one year later he quit legal studies in order to pursue theological studies at a small, new ministerial training school begun by his pastor, Uemura Masahisa. This step in such an entirely new direction took him towards a lifelong career as pastor and teacher in the Nihon Kirisuto Kyokai (Japan Christ Church).

After pastorates in Kyoto and Sapporo, followed by a three-year period of teaching and preaching in Tokyo, Takakura embarked in 1921 for over two years of study in Britain. He spent one academic year at New College, Edinburgh, one academic year at Mansfield College, Oxford, and then one academic term at Westminster College, Cambridge. In January, 1924, Takakura returned to Japan, where he spent the remaining ten years of his life in responsible positions as preacher, teacher, author, and speaker.

This thesis focuses its examination on Takakura's thought, all the while emphasising his own particular, historical context. Takakura's life spanned a critical period in the life of a rapidly-changing Japan that had joined the "modern family of nations" since its mind-boggling growth from the Meiji Restoration of 1868. Moreover, the Church into which he was converted was just completing the first generation of its existence since the arrival in Japan of Western missionaries in 1859. Hence how Takakura understood and came to articulate the Christian faith says much about the Church of the incomparable Meiji period (1868-1912), as well as about his own generation of Christians who lived in the ensuing Taisho (1912-1926) and Showa (1926-1989) eras.

Furthermore, Takakura's close interaction with Western thought is instructive concerning the universalisation of Christian theology during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Along with spending over two years in the West, Takakura did extensive reading in both British and German theology. How he received the Christian faith through these cross-cultural media, then adapted it into his own linguistic and religio-cultural context, demonstrates not only what happened with Takakura individually, but also what has been happening worldwide for the past two centuries. The thesis will thus seek to gain further insight from Takakura's example into the still relatively recent universalising trend in Christian thought.
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Introduction

Several dramatic changes have occurred within the Christian faith as it has spread outward from the West over the last two centuries. For one, the Western Church has slowly begun critically to evaluate the identification of Christianity with Western civilisation. In the midst of this still new critique, the Church has begun to decipher the unravelling of Western Christendom, something which actually has been occurring over the course of the past complicated five hundred years. Also, it has been within still relatively recent times that Christianity--or at least the understanding many of us have had of it--once again has burst out of one primary cultural expression. Christian practice and thought have become universal more than ever before.\(^1\) It is amidst the limited realisation of such a universalisation of Christian theology that this thesis seeks to understand the thought of a Christian who lived and thought in the midst of the universalisation process itself.\(^2\)

---


\(^2\)Although made two decades before the time of this thesis, the following comments accurately convey the current "limited" realisation of the Church’s universalised theology. Both quotations are from Gerald H. Anderson and Thomas F. Stransky, eds., *Mission Trends No. 3: Third World Theologies - Asian, African and Latin American Contributions to a Radical, Theological Realignment in the Church.* New York: Paulist Press, and Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1976. First, from the Foreword, p.1:

A radical theological realignment is taking place in the Church today. The old centers of theological influence in Europe and North America are becoming the new peripheries. The new centers of vitality and importance in theological construction are in Asia, Africa and Latin America--where the majority of Christians will be living in the year 2000.

Ironically, this fact...is not yet widely recognized or understood in the old centers. There is still a good deal of theological provincialism.

Second, from John S. Mbiti, in his article, "Theological Impotence and the Universality of the Church," p.8:
The person whose thought we will be exploring was named Takakura Tokutaro. Not only did his life span the adventurous years of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Japan, but he also held a prominent place within the Japanese Church. Even so, today few people outside of limited Japanese theological circles have even heard of this important figure. To help remedy that situation, as well as to look at an example of Christianity within a crucial period of history, this thesis is setting itself to the task of understanding and explaining Takakura, and specifically examining his thought.

In attempting to understand and explain Takakura’s thought, the thesis first has to acknowledge the prerequisite of being aware of the intellectual framework encompassing its approach. Simply presenting Takakura’s thought without first reflecting on how to approach such a man surely would result in squeezing him into the writer’s own mould. Put more strongly, apart from a self-critical posture, the thesis ultimately would use Takakura for its own ends, all the while unconsciously reckoning its own categories of thought to be the normative standard of judgement. Neither the writer nor the reader of this thesis wants that to happen: the quest is to allow Takakura to speak for himself in a way that we can hear both coherently and sympathetically.

Perhaps the most important matter to remember in approaching Takakura is that

On the one hand, the Church has become universal in a literal, geographical sense, thanks to the great missionary movement of the last 200 years, and the dedication of men and women from older Christendom plus the assistance of local converts; on the other, theological outreach has not matched this expansion. Consequently, half of today’s Christendom lies outside the fenced cloisters of traditional theology. This theology is largely ignorant of, and often embarrassingly impotent in the face of, human questions in the churches of Africa, Latin America, parts of Asia, and the South Pacific. Thus the Church has become kerygmatically universal, but is still theologically provincial, in spite of the great giants of theology. This is a serious dilemma, and if we do not resolve it, it will destroy our foundations as the Church in the world.
both a thesis and its subject matter have a context. Neither somehow floats by itself in a vacuum, unscathed by the realities of inherited assumptions and particular circumstances. In the present case, a late twentieth century, English language thesis is seeking to understand a Japanese Christian thinker whose life spanned a critical half-century of Japanese history, 1885-1934. What we are facing then are not only linguistic-cultural barriers, but a historical cleavage as well. The latter is not monstrous but very real, especially because the period between Takakura’s life and the present includes the Second World War. That debacle of human history inherently clouds the image any English-speaking person of European origin has of a person of Japanese lineage.

Despite these very real barriers, the thesis’ and Takakura’s contexts share the critical feature of the central place of the Christian faith. Indeed, it is that common feature that is the primary connecting link between the investigator and the subject of this study. In addition to our common humanity, shared membership in the Christian Church enables an attempt, at least, at overcoming significant cultural and historical obstacles. Moreover, recognising Takakura’s faith in Jesus Christ will

---

3Besides "context," other words such as "situation" or "circumstances" could be used as well to connote what is intended here. Adjectival terms such as "historical," "cultural," "social," "economic," "political," "religious," "linguistic," and "philosophical" modify and clarify what is meant by "context." These various adjectival terms greatly overlap: "historical" and "cultural" will be used here as the most comprehensive modifiers. Other modifying terms will be employed to highlight particularly relevant aspects of the "context," according to the specific subject at hand.

It should be noted that the perception of certain aspects of a context as relevant, as well as the use of theological constructs in describing various situations, are themselves actions affected by context. For an illuminating passage on how various African theologians who are interested in contextualising theology stress either cultural, philosophical, or social-economic-political aspects of their respective contexts, cf. John Parratt, ed., A Reader in African Christian Theology. London: SPCK, 1987, pp.148-149.

4Clearly other peoples’ images of Japanese are affected as well by World War II, not the least of whom are Koreans, Chinese, and other Asians who directly experienced Japanese military aggression. What we are focusing on here, however, is the historical relationship pertinent to approaching Takakura in this thesis.
facilitate understanding him as the thinker he really was, within his overall historical context.

While a shared Christian faith helps to bridge the gaps between the thesis and Takakura, there is still the presence of the "ghost" of Western Christendom which still "haunts us all." This means that we must take great care not to impose inherited theological traditions which may not be suited to Takakura’s own world. What this thesis thus proposes to do is to follow a more historical course as opposed to a systematic one. That does not mean it intends to be any less theological: on the contrary, the thesis’ posture requires a theological sensitivity that will seek to hear Takakura on his own terms, without giving undue interference on our receiving end.

The thesis will thus move through four stages or "Parts." First will be a consideration of Takakura’s life and times, or the "life context" within which he received the Christian faith. Second will be the Christianity which came to Takakura, which in his case involved two primary channels: the previous generation of Christians in Japan, and the multi-faceted Western form of the Christian faith which he encountered. These two bearers of Christianity will be the respective subjects of the two Chapters comprising Part II of the thesis. While receiving within his life context the Christianity that came to him, Takakura

---


6The thesis’ "Parts" could just as easily be labelled "chapters." The writer is not attempting to be difficult or novel by calling the main divisions "Parts." Rather, doing so is judged to be a helpful way of maintaining the common transmitting quality shared by the Meiji and Western "chapters" of Christianity which came to Takakura. Furthermore, using "Parts" as the main division headings will help to avoid confusion while examining the five "chapters" of Takakura’s most representative work in Part III of the thesis.
articulated his own translation\(^7\) of the Christian faith: that is thus the subject of Part III. Part IV will then attempt to analyse Takakura’s thought, followed by a summation of the entire examination in the Conclusion.

We will therefore be looking at Takakura’s thought as an adaptation of the Christianity which came to him across cultural and generational barriers. Furthermore, while retaining its historico-theological focus, the thesis also intends to take an interdisciplinary approach. Just a moment’s reflection shows that such an approach is indispensable for the proposed contextual examination of Takakura’s thought.\(^8\) Moreover, the centuries-old Western inheritance of an all-encompassing "theologia" as "Queen of the Sciences"\(^9\) makes it incumbent upon us to employ the assistance of extra-theological disciplines.\(^10\) Accordingly, one should note that the thesis is about Takakura’s thought, not simply his theology. The choice of wording is deliberate and intends to reflect the more all-encompassing attempt at understanding all of Takakura’s thinking, not just what we might want to label as

\(^7\)Use of the word "translation" here indicates the assistance to the thesis provided by that model of the cross-cultural transmission of the Christian faith. A representative description of such an understanding of Christianity’s movement across cultural barriers is Lamin Sanneh, Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1991. While recognising the help such a model has been in formulating its own general approach, the thesis nevertheless has set for itself the goal of understanding Takakura Tokutaro. Hence Takakura’s thought will dictate our examination more than any particular methodology or theory.

\(^8\)However intricately one might want to define "context," at least some sort of interdisciplinary approach to any historical situation is essential. Cf. above, p.2(n.3).


\(^10\)Dyson speaks of the theologian’s task of interpreting history "on the basis of a many-sided view of the situation of man in the world, a theme to which natural science and other human sciences also have a right to contribute." A.O. Dyson, The Immortality of the Past. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1974, p.92.
his theologising.11

Upon entering the actual consideration of Takakura and his context, the thesis' anticipation is that the course will prove to be challenging, and perhaps sometimes even unnerving. Even so, the thesis holds a correlative hope that a greater appreciation of the universalisation of Christian thought will result from this consideration of one important example of the adjustment of Christianity to a new situation.

Additional Note 1.
English Equivalents for Japanese Expressions

1. Listing of Dates

In order to accommodate both Western and Japanese readers, and to facilitate mutual understanding, most pre-World War II dates in this thesis will be given in both their Western and traditional Japanese forms.12 The latter correspond to Japanese imperial reigns, and the Western equivalents for the relevant portions of the three Japanese eras in which Takakura lived are as follows:

Meiji: 3 January 1868 - 30 July 1912;
Taisho: 31 July 1912 - 25 December 1926;
Showa: 26 December 1926 - post World War II.13

11Similarly, the thesis will seek to keep at arm's length the oft-used approach of tracing theological "lines of influence" between thinkers. On the one hand, this categorising methodology can be instructive, and it takes careful research to identify often hidden influences on someone's thought. The temptations, however, include tracing an idea to an unfavourable source for polemical purposes, as well as neglecting dynamic, personal elements involved in both transmitting and receiving. Polemics have their place; and, personal factors certainly are not everything for a thinker. This thesis, however, will seek to guard itself from seeking polemical gains on the one hand, as well as to give due consideration to Takakura, and those through whom he learned the Christian faith, as human beings on the other.

12The main exception to this rule will be references for Western publications. Also, needless repetition of dual listings of dates will be avoided where possible.

2. Romanisation and Translation of Japanese

When Japanese terms or phrases are quoted, they will be transliterated into a Romanised form.¹⁴ No single extant, recognised system of Romanisation will be used: as any experienced Japanese reader knows, they all have their limitations. Instead, the thesis writer will follow what he considers to be a "common sense" method that is largely self-explanatory, except for three points:

1. There are five vowel sounds in Japanese, consistently pronounced as follows:

   "a" as in "father"
   "i" as in "meet"
   "u" as in "glue"
   "e" as in "get"
   "o" as in "go".

   Technically there are no diphthongs, although a few combinations can tend to sound that way.¹⁵

2. Consecutive vowel sounds are written the same here as if there were only one vowel.¹⁶ This is the main weak point of the present "common sense" method; but, dealing with consecutive vowels is the main point of struggle for any Romanisation method.¹⁷ Readers of Japanese should be able to overcome this shortcoming, and non-Japanese readers should not become confused.

3. Although pronounced as "wa" and "e," respectively, the particles "ha" and "he" will be written as such. The Japanese reader should

¹⁴In many ways using Japanese script would be easier and preferable. However, computer software limitations--on this thesis writer at least--have made such an option difficult, if not impossible. Even so, using Romanised forms at least gives the non-Japanese reader a way of participating that would be ruled out if Japanese characters were used.

¹⁵This is especially the case with the combinations "ei," as in the name "Seiichi," or "ie" in the name "Iesu."

¹⁶The few exceptions will be certain names, such as "Seiichi" or "Ohki," which appear regularly and in set forms in English publications.

¹⁷Perhaps the best example of difference between methods is "Tokyo." Besides that common rendering in English, it is variably written as "Tookyoo," "Toukyou," "Tohkyoh," or "Tōkyō."
thus be able quickly and naturally to understand the original.

Japanese script has no capitals. Within transliterations here, appropriate words in titles, as well as the first word of sentences, will begin with capital letters.

As for translations, except where noted otherwise they are done by the thesis writer. He has occasionally consulted various acquaintances for assistance, but in these and other cases the final rendering is his own.\(^{18}\)

Unless otherwise noted, the English equivalents for Japanese titles of publications, organisations, etc. normally will be given only at the title’s first mention. Exceptions will of course be made where knowing the English translation is deemed particularly pertinent and helpful.

3. Names

The thesis will follow the standard Japanese procedure of listing the surname first, followed by the given name.\(^{19}\)

Additional Note 2.

Sources

1. Oral Sources

In terms of oral sources of information, there are some of Takakura’s surviving family members, along with some acquaintances and contemporaries, who have provided valuable assistance. These helpful and insightful people are acknowledged by name in footnotes and in the Bibliography.

2. Primary Written Sources

Takakura’s sermons, writings, and lectures have been gathered and published twice.

\(^{18}\)While in a slightly different category, it is best mentioned here in the section on language that the American thesis writer has attempted to use British spelling and usage in this thesis. Also, German expressions and titles will be rendered into English as deemed appropriate.

\(^{19}\)The only two exceptions to this rule are the names Neil S. Fujita and Dennis Hirota, which will appear in various references.
The first time was between two and three years following his death in 1934 (Showa 9):


The second time was in thirty-year commemoration of Takakura’s death:


As the two collections’ respective titles and numbers of volumes indicate, the former is more extensive. It contains correspondence, journal entries, and a full selection of essays and sermons. The advantages of the *Chosakushu* are greater accessibility and updated Chinese characters, the latter of which makes for easier reading.

When citing Takakura’s works, the location in the *Chosakushu* will be given preference; this choice is based primarily on the accessibility factor. In the numerous cases where the work is not included in the *Chosakushu*, the *Zenshu* location will be noted.

However, simply listing page and volume numbers in either the *Chosakushu* or the *Zenshu* would not help the reader know much about the context of the work being cited. The attempt will therefore be made to cite an earlier, more original

---

20Letters Takakura wrote have been reproduced, but not correspondence he received.

21There seem to be more copies of the *Chosakushu* available, and they are far less expensive than the *Zenshu*.

publication along with either the Chosakushu or Zenshu reference. The earlier publication will be listed first, followed by a semi-colon; the Chosakushu or Zenshu reference will follow. In cases where listing of multiple works makes separation by just a semi-colon confusing, the Chosakushu or Zenshu reference will be enclosed by parentheses.

Sometimes listing the details of a more original publication will be impossible, usually due to lack of access to the required information. In such cases, an effort will be made to include some sort of comment along with the Chosakushu or Zenshu citation to help put the work in context, for instance the date and/or occasion.

One dilemma in listing the earlier references is deciding which one of the sometimes several options to use. As a preacher, lecturer, and writer, Takakura could have the same work printed in a church pamphlet, then a journal, then one of his own published volumes, for example. In that sort of situation, the first choice will be a work’s location in one of the following four published volumes, none of which is very far removed from when and where the sermon, essay, or lecture would have been originally produced:


Takakura, Tokutaro. Oncho to Shomei (Grace and Calling). Tokyo: Nagasaki Shoten, 1926 (Showa 1).

23 With the inexplicable exception of Zenshu, Vol.2, both the Zenshu and the Chosakushu have explanations at the back of each volume as to where a particular work had been previously reproduced or published. While these explanatory comments will be cited only occasionally throughout the thesis, the writer must acknowledge here how essential these directions have been.

24 To avoid endless repetition, and because no confusion will result from it, Takakura’s name will not be listed with his cited works in the notes.
Takakura, Tokutaro. *Kami no Ai to Kami he no Ai (God’s Love and Love Towards God).* Tokyo: Nagasaki Shoten, 1928 (Showa 3). 25

Takakura’s best-known work originally was written and published in 1927 (Showa 2), but it has been reprinted several times since that time. The specific publication used in this thesis is as follows:


Specific citations to *Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo* will be accompanied by the equivalent location in the *Chosakushu*, Vol.2.

The only other choices for citation involve deciding between something like a church pamphlet/newsletter or a published journal. In such cases, the more accessible and verifiable journal location will be cited. 26

There are a very few of Takakura’s works that have not been reproduced even in the *Zenshu*. None of these plays a particularly crucial part in the thesis’ presentation, and their citations should cause no confusion. One noteworthy volume of Takakura’s works not found in the *Zenshu* is of his latest sermons, published in fifty-year commemoration of his death:


The reader will have gathered by now that all of the primary sources are in

---

25Ease of location is the primary criterion for this decision. Also, as will be pointed out later, the first three volumes are particularly convenient for tracking Takakura’s thought development.

26There were three journals in which Takakura regularly had sermons and essays published, and hence they will appear often in the references. Each will be explained later, but to alert the reader their titles at least can be mentioned here:

*Fukuin Shinpo (Weekly Gospel)*;
*Seisho no Kensan (Bible Study)*;
*Fukuin to Gendai (The Gospel and Modern Times).*
3. Secondary Written Sources

Although he never knew Takakura personally, one son-in-law of Takakura’s has written more secondary material than any other single author. Sato Toshio’s earliest significant contribution came as the compiler of Takakura’s *Chosakushu*; and, at the back of each volume are Sato’s insightful analyses. Citations of these analyses will appear regularly throughout the thesis, appearing as follows:

Sato, *Chosakushu*, Vol.#, p.#.

Besides having written other articles and surveys in which his explanations of Takakura’s theology appear, Sato’s other major effort towards research on Takakura is one of only two published single-author volumes devoted solely to Takakura:


The other published volume is Takakura’s authoritative biography, first published (not surprisingly by now) in twenty-year commemoration of his death:


There are various articles to be found in theological journals and survey works.

---

27 The lone exception is a short English essay reproduced in the *Zenshu*, to be cited later. However, even this work has been translated into Japanese for the *Chosakushu*.


29 Some of these journals have produced commemorative issues about Takakura. Besides Sato’s 1983 book, Oshio’s biography, and scattered articles, these special issues are the only published secondary materials devoted primarily to Takakura.

There is a recent unpublished M.A. thesis which deals with Takakura by
Many of these will be cited throughout the thesis.

As for English materials, the single essay which has set the pace for what small familiarity there is with Takakura in English-speaking theological circles is chapter four, entitled "Takakura Tokutaro and the Theology of Biblical Evangelicalism," of Charles Germany's important work on Protestant theology in Japan:


Every English survey work of Japanese theology (written by a non-Japanese author) that pays more than the slightest passing interest to Takakura refers to Germany's essay--and sometimes only to that essay.

There is one unpublished Th.D. dissertation, written in English by a Japanese, on theology in Japan that devotes considerable space to Takakura. There is also a smattering of English survey articles, written by Japanese Christian writers for English-language journals, that mention Takakura to one degree or another. Several of these will be cited at appropriate places in the thesis.
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examining a limited subject, and only through selected sermons.
Part I. The Life Context  
Which Shaped Takakura’s Thought:  
Takakura the Human Being

Understanding Takakura’s thought requires understanding Takakura as a human being. Biographical information is not simply a required introduction to the "meat" of the thesis. Rather, it shows the man that experienced, taught, lived, and wrote what he did, with the accompanying assumption that someone’s thought—if it is at all adequately to be understood--cannot be divorced from that person’s life and context.

The approach here is to spotlight, largely along chronological lines, the life and times of the man Takakura Tokutaro. In order to see most clearly his various facets, different aspects will be examined separately--much as different colours along the spectrum can be examined after being separated out of a beam of light with a prism. Thus although Takakura’s life and times form one unified picture, the complexity and multi-coloured nature of that picture necessitate this section’s proceeding to look at Takakura’s life and context under the following separate headings: home and family, personality and character, experience of Meiji through early Showa Japan, conversion to Christianity and subsequent career, and death.¹

A. Home and Family

Clearly an important part of any person’s thought involves the formation of personhood that takes place within close interpersonal relationships; Takakura certainly was no exception to this reality of life. In his own case, however, there were some particular elements within those relationships that make looking at his family ties indispensable for our study. This section will go up through Takakura’s

¹These headings will label the five subdivisions of Part I, A through E. In the last portion of subdivision C ("6. Religious Developments"), a few comments will be offered concerning the nature of the separate headings of Part I. In particular, these comments will speak to the headings within subdivision C, which deals with late Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa Japan. As to the order of the subdivisions, if Part I--termed here Takakura’s "Life Context"--were viewed as his "Life and Times," the middle section C would be seen to focus more on the "Times," whereas the rest of Part I to deal more directly with Takakura’s "Life."
adult years, thus including his own marriage and children. But we must begin, quite naturally, by looking at the family context within which he was nurtured as a child.

1. First Five Years

Takakura Tokutaro was born on 23 April 1885 (Meiji 18), in Ayabe Cho (town), a modest community situated in Ikaruga Gun (county) on the western edge of the Tanba Highlands of central Kyoto Prefecture. Tokutaro was the firstborn to his father Heibei and mother Sayo, the latter of whom was from nearby Fukuchiyama. Sayo had to return to Fukuchiyama upon being divorced by her husband when Tokutaro was five years old. Even so, the mother-son relationship continued over the ensuing years, both in terms of mutual affection and actual meetings.

Tokutaro’s father Heibei was in fact an adopted son, having been born in a neighbouring village and bearing the name, “Muraue Kumayoshi.” Tokutaro’s grandfather, also named Heibei, claimed ancestry originating in Ikaruga Gun, including several generations in Ayabe. Heibei needed a successor to carry on the Takakura name in Ayabe as well as to continue to develop the sizeable family

---

2Oshio Tsutomu, Takakura Tokutaro Den (Biography of Takakura Tokutaro). 2nd ed. Tokyo: Shinkyo Shuppansha, 1955, p.2. Due to its central place in the literature about Takakura, hereafter this work shall be referred to simply as Oshio, p.#. I am grateful to Charles Germany for lending me his copy of Oshio’s book.

Ayabe lies approximately fifty-five kilometres northwest of the city of Kyoto. Cf. Figure 1, ensuing page.

3Fukuchiyama is about fifteen miles west of Ayabe. Cf. Figure 1, ensuing page.

4Oshio, p.4.


6op.cit., p.3.

7He was the fourth generation to have been so named; in fact, the name officially was “Heibeitoru.”
fortune which had been accumulated through merchandising, particularly tools for producing silk thread. Heibei thus adopted Kumayoshi, renamed him Heibeito, and looked to him to bear the heavy family responsibilities in the future.

Figure 1. Takakura in Japan

When Tokutaro was one year old (in 1886; Meiji 19), someone stole the entire load of green tea that his father Heibei was transporting to sell at the port of Kobe.10

---

8That is, he renamed "Heibeito" the fifth.
9Takakura Yukie, 1992, p.11. The name "Yukie" will be affixed in continuing references for clarity’s sake.
10Oshio, pp.3-4. According to Takakura Yukie, this was Heibei’s first job. Ibid.
Declared an inept merchant by his (adopted) parents, and subsequently finding it difficult to continue living at home, Heibei accepted the offer of his good friend Hatano Tsurukichi to go to Joshu in order to learn silkworm culturing. Hatano advised Heibei that he could eventually return to Ayabe and improve what seemed to Hatano at least to be a deficient silk thread product there. Leaving behind his wife and young son in Ayabe, Heibei devoted himself for approximately the next three years to learning the silk industry. Apparently he never contacted his family in Ayabe during the entire period.12

During the 1880’s (second Meiji decade), that is during the time of Heibei’s sojourn there, Gumma Prefecture was an area particularly targeted by Congregational Churches and evangelists for evangelistic outreach. These efforts were largely associated with Doshisha in Kyoto and such well-known Congregationalist ministers as Ebina Danjo and Nishima Shimeta.13 Heibei came into contact with several Christians14 and congregations, observing their free lifestyle and determined spirit. Soon after returning home, Heibei confessed his faith and was baptised.15 Thus through his time away in Gumma, Heibei became the first channel for the entrance of Christianity into the Takakura family.16

Upon returning to Ayabe, Heibei did indeed reform silk production there,

11He went to the part of Joshu which is the southern part of present day Gumma Prefecture, approximately eighty kilometres northwest of Tokyo. Cf. Figure 1, previous page.

12Takakura Yukie, 1992, p.11.

13Oshio, p.5.

14Oshio even notes that Heibei came into contact with a Greek Orthodox believer named Fukuzawa. Ibid., pp.4,5.

15In a 26 January 1921 (Taisho 10) letter from Takakura to his father Heibei, the latter was congratulated on the thirtieth anniversary of his baptism, thus dating his baptism in early 1891 (Meiji 24). Takakura Tokutaro, Takakura Zenshu (Complete Works of Takakura). Vol.10. Tokyo: Takakura Zenshu Kankokai, 1937 (Showa 12), "Kashin" ("Family Correspondence"), p.267. Hereafter references to Takakura’s Zenshu will be listed as Zenshu, Vol.##, p.#.

16op.cit., p.6.
eventually assisting Hatano in beginning the still well-known Gunze company.\textsuperscript{17} However, the time spent apart from his wife had taken its toll to the extent that personal estrangement led to final separation and Sayo’s return to Fukuchiyama.\textsuperscript{18}

Several points about Takakura’s\textsuperscript{19} home and family life during his early years are worthy of comment at this point. One is that, unlike many of the well-known first generation, Meiji Era Protestant Church leaders such as Uchimura Kanzo and Uemura Masahisa, Takakura’s lineage was not samurai. Many of the first generation leaders’ samurai families, e.g., in Uemura’s case, had been displaced socially and become financially destitute. Takakura was from a well-to-do family,\textsuperscript{20} and this enabled him to proceed along an elitist educational course, then to pursue theological interests. Takakura’s merchant family background gave him a somewhat different perspective on Japan and its place in the world--and Christianity’s role therein--than those Christians of former samurai families. Such important differences between Takakura and first generation Christian leaders will be examined later in the thesis.

Another point is Takakura’s respective relationships with his mother, father, and grandparents. The close and continuing relationship with his mother has already been mentioned. Upon Heibe’s return home and Sayo’s subsequent dismissal, Takakura became "defiant and outwardly obstinate"\textsuperscript{21} toward his father, instances

\textsuperscript{17}Takakura Yukie, 1992, p.12.

\textsuperscript{18}op.cit., p.4. Oshio (cited by Takakura Yukie, Ibid., p.10), mentions that Heibe’s interest in Christianity was a factor in the couple’s divorce.

\textsuperscript{19}i.e., Tokutaro’s

\textsuperscript{20}Charles Germany specifically notes Takakura’s "sufficient" family income "so that as a child he never knew hardship." Charles H. Germany, Protestant Theologies in Modern Japan. Tokyo: International Institute for the Study of Religions Press, 1965, pp.89-90. In light of the central place which Germany’s essay has in the English material on Takakura--not to mention the importance of the entire book for what awareness there is of Japanese theology among English-speakers--hereafter this work shall be referred to simply as Germany, p.#.

\textsuperscript{21}Oshio, p.4.
of which will be mentioned shortly. Takakura's close relationship with his grandparents would have been expected in any Meiji, small town home, particularly with the special treatment given to the oldest son. That Takakura's father was adopted,22 considered a business failure by his parents, then further estranged from his family by his attraction to Christianity23 would have served only to strengthen Takakura's own relationship with his grandparents and wider family. Takakura's letters to his family over the years24 indeed testify to his continuing close relationship with them. This was particularly the case with his grandmother, up until her death in 1918 (Taisho 7).25

2. Two Stepmothers, Relationship with Father

Takakura's home and family situation only grew more interesting upon his father's remarriage to Yamamoto Kimiko in February, 1893 (Meiji 26). At that time, Tokutaro was still only seven years old and completing his first year of elementary school. Heibei met his new wife at the Tango Miyazu Church,26 where he frequently attended meetings in the midst of his family strain and loneliness.27 Kimiko's Christian zeal greatly encouraged Heibei, and she must have been a key

22Takakura Yukie notes how Tokutaro was viewed as the only "true" Takakura son, and that amidst his grandparents' "dotage" and "infatuation" he was permitted to disregard his parents' instructions. Takakura Yukie, 1992, p.9.

23The important question of what his father's and his grandparents' religious affiliations meant for Takakura himself will be considered later.

24These letters begin in Takakura's junior high school days. They have been reproduced in Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," pp.170ff.

25Ibid., p.260.

26Miyazu is located near the Japan Sea Coast, almost thirty kilometres north of Ayabe. Cf. Figure 1 above, Part I, p.16. (To give a measure of assistance to the reader, cross-references to previous passages or notes which are within the same Part--or Chapter in the case of Part II--will include the word "above.")

27It is interesting to note as well that it was Heibei's friend Hatano Tsurukichi who served as go-between for arranging the couple’s marriage. Hatano himself had become a Christian, and with Heibei's later assistance he founded the Gunze company on Christian principles, particularly in its treatment of female employees. Takakura Yukie, 1992, p.12.
factor in her husband’s continuing, active church involvement.\textsuperscript{28}

Even though Kimiko’s presence was an encouragement to her husband, this did \textit{not} prove to be the case with her stepson. Viewing his stepmother as a persecutor, Takakura fought back with numerous attacks and counterattacks of rebellion and spite.\textsuperscript{29} However, this attitude softened somewhat during Takakura’s junior high school years. While attending school in Tokyo, he actually lived with Kimiko’s (Christian) family there.\textsuperscript{30} Furthermore, during Takakura’s third and final year of junior high school—while he was preparing for the crucial high school entrance examinations—Kimiko died suddenly of typhoid fever on 22 September 1902 (Meiji 35).\textsuperscript{31} Perhaps in an attitude of penance, Takakura switched in his posture towards Kimiko’s daughter Hatsue,\textsuperscript{32} proving thereafter to be a kind and caring older brother.\textsuperscript{33} Takakura’s similar affection for his still younger stepbrother, and step-siblings born later, can be seen in his family correspondence.\textsuperscript{34}

The following February, 1903 (Meiji 36), Takakura’s father married Kimiko’s younger sister Chiyoko,\textsuperscript{35} who was also a Christian. Thus by the time Takakura had turned eighteen years old, he had his third mother.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{28}Oshio, pp.10-11.
\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., pp.13-14.
\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., p.15.
\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., p.311.
\textsuperscript{32}I.e., Takakura’s stepsister
\textsuperscript{33}op.cit., p.14.
\textsuperscript{34}Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," pp.170ff.
\textsuperscript{35}op.cit., p.15.
\textsuperscript{36}Takakura’s letters home indicate Chiyoko’s active church involvement, Christian nurture of her children, etc. Also, in his letters Takakura shows no hostility towards either stepmother from his junior high days on. op.cit.
Two other incidents occurred prior to Takakura's own marriage that strained his relationship with his parents, particularly his father. One involved his engagement to the second daughter of the pastor of the Congregational Church in Ayabe. Upon visiting home on his vacations from high school in Kanazawa, Takakura became attracted to Uchida Terue. The summer of 1906 (Meiji 39), that is after Takakura had graduated from high school and was preparing to go to Tokyo and enter the Imperial University, saw the young pair growing particularly fond of each other. The relationship continued for another two years until Takakura entered seminary in Tokyo in 1908 (Meiji 41) to pursue theological studies. At that point the engagement was called off, causing considerable embarrassment to the Takakura family.

The second incident was also associated with Takakura's decision to pursue theological studies in 1908 (Meiji 41). According to his own childhood dream—and according to the concurrent wishes of his father as well—to become a foreign minister or politician, Takakura was studying in the elite Tokyo Imperial University. Having found legal studies personally unsatisfactory and unfulfilling, however, Takakura decided to transfer to the Tokyo Shingakusha Shingakko (Seminary). This small school was headed by Uemura Masahisa, from whom Takakura had received baptism in December, 1906 (Meiji 39). Besides this decision dashing any hopes for future prestigious government-related career

37It is interesting to note that the engagement ceremony was given by Hatano Tsurukichi.

38Kanazawa is located near the Japan Sea Coast, approximately 185 kilometres northeast of Ayabe. Cf. Figure 1 above, Part I, p.16.

39Likely the engagement was called of by Terue’s mother, who did not want her daughter married to a poor pastor. Oshio, pp.35-41.

40One can see this, for example, in Takakura’s February, 1903 (Meiji 36), letter to his father, just prior to his finishing junior high school. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," p.171.

41Uemura’s role in Takakura’s life and thought will be discussed extensively later in the thesis.
possibilities, it closed off receiving special scholarship funds which Takakura’s father had arranged for him to receive from his home country, Ikaruga Gun. Takakura’s decision thus not only trampled on his father’s wishes for his eldest son, but it again caused considerable embarrassment. A sharp exchange of telegrams between father and son reveals the depth of hurt caused to both through this incident.42

3. Marriage and Children

Following graduation from seminary in 1910 (Meiji 43) and one year of voluntary military service, Takakura was married to Sera Senko at Uemura’s Fujimicho Church 2 May 1912 (Meiji 45), with Uemura officiating. Uemura had recommended Miss Sera to Takakura, and with the particular help of an influential woman in the church, Komoto Kameko, had arranged the marriage and ceremony. Senko’s family was of “imperial noble” lineage and “very feudalistic.”43 Although she was sometimes criticised by, and distant from, her husband,44 Senko remained Takakura’s wife the rest of his life.

Takakura’s first three offspring were girls. His first daughter, Mitsuko, was born on 19 March 1913 (Taisho 2).45 Particularly in Takakura’s later years of illness, Mitsuko was the person closest to him. She bore the brunt of caring for her father, and she would accompany him on trips for rest and recreation.46 Probably due to the family’s recent move to Sapporo on the northern island of Hokkaido, Senko miscarried the Takakura’s second daughter in November of 1913 (Taisho 2). This

42Oshio, pp.44-48.

43Ibid., pp.63-67. Noting this perhaps gives some insight into some of Uemura’s prestigious connections.

44Cf., e.g., Takakura Yukie, 1992, p.56.

45op.cit., p.68. On page 313, Oshio incorrectly lists the birth date as 15 March.

event naturally produced terrible grief for Takakura. Another girl, Kazuko, was born in October, 1914 (Taisho 3). However, the following autumn she suddenly contracted intestinal pneumonia, and despite extensive medical efforts she died one week later. Oshio describes Kazuko’s death as a "source of unforgettable sadness throughout Takakura’s lifetime." At the same time, the tragedy gave rise to some "unfulfillment, discord, and estrangement" between Takakura and his wife Senko.

In September of 1916 (Taisho 5), Takakura’s son Toru was born. He later followed in his father’s footsteps in becoming a pastor, and he eventually held such responsible ecclesiastical positions as General Secretary of the United Church of Japan. Nobuko, a girl, was born in September, 1918 (Taisho 7). The youngest child--another daughter--Keiko was born on 7 April 1926 (Taisho 15). She later married Sato Toshio, the well-known United Church of Christ pastor, professor at Union Theological Seminary in Tokyo, and recognised authority on Takakura.

Takakura had to be away from his wife and children for two and one-half years

---

47 op.cit., p.75.  
48 Ibid., p.76.  
49 Ibid., p.79. According to a 20 April 1994 conversation with Toyama Mitsuko, "Toru" is from "Heibeitoru," thus making him the sixth generation of Takakura to bear the name. Apparently, Tokutaro was not named "Heibeitoru" due his father’s relative youth and good health when Tokutaro himself was born.  
50 Toru is incorrectly identified as "General Secretary Takakura Tokutaro" in David Reid, New Wine: The Cultural Shaping of Japanese Christianity. Berkeley, California: Asian Humanities Press, 1991, p.84.  
51 Oshio, p.79.  
52 Ibid., p.316. This was after Takakura returned to Japan from his overseas study in Britain, to be discussed later.  
while he studied in Britain from 1921 to 1924 (Taisho 10-13). Nevertheless, Takakura's affection for his family was intense, and his love for and commitment to serve them upon his return to Japan was deep. From the time of Takakura's return from Britain, however, his family was "engulfed" by the "bewilderment" of the "whirlpool" of Takakura's intense activity and "harsh personality," interrupting what had been for them a rewardingly peaceful and happy period of living in Ayabe.

The remaining ten years of Takakura's life left both happy memories in the minds of his children, as well as feelings of fear produced by a capricious father. These kind of comments help bring to even greater urgency the question of Takakura's personality and character, which we will consider next.

B. Personality and Character

Japanese terms often used to describe Takakura's personality carry such English meanings as "violent" or "fierce," as well as "intense" or "strong." His Christian faith was "passionate," his writing style "frank" and "fearless," his public stance on issues "resolute." Interestingly, in comparison to some other

54 op.cit., pp.145-146.
56 Ibid., p.50; Toyama, 1964, pp.6-8.
59 "netsuretsu" 
60 "goho" and "hotan"; op.cit.
61 "takumashi" or "kizen"; Ibid., pp.330,335.
public figures, Takakura is perceived as a "dynamic" personality, and as having had an erratic, "darting" preaching style. Takakura’s biographer Oshio sums him up as a "peculiar" or "unique" person.

As a child, Takakura is uniformly recognised to have been spoiled, arrogant, headstrong, and mischievous, although there is no evidence that he necessarily was an excessively bad boy. As noted above, Takakura openly expressed his hostility towards his first stepmother, and a certain obstinacy relative to his father continued into Takakura’s adult years. One could also infer that the child’s inflated self-esteem helped to fuel Takakura’s continuing dream to become a famous, influential politician upon reaching adulthood.

Descriptions of Takakura’s early development as an adult and as a Christian thinker—including Takakura’s own self-description—invariably begin with his

62This term "doteki" was suggested by Akiyama Norie in a meeting on 19 April 1994.

63This is according to one analyst’s description of Takakura’s preaching in comparison with Uemura, Uchimura, and Yamashita Gunpei—all of whom will be considered later. Meeting with Obata Susumu, 22 November 1993.

64"tokui"; Oshio, "Hashigaki" ("Preface"), p.2.


66Oshio, p.13.

67The following is true at least of descriptions of Takakura in Japanese. This is not the case with Germany’s chapter on Takakura, for example. Cf. Introduction, p.13.

struggle over the problem of the "self." 69 Furthermore, these descriptions all quote Takakura’s remark written in his high school boarding house memorial album, "The thing one should love the most is oneself." 70 Coupling such characterisations of Takakura’s early adult years with those of his childhood "arrogance" leads to a fairly consistent, clear picture of an egotistical, difficult-to-live-with human being.

Other factors come into play, however, through both Takakura’s own writings and further descriptions of his character by others. Together these paint a picture of Takakura’s personality that turns out appearing slightly more complex than the prematurely viewed portrait described above. That is, these further characterisations lead to an affirmation of Takakura as not only "fierce" and "intense," but also--to use Oshio’s more complete phraseology--"peculiar" and "unique." For example, coupled with "explosions of righteous indignation" which would leave his hearers "trembling" were times of good temper filled with "joke telling and frolicking wit" that would make "even a pessimist have a broad smile." 71 There was in fact deep affection within Takakura’s family, and there were times of fun and games. 72 Personally, Takakura often preferred quiet solitude and times of meditation. 73 And in the openness and frankness of Takakura’s writings, what emerges is a genuinely humble self-deprecation, as well

---

69 The equivalent term here is "jiga," although "jiko" is used as well. Cf., e.g., Oshio, p.33; Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.389-395; Fukuda Masatoshi, "Takakura Sensei no Naiteki Hatten ni tsuite" ("Concerning Professor Takakura’s Inner Development") Shingaku to Kyokai (Theology and Church) 1, No.1, 1934 (Showa 9), pp.142-154.

70 "Mottomo aisubeki mono ha jiko nari." op.cit., in Oncho no Okoku, p.1; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.18. This saying of Takakura’s is quoted in Oshio, p.33; Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.390; Fukuda, 1934, p.146.


72 Toyama, 1964, p.8.

73 This comes out, for instance, in his description of his life on board ship travelling to Britain. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," p.269.
as a heartfelt need and appreciation of friends and acquaintances.\textsuperscript{74} The view, therefore, of Takakura as a person of "wilful, selfish demeanour"\textsuperscript{75} needs to be balanced and tempered with elements of warmth, humility, and humour.

Pleasant qualities notwithstanding, the strength and intensity of Takakura's personality must be given its due weight. A weak person would have been incapable of "giving up the promise of security and recognition...channelled toward the graduates of Tokyo Imperial University...to enter a small theological seminary of from twenty to thirty students...,"\textsuperscript{76} and that against his own father's wishes. No weak person would have been able to stand up to and oppose such an imposing figure as Uemura Masahisa, something that Takakura did on more than one occasion.\textsuperscript{77} It also took a strong, intense person to carry the heavy responsibilities that Takakura did, as well as to command the amount of respect that was afforded him.

\textsuperscript{74}These aspects of Takakura's writings are expressed as explicit ideals to be cultivated in, e.g., "Juryo no Oncho" ("Acceptance of Grace"), in Takakura Tokutaro, \textit{Oncho to Shomei (Grace and Calling)}. Tokyo: Nagasaki Shoten, 1926 (Showa 1), pp.23-30; Zenshu, Vol.1, pp.434-440. \textit{Oncho to Shomei} was Takakura's third major publication; hereafter references to it shall be listed as \textit{Oncho to Shomei}, p.#.

\textsuperscript{75}"katte na furumai"; Takakura Yukie, 1992, p.58.

\textsuperscript{76}Germany, p.90.

\textsuperscript{77}The fact that Uemura was Takakura's teacher made it even more difficult to oppose him. One instance of a disagreement which Takakura had with Uemura was over the future of the seminary, as recorded in Sato, 1983, pp.124-125. Cf. also Takakura's public acknowledgement, "My obstinate heart was not humble before [Uemura] Sensei ['Teacher']" ("Watashi no katakuna na kokoro ha sensei no mae ni hanburu ni narienakatta"). This is in Takakura's preface to his second book, \textit{Oncho to Shinjitsu (Grace and Truth)}, published just a few weeks after Uemura's death. "Oncho to Shinjitsu--Jo ni Kaete" ("Grace and Truth--A Substitute for a Preface"), in Takakura Tokutaro, \textit{Oncho to Shinjitsu}. Tokyo: Nagasaki Shoten, 1925 (Taisho 14), p.31; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.2, p.31.

Hereafter references to \textit{Oncho to Shinjitsu} shall be listed as \textit{Oncho to Shinjitsu}, p.#.
There are some possible explanations as to why Takakura was as intense—even ferociously so—as he was. In addition to the pain of losing two children, from an early age Takakura had a chronic gastro-intestinal sickness which plagued him to his last days.\textsuperscript{78} The combination of constant physiological pain and deep hurt associated with one’s family can give rise to any number of personality "disorders," including unpleasant outbursts of anger. Another explanation of Takakura’s "fearlessness" and "fierceness" is his having been brought up in the rough, wild Tanba Highlands of central Japan.\textsuperscript{79} Theologically speaking, one can always appeal to God’s Providence in seeking to explain the formation of such a unique personality as Takakura.

C. Experience of Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa Japan

Before continuing with Takakura’s biographical sketch, we need to widen our view to consider his historical context. His was a period of rapid and decisive change; here we can touch on just a few of the many highlights. We will selectively consider various aspects of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Japanese society within which Takakura lived and thought. Emerging as a lad from the cradle of his family’s care, his first entrance into society was through the education system. With that topic we shall thus begin our discussion as well.

1. Education - National System

Takakura’s formal education began in April, 1892 (Meiji 25), when he entered the Ayabe Cho administered ordinary elementary school. He graduated from that school in March, four years later. April, 1896 (Meiji 29), saw him enter the Ikaruga Gun higher elementary school; again, four years later in March, he graduated. From April, 1900 (Meiji 33) through March, 1903 (Meiji 36), Takakura attended junior high school in Tokyo. He then spent three years at the prestigious Fourth High School in Kanazawa, from September, 1903 (Meiji 36), through June,
1906 (Meiji 39). In September, 1906 (Meiji 39), Takakura embarked on the long sought-after goal of studies in the German Legal Studies Department of the Faculty of Law, Tokyo Imperial University.80

It is very important to note when Takakura went through the education system. Approximately two decades before Takakura started school in 1892 (Meiji 25), the new Meiji government faced the difficult task of transforming the 280 feudal domains that emerged out of the two and one-half centuries-long Tokugawa Era into a unified nation-state. A national educational system, using uniform teaching materials and a standardised dialect, was seen to be one of the crucial elements in creating national loyalty among the populace.81 The organisational fountainhead of this effort, the Ministry of Education, was thus established in 1871 (Meiji 4). The following year saw the promulgation of the Fundamental Code of Education, emphasising the universal and utilitarian nature of education throughout the nation.82

The Education Ministry’s task was made easier by a strong existing educational tradition in most parts of Japan. Many samurai youth were educated in official feudal domain schools. Commoners, too, were able to attend private academies and village "terakoya" ("temple schools"), so named due to their normal location in the local village Buddhist temple. By the mid-nineteenth century, this vast array of schools had produced a male population that was forty-five percent literate, along with a fifteen percent literate female population.83 It should be noted as well that this education which the generation prior to Takakura’s received was often along

80Oshio, pp.10,14-15,22,44,312.


traditional, Confucian and "Bushido" ("Samurai Spirit") lines and emphases.84

Administratively, the new educational system was initially based on the highly centralised French model,85 but soon shifted to a more locally controlled American style;86 throughout, American and English materials were used extensively.87 Insofar, then, as the generation previous to Takakura encountered this new system, they were educated within a more Anglo-Saxon framework.88

The two decades following the 1868 Meiji Restoration had seen the free importation of Western institutions, technology, customs, and ideas. However, in the last few years of the 1880's (late Meiji 20's and early 30's), there was a predictable conservative reaction, shifting the trend towards national consolidation.89 Since Germany was perceived to be the most congenial Western counterpart to Imperial Japan, there was an accompanying general drift towards things German, including German pedagogical ideas.90 Thus by the time Takakura attended school in the two decades surrounding the turn of the century (approximately the third and fourth Meiji decades), he studied the German language

---

84At least this was the case for Uemura, Uchimura, and Ebina. Sato, 1983, p.13.

85op.cit., p.168.


89See the section below on Takakura's experience of Japan's political situation.

90Passin, 1965, p.150. Gluck describes the shift as follows: "The elementary curriculum...shifted from an Anglo-American egalitarian emphasis on the individual intellect...to a mixture of Confucian and European elitism and moral emphasis that used texts ranging from the most ancient Analects to the latest Herbertian example." Gluck, 1985, p.19.
and was generally nourished within a German style of education. Of course, the Japanese foundation underlying the system of education, throughout both the early and later periods, must not be forgotten. As one observer has noted: "The educational system [was] adapted from a combination of European and American models superimposed on traditional concepts.... [T]he result was thoroughly Japanese for the borrowed elements were quickly modified by the unique native environment and psychology."92

The famous Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890 (Meiji 23)93 should be noted at this point. As examined briefly above, in the late 1880's (late Meiji 20's and early 30's) there was a "nationalistic resurgence"; this movement "swept to its


In the dominant Anglo-French tradition the primacy of sense perception and the validity of empirical procedures were taken for granted as naturally as the supremacy of the 'idea' was accepted in Germany. And from these assumptions there followed certain familiar consequences: utilitarianism and positivism, democracy and natural science, in Britain and France became logical sets of partners. In Germany it was quite otherwise. Hence there came about that parting of the ways, that separation of Germany from the main stream of Western European social thought, which was to torment the minds of Ernst Troeltsch and Friedrich Meinecke. Why was it, they asked themselves, that from 'shallow' philosophies of history and society the British and the French had been able to develop political practices that were both viable and humane, whereas the Germans, with their 'deeper' understanding, not only had failed to achieve a social equilibrium, but as the twentieth century advanced, were ever more obviously succumbing to the 'demon' of naked physical power?


climax in the Imperial Rescript...."\textsuperscript{94} The Rescript is essentially filled with Confucian ideals, stressing loyalty and duty within Confucian-style relationships. The duties of the Japanese citizenry to the imperial throne are particularly emphasised. The document was treated with great reverence, and was required by law to be read regularly and with great sobriety at all schools throughout Japan.\textsuperscript{95}

Like all of his contemporaries, then, Takakura would have been quite familiar with the contents of the Rescript, and he would have been taught through it the basic posture of reverence towards the Japanese Emperor. While on the one hand teaching a Confucian framework of life's relationships that was similar to the mindset of the previous generation, on the other hand the new Meiji Era educational system, particularly after 1890 (Meiji 23), emphasised to the younger generation a specifically national, imperial focus of ultimate loyalty that was both new and strong.

Furthermore, not only was the Rescript itself strongly emphasised in the schools. The overall curriculum which Takakura would have been taught was based on the spirit of the Rescript. This was particularly the case in the course termed "morals,"\textsuperscript{96} but other courses as well embodied the Rescript's nationalistic, Confucian ideals. Note, for example, the following descriptions of the purposes of teaching Japanese history and geography at the higher elementary level:

> The object of instruction in Japanese history is to give the children the outline of the evolution of Japanese nationality, and to foster in them the sense of honor of becoming subjects of this Empire.

\textsuperscript{94}Passin, 1965, p.91.


\textsuperscript{96}"Part II, Elementary Education," in \textit{Education in Japan; Prepared for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis, U.S.A}. Japan: Department of Education, 1904, pp.11-12. "Morals" was also part of the required curriculum through high school. "Part III, Secondary Education ['middle schools']," p.4; "Part IV, Higher Education" (according to p.2, "schools preparatory to the universities"), p.3.
The object of instruction in geography is to give the children a general knowledge of the earth’s surface and the life of its inhabitants and also to enable them to form a general conception of this Empire with reference to its geographical position, so as to foster the spirit of patriotism at the same time.97

Takakura’s generation of school children were thus taught a love of their country through the entire, nationally-uniform curriculum, beginning at the elementary level and extending throughout all the years of their formal education.98

The entire course curriculum that Takakura studied was as follows:

In "ordinary elementary" school (first four years): morals, the Japanese language, arithmetic, and gymnastics.

In "higher elementary" school: the above four subjects, plus Japanese history, geography, science, drawing, and singing.99

In "middle" school: "morals, Japanese, Chinese-classics, foreign languages, history, geography, mathematics, natural history, physics, chemistry, law and economics, drawing, singing and gymnastics."100

In the "higher" school.101 morals, Japanese language and Chinese classics, two out of three foreign languages: English, German, or French, with an option for those students intending to enter the Faculty of Law to study Latin, history, logic and psychology, "first


98Following Japan’s victory in its war with Russia in 1905 (Meiji 38), compulsory education was increased from four to six years in order to equip the populace to bear its increasing economic and political responsibilities. Hugh L. Kennleyside and A.F. Thomas, History of Japanese Education and Present Educational System. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1937, p.105.

99op. cit., p.11.


101There were three sections or courses of study, depending on the intended faculty in university. Takakura would have been in the first course of study, i.e., that for students planning on eventually entering the Department of Law or of Literature.
principles of law,” and gymnastics.102

The higher school education was further described as follows:

But, intellectual culture, important as it is, is not all that is looked for from these institutions. As students in the higher schools are about twenty years old,—an age well fitted for the cultivation of their moral character, they are placed under strict supervision and careful protection. To this end, all the higher schools are provided with dormitories, and careful attention is given to instruction in gymnastics, with uniform good results in the matter of students’ health, conduct, and scholastic achievement.103

In Kanazawa, Takakura attended the fourth of the only eight national high schools, entrance into all of which was highly competitive.104 According to the pattern described above he lived in dormitories,105 situations which fostered close interaction between teachers and students. In Takakura’s case, however, participation in gymnastics was difficult due to his chronic abdominal illness;106 undoubtedly he was an exception to the "uniform good results" achieved in "students’ health.”

Takakura’s relatively poor health did in fact, however, help to afford him a golden opportunity that otherwise he might not have had. Takakura did not feel well enough to participate in a school parade on 11 January 1905 (Meiji 38). The event was to celebrate the news of the fall of Port Arthur, a major victory in Japan’s war with Russia. Due to the festivities, the following day was also a holiday, so after

102op.cit., "Section IV, Higher Education," p.3. Regarding which foreign languages Takakura studied in high school, as noted previously he definitely studied German. In a 13 October 1906 (Meiji 39) letter written to his parents, i.e., during his first term at the Imperial University, Takakura mentions attending French class three times a week. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," p.188.


104Passin, 1965, p.103.

105Takakura was in three dormitories during his high school years. Oshio, p.26.

106Ibid. However, Oshio also mentions periods of strength and relatively good health during Takakura’s high school years.
studying in the morning Takakura called on his German instructor and assistant school dean, Professor Mitake, that afternoon. During their conversation, Takakura, in the midst of his fatigue and "vague discomfort," was lamenting the general frivolity and lack of sincerity that characterised his interaction with most of the other students. Mitake responded by inviting Takakura to move into the Sansan Juku, a private boarding school where students and teachers alike sought to build a community in which free expression of opinions between everyone was encouraged. After some reflection, and after attending two meetings in which the Sansan Juku’s teachers were active participants, Takakura entered the dormitory--"a major turning point in his life"--on February 26.107 He remained a resident there until graduation in June of the following year.

Through the boarding school’s communal-style of daily life--especially including the close interaction with the professors--Takakura began to mature rapidly.108 Furthermore, the stimulating environment of the Sansan Juku was particularly enhanced for Takakura through two significant individuals. One of these was the pastor of the local Nihon Kirisuto Kyokai ("Japan Christ Church," hereafter referred to as NKK) church, Tominaga Tokuma. The three years that Tominaga pastored in Kanazawa coincided with Takakura’s three years there.109 Also, it so happened that Tominaga was a close acquaintance with one of the high school teachers who was none other than the principal of Takakura’s own Sansan Juku.110 The friendship between that teacher and Tominaga contributed to several joint lectures, as well as informal "consultations" which involved the dormitory students, held at

108 Ibid., p.32.
110 Unuma Hiroko, "Nishida Kitaro to Kirisutoshatachi" ("Nishida Kitaro and Christians") Seisho to Kyokai (Bible and Church) January, 1980, p.49.
the church.\textsuperscript{111} It is difficult to know how often Takakura might have attended various church functions per se. In any case, it is possible that, while he was a student in Kanazawa, Takakura would have heard and even met Uemura Masahisa: Uemura travelled to Kanazawa and spoke in Tominaga’s church,\textsuperscript{112} the latter having earlier studied under Uemura.\textsuperscript{113} Moreover, besides indirectly through others, Tominaga made a "deep impression" on Takakura personally through his "grave and dignified original, foundational style of living."\textsuperscript{114}

The second significant individual was the teacher who was Tominaga’s friend, Nishida Kitaro.\textsuperscript{115} Examination of the extent of Nishida’s influence on Takakura must be postponed until later in the thesis. Suffice it here to say that it was indeed an "interesting historical scene"\textsuperscript{116} in Takakura’s life to have had Nishida as one of the three or four teachers who were intimately involved with the boarding school where Takakura spent the latter half of his high school years. Just a few years after

\textsuperscript{111}op.cit., p.30.


\textsuperscript{113}op.cit., p.29.

\textsuperscript{114}Ibid., p.30. Tominaga became well-known within the Christian world in Japan during the period following his years in Kanazawa. This was especially the case after he authored several widely-read books, e.g., Kirisutokyo Shinkai (A New Understanding of Christianity), published in 1909 (Meiji 42). This work is cited by Sato as one of the scholarly works that began to be produced by the Christian world in Japan in the Meiji 40’s. Sato Toshio, in Furuya Yasuo, ed., Nihon Shingakushi (History of Japanese Theology). Tokyo: Yorudansha, 1992, p.64. I am grateful to Professor Furuya for directing my attention to this book.

\textsuperscript{115}Nishida went on to become professor of philosophy at Kyoto University from 1913 to 1928 (Taisho 2 - Showa 3). He has been regarded as the founder of the Kyoto School of Philosophy. Abe Masao, "Nishida’s Philosophy of Place" International Philosophical Quarterly 28, No.4, Issue No.112, December, 1988, p.355(n.2). Professor Abe was kind enough to send me this article.

\textsuperscript{116}Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.390.
having Takakura as a student, Nishida produced in 1911 (Meiji 44) his *Zen no Kenkyu (A Study of Good)*. This was "the first and most representative fruit" of the initial efforts by "Japanese philosophers...to systematize their own thought through their own speculation yet by means of the method of Western thought."¹¹⁷ Also, speaking generally of Nishida, many would echo the remarks of one analyst: "Without doubt...Nishida...is the most outstanding philosopher of modern Japan."¹¹⁸ To have interacted that closely with so powerful an intellect as Nishida would have left an impression on anyone, especially a twenty-year old who was grappling with the great issues of life.¹¹⁹ Furthermore, the student-teacher relationship within which Takakura knew Nishida only amplified the broad-ranged influence Takakura received, i.e., not just knowledge, but also moral virtue.¹²⁰

With his graduation from high school and entrance into the Imperial University in Tokyo, Takakura’s educational experience in many ways had exemplified the best of what the famous Minister of Education, Mori Arinori, had envisioned when he establish[ed] a dual system: on the one hand a compulsory sector heavily indoctrinated in the spirit of morality and nationalism; on the other, a university sector for the elite in an atmosphere of the greatest possible academic freedom and critical rationalism. Although the freedom of the university involved a certain degree of risk, Mori felt that it was minimized by the fact that all students would come to it only after a thorough indoctrination in the lower schools.... Mori...tried to formulate his own nationalism....: the need


¹¹⁸Abe, 1988, p.355.

¹¹⁹Oshio includes some reflections by another student concerning Nishida as a teacher in Kanazawa; the comments reveal the depth of Nishida’s penetrating influence, including even through the look of his eyes. Oshio, pp.31-32. In a different article (mentioned earlier), Oshio elaborates on the likelihood of Nishida’s significant influence on Takakura. Oshio, No.1, 1954, pp.60-63.

to create a 'new' Japanese individual, not 'subject' but 'citizen', one equipped in education and mentality to accept his personal responsibility for the fate of the country....

Of course, Takakura's leaving the University Law Faculty to pursue theological studies broke the ideal pattern. And surely neither Mori Arinori, nor anyone else, ever envisioned one of Japan's promising elite government officials travelling to Britain for over two years to conduct further Christian theological research. These major aberrations notwithstanding, however, Takakura's formal education—which began soon after the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education—must be considered exemplary: indoctrination in conservative morality forming the foundation of critical and creative thinking. Like many of his contemporaries, Takakura emerged from the process as "a 'new' Japanese individual..., equipped in education and mentality to accept his personal responsibility for the fate of the country."

2. Japan's International Standing - War and Nationalism

What was Japan's "fate" among the world of nations during Takakura's lifetime? One recent writer has compared Japan's level of influence at the turn of the twentieth century to that of the United States, which had just stepped onto the world stage.

---

121 Passin, 1965, pp.88-89.

122 Takakura did, however, manage to continue his enrolment in the Imperial University while he studied in seminary. He took Uemura's advice to transfer to the Faculty of Literature, due to its being more compatible with religious studies. Thus, for example, Takakura was able to study Buddhism under the eminent scholar Anesaki. Chosakushi, Vol.1, "Takakura Tokutaro Ryaku Nenpu" ("Outline of Takakura Tokutaro's Personal Chronological History"), p.378; Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," pp.214,215.

Takakura's long-time friend, and Japan's first eminent church historian, Ishihara Ken, suggests that Takakura's retaining his place in the Imperial University was to avoid compulsory military conscription. Ishihara Ken, "Takakura Tokutaro Ron" ("Thesis on Takakura Tokutaro") Fukuin to Sekai No.3, 1964, p.12.

123 August, 1921 (Taisho 10) to January, 1924 (Taisho 13); Oshio, pp.92,144.

124 Of course, the meaning of "world of nations" must not simply be uncritically assumed, for one's "world" is determined by where and when one lives.
international scene\(^{125}\) with its 1898 military triumph over Spain. Japan, for its part, had "emerged from age-old seclusion in 1868, and then amazed the world by its alliance with the most powerful of the Great Powers, Britain, in 1902 and by its overthrow of another great Power, Russia, three years later."\(^{126}\) A citizen of Japan's fellow newly emerged power, the United States, and a person who had spent many years in China, asserted the following in 1918 (Taisho 7), when Takakura would have been thirty-three years old:

Japan's future is inseparably bound up with that of China. It is certain, too, that the rapid rise to prominence of the Far East during the past half century is to be no transient phenomenon. Japan and China are for better or for worse to bulk increasingly large in world affairs and will need more than ever before to be taken into consideration by Europe and America.\(^{127}\)

Forty-nine years later, Yoshida Shigeru\(^{128}\) summarised in his provocatively-titled book, *Japan's Decisive Century: 1867-1967*, Japan's "rapid rise to prominence... during the past [counting back from 1918] half century" as follows:

The passing of the Emperor Meiji in 1912...marked the end of a chapter in the history of modern Japan.... [T]he work of bringing into being a Japan characterized by a spirit of adventure was over. The mobilization of the younger generation was complete. The second phase of the modernization process then began, and the country had to face a difficult period of transition and adjustment.

Viewed in the perspective of history, this transitional period began with the Russo-Japanese War.... By its victory in that conflict, Japan not only made its independence secure--thus achieving a goal the nation had set for itself at the time of the Meiji restoration--but it

\(^{125}\)Here, the "international scene" means at least the "Eurocentric" scene which formed the backdrop to "World" War I.


\(^{128}\)Yoshida was prime minister of Japan for two terms totalling seven years between 1946 and 1954. Reischauer, 1981, p.257.
also attained overnight the status of a major power.\textsuperscript{129}

Combining these two sets of insights voiced by representatives of American (with a Chinese angle) and Japanese perspectives, the following characterisations of Japan’s international status during the Meiji Era can be made:

1. Japan’s Meiji Era goals of growth were a combination of both domestic and foreign policies.\textsuperscript{130} "Mobilization" and "modernization" were the partners of Japan’s "rise to [international] prominence" and making "its independence secure" from Western aggression. In fact, Japan’s opening its two centuries-long closed doors to the West in 1854, after U.S. Navy Admiral Perry’s "Black Ships" had sailed into Tokyo Bay "offering" (read "demanding") trade relations, was at once the outcome of intense internal political conflict and dynamic socio-economic change, as well as acquiescing to outside pressure.\textsuperscript{131} Furthermore, the "Restoration" of imperial reign in 1868 officially replaced over two-and-a-half centuries of Tokugawa shogunate rule. That new order was further consolidated by the successful suppression of the 1877 (Meiji 12) "Satsuma Rebellion," a military resistance to imperial rule by a group of discontented samurai in western Japan. Thus not only was Japan’s domestic politico-economic path directed towards becoming a unified, national imperial power. In terms of foreign policy, Japan’s decision to resist colonisation by the West by means of opening itself to the West had clearly been made.\textsuperscript{132}

2. Japan’s love-hate relationship with China was intensified. Japan had


\textsuperscript{130}Educational policy is a clear example of this.

\textsuperscript{131}Although referring specifically to the 1868 Meiji Restoration, the following remark applies to the events of the immediately preceding decade as well: "The Meiji Restoration...was the product of complex changes which had been at work for a number of decades...[:] economic, intellectual, and political...." Ike Nobutaka, \textit{The Beginnings of Political Democracy in Japan}. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1950, p.7. Ike later refers to "The conjunction of two crises in the middle of the nineteenth century: the internal economic crisis and the external pressure of the Western powers...." p.188.

\textsuperscript{132}Since only well-known historical events are included in the explanation here and throughout this section of the thesis, many of them will not be specifically referenced. Please see the Bibliography for sources describing such historical events.
borrowed much from her larger, western neighbour over the centuries: written language, political structure, forms of Buddhism and Confucianism, countless expressions of culture. Having seen China in some ways overrun by the expanding West, Japan determined that she would not suffer the same fate.\textsuperscript{133} War with China over control of the Korean Peninsula broke out in 1894 (Meiji 27), with Japan emerging victorious. Japan later claimed full control over Korea by annexing it in 1910 (Meiji 43). However, despite such hostilities (including the later fighting leading directly into World War II), Japan continued to see itself fundamentally as an Asian ally to China versus the West.

3. Japan's victory over Russia in their 1904-05 (Meiji 37-38) war was a significant turning point. Having just three years earlier (1902, Meiji 35) signed the Anglo-Japanese Alliance with Britain—"which was the first truly equal alliance between a Western nation and a non-Western one\textsuperscript{134}—Japan had achieved its national security goal by meeting, and indeed defeating, the West on the latter's own terms, i.e. economic and military power. At this point, however, Japan had to make the transition to bearing the responsibility of its newly-found strength.

So far the discussion has focused on relatively easy to identity political and economic policy. In trying to describe the more intangible (but at least as important, especially for determining what Japan's international standing meant to Takakura personally) reality of attitude, another American author has written:

Despite fervent cries to 'stay as you are' from Western Japanophiles, the Japanese have avidly looked to Europe and America for their inspiration. From the moment the Japanese gave up their voluntary seclusion from the world, comparison with the West has dominated their opinion of themselves.

The assumption that modernization in Japan was equivalent to Westernization has tended to direct the search for definition of modernization among Japanese toward the task of finding 'meaning'


\textsuperscript{134}Reischauer, 1981, p.90.
in Western civilization. What, in other words, were the essential features of the West which should be emulated? The early flirtation with Christianity, the vacillation between laissez-faire liberalism and militant statism, even the emulation of Hitlerian Germany were justified on the basis that each effort brought Japan closer to the secret of the West’s success. Each generation of Japanese has had its particular sensitivities as to where Japan fell short of the Western ideal.\textsuperscript{135}

Pursuing this same theme of comparison to the West, another Japanese writer has sought to combine the intangible "feelings" of Japanese with their nation’s political policy following World War I. Just as Germany was frustrated by the humiliation of the Treaty of Versailles, "Japan too felt a sense of frustration, induced by the refusal of her fellow victors to recognize racial equality in the preamble to the Covenant of the League of Nations, and by their insistence at the Washington Conference that Japan evacuate Shantung."\textsuperscript{136} Having worked furiously for half a century to achieve equal status with the Western powers, Japan felt snubbed by the nations which it had admired, emulated, and gauged its own progress by comparison with them.

Finally, then, what were the personal implications for Takakura of the whole set of factors including Japan's international standing, its corresponding domestic/foreign politico-economic policies, and the possible feelings and attitudes of Japan’s


\textsuperscript{136}Hayashi Kentaro, "Japan and Germany in the Interwar Period," in James William Morley, ed., Dilemmas of Growth in Prewar Japan. The Conference on Modern Japan, Vol.6. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971, p.467. As to the general Japanese attitude toward World War I per se, there apparently was a surprising--at least to a Western observer--lack of interest. Cf., e.g., the following comment in Gino K. Piovesana, "Miki Kiyoshi: Representative Thinker of an Anguished Generation," in Joseph Roggendorf, ed., Studies in Japanese Culture: Tradition and Experiment. Tokyo: Sophia University, 1963, p.147: "Like most young men of his generation, he hardly felt the impact of the First World War. The only inconvenience he encountered during the war years was the difficulty of obtaining German books...." One could assume the same of Takakura, especially since during the years of World War I he was pastoring in Hokkaido, Japan’s northernmost island and most remote in terms of communication and participation in national life.
citizenry regarding such matters? Since there is very little recorded as to what he had to say directly about the general subject, not much can be gathered from Takakura's own words. However, there is every reason to believe that Takakura's own attitudes would have been very much in agreement with identifiable government policy, as well as not so easily identifiable "general attitudes" of the Japanese public as set forth in such representative literature as that cited above.

First, there is the huge factor of Takakura's formal education, described earlier. Given the system through which he passed, he could be expected to have been in agreement with Japan's foreign policy, and attitudinally within the mainstream of corresponding public support. Moreover, the fact that Japan's major wars with China and Russia took place within the course of Takakura's education would lend further support to viewing Takakura--like most citizens during wartime--as loyal to his country's international causes.\(^\text{137}\)

Furthermore, there are in fact a few statements in his writings that support this conclusion. For example, in a letter to his parents written in February, 1904 (Meiji 37), Takakura explicitly mentions the war with Russia and its critical importance for Japan's very survival.\(^\text{138}\) Twenty years later, in a Christmas message delivered after he had returned from his period of study in Europe, Takakura expressed concern that the Christian foundation of Europe was being threatened by political radicalism.\(^\text{139}\) Such an understanding of Christianity's fundamental relationship with Europe mirrored that of the consensus Japanese view. Another prevailing understanding with which Takakura concurred concerned Japan's special mission in the world. Given its unique place as an Asian nation which had absorbed Western culture, Japan was to be both the producer of a brand new

\(^\text{137}\)The wars were fought during 1894-1895 (Meiji 27-28) and 1904-1905 (Meiji 37-38), when Takakura was in elementary and high school, respectively.


\(^\text{139}\)Kurisumasu no Yorokobi" ("The Joy of Christmas"), in Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.112; Zenshu, Vol.1, p.388.
culture, as well as an example to other countries in Asia.\textsuperscript{140}

It can thus be asserted with a high degree of confidence that Takakura shared the prevailing Japanese feelings towards the wider world, including China and the West. He also agreed with Japan’s foreign policy that had prevailed since the beginning of the Meiji Era. Although he did not leave very much in writing explicitly about Japan’s international standing, he did at least drop a few hints. In the end, it should not be surprising that Takakura’s thought as a whole—including his specifically Christian, theological thought—did in fact match up with prevailing Japanese attitudes of his day. Thought is generated from within historical and cultural contexts, whether that thought concerns the place of one’s own national context relative to others, or one’s own particular political context. It is thus to Takakura’s political context that we will turn next.

3. Political Ethos - Imperial Consolidation and Democratic Tendencies

Mention has already been made of the gist of Japan’s political development during the Meiji Era, i.e. towards a unified monarchy and expanding empire. Indeed, the "nationalist resurgence" culminating in the issuing of the Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890 (Meiji 23) was "co-climaxed," so to speak, by the 1889 (Meiji 22) promulgation of the "Constitution of the Empire of Japan." Its primary designer, Ito Hirobumi, praised the Constitution as the "Emperor’s gift to the Japanese people." Interestingly, ever since participating in the famous Iwakura Mission of 1871-1873 (Meiji 4-6), when he and forty-five other government representatives visited all the major Western countries and observed their institutions,\textsuperscript{141} Ito had regarded the Prussian monarchy to be the most suitable to Japan, and thus worked closely with a German adviser in composing the

\textsuperscript{140}"Jiga yori Kokka he" ("From Self to the State") \textit{Seisho no Kensan (Bible Study)} No.118, October, 1926 (Taisho 15), p.15-16; \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.5, p.544.

Constitution.\textsuperscript{142}

It must not be supposed, however, that Japan's growth into a powerful, industrialised nation-state was smooth, nor unmet by opposition. To be sure, the initiative for change was taken "from above" by the government: an aristocratic oligarchy consisting of "a small group of low ranking but able samurai [had] effect[ed] a political revolution," namely the Imperial Restoration of 1868.\textsuperscript{143} This was different from a movement "from below," as had been the case, for example, with the Industrial Revolution in Britain.\textsuperscript{144} But despite such government leadership,

For the quarter of a century preceding 1890 Japan had passed through a time of unprecedented ferment, a time of experimentation and groping, as it sought to reorient its institutions to the realities of the international order into which it was so suddenly thrust. Building an industrial society had required supplanting much of the old order with techniques and institutions borrowed from the West. As the bureaucracy and the military, as commerce, industry and education fell under the sway of Western example, there developed among the educated segment of society an intense ambivalence about traditional Japanese and the new Western cultures.\textsuperscript{145}

Politically, there had been a coalescing of interests held by certain disenfranchised samurai, who had been outmanoeuvred by the oligarchy, and by those making up


\textsuperscript{143}Ike, 1950, p.188.

\textsuperscript{144}Sonoda Hidehiro, "Industrial Revolution," in Umesao Tadao, ed., \textit{Seventy-seven Keys to the Civilization of Japan}. Osaka: The Plaza Hotel, Inc., 1983, pp.229-230. For a balancing statement, however, note that "The basic trend during the Tokugawa period was for more and more initiative to be seized from below.... The speed and thoroughness of the early Meiji reforms as well as the rapid transition that followed should be seen against the backdrop of early dynamism." Marius B. Jansen, \textit{The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 5 - The Nineteenth Century}. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, p.567.

\textsuperscript{145}Pyle, 1978, p.90.
the "People's Rights Movement," consisting of merchants and taxpaying peasants.\footnote{For an in-depth attempt at examining the intensity and extent of intellectual and political vigour within the People’s Rights Movement--especially within the countryside villages--see Irokawa, 1985, pp.62-66,197.} This had brought about the formation of actual political parties which vied for power.\footnote{Reischauer, 1981, pp.87-88; Iglehart, 1959, p.62.} The Constitution--which did allow for a parliament and guarantee certain freedoms--was at least in part a response to real domestic demands for representative government.\footnote{George M. Beckmann, The Making of the Meiji Constitution: The Oligarchs and the Constitutional Development of Japan, 1868-1891. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1957, Preface, p.vii.} It thus "took up a position midway between extreme radicalism and reactionary oligarchy."\footnote{Anesaki Masaharu, History of Japanese Religion, With Special Reference to the Social and Moral Life of the Nation. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1930 (Showa 5), p.363.} Nevertheless, it should be stated that with the Constitution and Rescript on Education, the Meiji oligarchy consolidated both the nation's formation into a national empire, as well as its own firm grip on political power. By resorting to "traditional language of loyalty and obligation,"\footnote{This is a manifestation of what one author has termed "the comeback of the Japanese tradition [which] marked the full maturity of the Meiji system." Jansen, 1965, p.70.} as well as drawing upon a mythical past, the government defined and propagated its imperial system "to provide the ideological glue that would hold the new political structure together."\footnote{Pyle, 1978, p.99.} Thus

The 1890s marked a watershed for Japan. The mood and concerns of the nation underwent dramatic change. During the generation after 1868, Japan had been preoccupied with domestic reforms, intent on reordering its society and government. By 1890, however, the new political order was established and a new sense of discipline and
purpose was evident in the nation’s life.\textsuperscript{152}

Having been enforced, a consensus had emerged that galvanised what had seemed at times to be a chaotic period of political development. An increasingly efficient educational system was established to mould the upcoming generation in the ways of the newly shaped empire. With the ensuing victorious wars against China and Russia, coupled with resolution of the frustrating unequal extraterritorial treaties with Western governments,\textsuperscript{153} "Japan emerged as one of the world's great powers, and the rise of its imperialism influenced nearly every aspect of the new industrial society that was taking shape...."\textsuperscript{154}

However, with the conclusion of its war with Russia, Japan was entering "a difficult period of transition and adjustment."\textsuperscript{155} Internationally, there was a series of monumental events occurring on into the late twenties and thirties (early Showa), e.g., the beginning of the Chinese revolution in 1911 (Meiji 44); World War I in Europe with the resulting disappearance of the German, Austrian, and Russian monarchies; the formation of a communist regime as a result of the Bolshevik Revolution; the disappointment over the deletion of a proposed clause concerning racial equality from the League of Nations Covenant;\textsuperscript{156} the failure to renew the alliance with Britain in 1922 (Taisho 11); the economic depression of the late 1920’s (early Showa); mounting tensions in Manchuria in the early 1930’s.

Domestically, both the assassination of Ito Hirobumi and age had depleted the ranks

\footnote{\textsuperscript{152}Ibid., p.103.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{153}This matter has been cited often and in a variety of literature, e.g. Anesaki, 1930 (Showa 5), p.359; Yamamori Tetsunao, \textit{Church Growth in Japan: A Study in the Development of Eight Denominations, 1859-1939}. South Pasadena, California: William Carey Library, 1974, p.87.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{154}op. cit.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{155}For Takakura, the war with Russia ended toward the end of his middle year of high school. The quotation is from former Prime Minister Yoshida, quoted earlier.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{156}Yoshida, 1967, pp.31-32.
of the Meiji oligarchy, just at a time when there was the beginning of a feared moral vacuum and of a gap between traditional values and those of imported Western technology.\textsuperscript{157} Those who had been educated during the innovative first two Meiji decades had come of age, bringing to positions of influence their creative thinking and ideas.\textsuperscript{158} Furthermore, Marxist thought was becoming more widely read and embraced, particularly amongst the student population.\textsuperscript{159}

The Japanese government felt that it had to combat such moral failure and "dangerous thoughts,"\textsuperscript{160} and the urgency to provide domestic stability was continually justified by the ensuing international events outlined above. At the beginning of this post-Russian War period, the government thus issued an Imperial Rescript in 1908 (Meiji 41). This sought to encourage traditional, Confucian social behaviour. However, Japan had undergone profound changes such that it had become "modern," and its people had become "individuals."\textsuperscript{161} It became apparent that no government intervention--not even an imperial decree--could reverse the transformation. What apparently happened, then, was the inevitable

\textsuperscript{157}Ibid., p.28.

\textsuperscript{158}Pyle, 1978, pp.74-75.

\textsuperscript{159}One author comments that, even though published in 1867, "Das Kapital did not begin to pose a threat to government authority until much later in the last years of Meiji [i.e., the period under discussion] and, in real sense [sic], only in the 1920s." Irokawa, 1985, p.69. Concerning the major influence of Marxism in the 1920's, cf. Malcolm D. Kennedy, The Estrangement of Great Britain and Japan, 1917-35. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969, pp.84,94.

The related phenomenon of Christian Socialism will be examined later in Part II, ch.1.


transition into a democratic society, confirmed by the eventual granting in 1925 (Taisho 14) of Manhood Suffrage.

The ensuing period thus earned the title "Taisho Democracy," and the following type of description of the time is not uncommon:

The Taisho era was a period during which such concepts as individual rights, freedom, and democracy flourished in the intellectual and cultural realms. The Taisho intellectuals were not burdened with the task of 'enriching and strengthening' the nation as were their predecessors in the Meiji era. These thinkers grew up in a relatively carefree atmosphere at a time when Japan had already joined the ranks of the world's major powers.

The same author further describes the political system of the day: "In September, 1918, the first true party government came to power under Hara. This form of rule, except for a brief hiatus, was to hold sway in Japan until the assassination of Prime Minister Inukai on May 15, 1932."

While undoubtedly conveying actual trends of the time, these assessments of Japan's political situation--both structural and popular--during the Taisho Era and the few years surrounding it must be counterbalanced by other analyses. As "party government came to power" during the Taisho Era, the government was facing the continuing and overriding challenge of establishing its authority. That is, as was the case in similarly industrialised countries, the Japanese government was

---

162This, along with the comments which follow, is not to imply that transforming into a "democracy"--and in particular a discernably Western form of democracy--was necessarily the most desirable course for Japan. (Nor is it the position here to favour the converse argument, i.e., that becoming "democratic" was undesirable, due to being "un-Japanese" or "Western.") This section of the thesis primarily attempts to reflect the relevant literature on the subject, the bulk of which has a pro-democratic posture.

163Kennedy, 1969, p.94.


165Ibid., p.192.
struggling actually to govern an ever-changing and increasingly complex society.\textsuperscript{166} Having assumed governing power from the Meiji oligarchy,\textsuperscript{167} it was the complex state bureaucracy that enjoyed the most unquestioned place of legitimacy.\textsuperscript{168} This bureaucracy was in fact a web of private and public interests, consisting "of a series of...elite groups (the military, the civil bureaucracy, politicians, businessmen, and 'intellectuals' in the Japanese sense)..."\textsuperscript{169}

Furthermore, "the advent of party politics did not mean the rise of coalition politics...[nor]...the rise of mass democracy." The first two political parties formed in the 1880's (the second Meiji decade) had no major differences in policy, and their "successors...continued to draw their members from almost the same restricted social groups: rural notables and ex-officials."\textsuperscript{170} That the politicians had not taken a new attitude towards democratic parliamentarism can be seen in the Diet's passing the Peace Preservation Law--directed specifically against socialist and labour groups--only one week after the Universal Manhood Suffrage Law had been passed.\textsuperscript{171} Instead of allowing full democratic participation in government, "officialdom acted in the characteristically Japanese way of resorting to liberal reforms and promptly curbing them with reactionary legislation."\textsuperscript{172}

What might appear, therefore, to have been sprouts of a genuine form of Western,
liberal democracy having taken root in Japanese soil could be seen instead as evidences of Japan’s adopting some of "the worldwide enthusiasm for democracy." Such enthusiasm for democracy was natural after its victory over authoritarianism in World War I, coupled with the intense period of internationalisation in Japan following the war. "Far more complex and fundamental" than a blooming of democracy, Taisho Japan was a continuation of a rapidly changing society that had reached a severe point of "disequilibrium in [its] growth process." The Taisho years emerged out of the incomparable Meiji Era. However, during its last decade Meiji Japan had become "fatigued." Its dizzying pace of transformation had not allowed time for digestion and settling, and militarism eventually took over the reins of authority.

While recalling the description of Japan following its war with Russia as a "difficult period of transition and adjustment," noting the following quotation can


176Harootunian, 1974, p.12.

177Reischauer, 1971, p.509.


179Politics does not move strictly according to people’s intentions and plans, of course. Recent note has been made of the political roles which natural disasters can play, namely of how "the Imperial Army’s mobilization in the 1923 Kanto earthquake helped end what was then a budding Taisho-era democracy." Doi Ayako, "The Other Poison in Japan’s Air" The Daily Yomiuri 31 March 1995, p.16.
help lead into a more direct exploration of the implications of Japan’s political situation on Takakura’s own personal thinking:

If the Russo-Japanese War confirmed the nation in its new international style, it also symbolized for many an end to the years of self-sacrifice. The time for working together in a collective effort to achieve some larger national purpose was over; the meaning of self-sacrifice and group effort was transmuted into the promise of the self seeking its own goals; public interest became private interest.\(^{180}\)

As this statement indicates, by all accounts "individualism" was a major trend amongst most Japanese intellectuals during the late Meiji years, particularly after the war with Russia.\(^{181}\) One account of the development of Meiji culture goes as far as to describe the decade from 1898 to 1907 (Meiji 30’s) "as a period of breakdown and dismemberment" due to "the prevalence in the thought of the Meiji 30’s of...individualism. Japan, now on the world stage, found that to the degree that she hardened and strengthened her framework there was asserted an egotistical or self-centered type of individualism...."\(^{182}\) As seen already, Takakura himself was fundamentally a part of this trend, writing down his infamous remark concerning his belief in the central importance of self-love\(^{183}\) upon his graduation from high school in 1906 (Meiji 39).

The ideology of Meiji nationalism was in direct contrast to such individualism. The government thus "imputed all manifestations of individualism to decadent Western ideologies like Christianity or democracy," and it "sought to restrict

\(^{180}\)Harootunian, 1974, pp.20-21.

\(^{181}\)The subject of individualism will be examined more closely in the section below which focuses specifically on the intellectual context in which Takakura lived.

\(^{182}\)Kosaka, 1958, pp.295,298.

individual self-expression to the subject’s duty to contribute unselfishly to the achievement of national goals...."\(^{184}\) The government’s task was made easier by the fact that the education system, through which Takakura himself had passed, prevented scholars from entering positions of political power. The entire system had "assured perpetuation of the split between the intellectuals and officials, the highly educated bureaucratic underlings and the less educated authorities in power."\(^{185}\) What the mixed Western and Japanese educational system had fostered was an inculcation of tenets of loyalty to the authoritarian state, along with the development of technological expertise necessary for economic growth.\(^{186}\)

The early years of the twentieth century (late Meiji) comprised a time prophesied by the famous author Soseki Natsume as leading to a "nervous collapse" caused by what Lafcadio Hearn termed a "national ‘overstrain’."\(^{187}\) Moreover, insofar as they were locked out of political power to do much of anything about the situation, "the overwhelming psychological reality of the times, as far as most intellectuals and writers were concerned, was of lost optimism, defeated ideals, spiritual decadence, and the oppressive weight of institutions and ideology."\(^{188}\) Unable to influence whatever the "public interest" might be, most intellectuals fled to pursue individual "private interests," whether religious, aesthetic, utopian political programs, or perfection of the self. Politically speaking, however, what all of these pursuits amounted to "was a turning away from existing social reality and a striving

---


\(^{185}\)It was particularly scholars in the humanities who were excluded from power. Hopper, 1976, pp.7-8.

\(^{186}\)Ibid.


for emancipation that never came to grips with the realities of the socialized self."

Similar to the lack of Takakura’s own comments concerning Japan’s international standing, Takakura’s concrete political statements are difficult to find. He did produce some relevant material concerning "culture" and "civilisation," plus one address which directly seeks to address the matter of "the state." These works, along with some additional scattered comments, speak primarily of purifying and elevating the culture or nation with the propagation of the Christian gospel, i.e., a specifically religious as opposed to a concrete political objective. Takakura’s reading as an adult included a smattering of political subjects; in February of 1927 (Showa 2) he attended meetings opposing the government’s Religious Bodies Control Law, himself having a "concern" or "interest", and, he occasionally made journal entries indicating a worried concern, at least, over certain major,

189 Arima Tatsuo, The Failure of Freedom: A Portrait of Modern Japanese Intellectuals. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969, p.5. Interestingly, Arima goes on to argue (pp.7ff.) that "No one made a more profound attempt to emancipate the self and to actualize his individual aspirations beyond society than Nishida Kitaro (1870-1945)...." Nishida, it will be recalled, was Takakura’s influential high school teacher.


191 This is the aforementioned "Jiga yori Kokka he" Seisho no Kensan No.118, October, 1926 (Taisho 15), pp.1-20; Zenshu, Vol.5, pp.523-550.

192 Making such a distinction is not to imply that either Takakura or the thesis would want to separate religious and political concerns.


194 Oshio. p.315.
domestic political events. Otherwise, Takakura's life and teaching could be, and has been, characterised as a "retreat from practical action into concern with the purity of the gospel proclamation within the church."  

Is this apparent lack of political involvement due to a flight to religion, wherein Takakura, like other intellectuals of his day, avoided the political realities which he was confronting in his early days of law school in 1906 (Meiji 39)? Could it be (and this certainly is more speculative) that, feeling the weight of political expectations being placed on his young shoulders by his friends, neighbours, and family in his home town of Ayabe, Takakura left a politically-related career and sought refuge in Christianity? Takakura had been moving through the national education system during the optimum period of cultivating loyalty to the imperial system, yet potentially he was blocked from affecting it with any real political influence. It is therefore not impossible that, amidst the "overwhelming psychological reality of the times," Takakura was a prime example of an intellectual who contributed to "the failure of Japan's effort to extend the emotional experience of emancipation beyond the level of the philosophical, the religious, and the aesthetic into the realm of social reality[, which] is part of her general failure to preserve and foster the constitutional form of government."  

---

195He noted such concerns, for instance, in 1927 (Showa 2), after the Emperor Taisho's death, and in 1932 (Showa 7), following the assassination of Prime Minister Inukai. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki" ("Diary"), pp.236-237,368.  
196Germany, 1965, 117.  
197In thinking of family and friends in Ayabe, it is helpful to recall that Takakura would have grown up with them in the afterglow of the People's Rights Movement of the 1880's (Meiji 20's). It is also instructive to note that "fleeing" from political responsibility would not necessarily be incompatible with his strong character, since leaving politics went against the expectations of those close to him.  
199Arima, 1969, p.3.  
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4. Socio-economic Trends - Growth and New Problems

No less remarkable than Japan's "Economic Miracle" since World War II was its transformation during the Meiji Era from an isolated, loosely-connected group of primarily agrarian domains to an internationally powerful, unified, industrialised nation. By all accounts, many of the foundations for the stupendous Meiji period of growth were laid during the preceding Tokugawa Era (1600-1868). There was growth of a money economy and an accompanying rise of a merchant class; growth and development of cities, which promoted commerce and trade, communication, and other elements of an administrative infrastructure; "the penetration of capitalism on the village level" by the mid-nineteenth century; the existence of resilient collective institutions, particularly the family and village, which were able to transform themselves into industrial and firm collectives; a predominant Confucian outlook that enabled such institutional transformation by cultivating people’s support of the well-being of whichever group(s) to which they belonged--whether family or village, industry or firm, or ultimately nation.

---

200Edo Japan was "loosely-connected" when compared to the unity of late nineteenth and twentieth century "nation-states." Tokugawa Japan was unified under one central government, but the rebellions and discord of the mid-nineteenth century revealed the relative weakness of the connections between the several "feudal" domains.


206op.cit., pp.31-33,39.
-because of neo-Confucianism's earlier transformation within Japan. This transformation, which had occurred from the time of its introduction into Japan around the mid-fourteenth century until the mid-seventeenth century, turned neo-Confucianism from being "a cultural ideology...[into]...a set of functional ethical codes."207 Such a transformed neo-Confucianism thus promoted appropriate, loyal behaviour within whatever relative, concrete situation in which people found themselves.208 The coming of the Western powers in the mid-nineteenth century then served as the spark to ignite, as well as a continuous source of fuel for, a generation of explosive growth.209

1868 to 1892 (the first quarter century of Meiji) saw the government nurturing strategic industries, communications, other public services, and particularly textiles. The next twenty-five years, i.e. approximately until the end of World War I, saw continued growth of heavy industry and textiles. The wars with China and Russia,210 the annexation of Korea in 1910 (Meiji 43), and industrial sales to warring European powers during the First World War contributed greatly to this growth. The ensuing decade saw even increased growth, particularly in the spinning industry, as well as in other sectors such as automotive, aircraft and chemicals.211


208That is, people adapted cooperatively instead of objecting to change based on absolute, ideological grounds.


With industrialisation came, not surprisingly, an accompanying high rate of urbanisation:

In the thirty-seven-year period between 1888 and 1925 there was an estimated population increase of a little over nineteen-and-a-half million. Of this increase, 16,683,000 were living in towns and cities with a population of 10,000 or more. In 1930 one third of the male population of Tokyo between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four had migrated to Tokyo within the preceding five-year period...

Furthermore, as the population flocked to the cities, there was a shift from people working in agriculture to industrial production:

Between 1877 and 1921, the percentage of population engaged in agriculture and forestry declined from eighty percent to 51.6 percent. Moreover, the growth of urban areas which accompanied rapid industrialization was not due primarily to rising population, but to migration from the country to the city.

With industrialisation and urbanisation came a rise in so-called "white-collar" professionals, along with the new situation that "by the first decades of this century an individual’s life chances were determined not so much by his family’s feudal status in itself as by the income and amenities attaching to his father’s occupational position. The pattern of occupational mobility became not so very different from that of Western societies."

Despite the obvious "socio-cultural change and, through the process of industrialization, the civilization itself becoming] gradually differentiated" during the Meiji and Taisho Eras, some social analyses of the period stress the orderly and smooth nature of the transition:

economy in the 1920’s was in a state of chronic crisis." Hayashi, 1971, p.475.


215 Yamamori, 1974, p.15.
The Japanese kinship system adapted relatively easily to modernization and...its continued strength helped make the transition a relatively smooth process.... In contrast to many of the large migrations in Europe and especially the migrations to the Unites States...[. t]he continued economic expansion of Japan in the post-Meiji period and the political stability, once the Satsuma rebellion had been subdued in 1877, meant that migration within Japan could be a continuous and orderly process.216

Citing the durability and adaptability of the basic "ie" kinship unit in rural Japan, this sort of analysis argues that, given the collective nature of Japanese society,

In the most industrialized sector of society, the 'ie'...is replaced by the large economic firm on the one hand and the small nuclear family on the other.... The individual thus comes to have dual membership which might conceivably lead to cross-cutting ties interfering with a complete commitment to the other group. This dual commitment, however, generally has not led to problems because the two organizations, the business firm and the family, have been kept perfectly distinct.217

Furthermore, in promoting its ideology, government applied the notion of family loyalty to the entire citizenry's relationship to the emperor, providing the political cement that ensured Japan's emergence as a unified, industrialised nation.218

Such analyses seem plausible enough--especially when comparing Japan's social stability to that of some other nations--and undoubtedly contain a great deal of truth. Without question, though, there was widespread social disruption, conflict, and disorder associated with Japan's rapid economic growth. The "social question" concerning human suffering, as well as Japanese society's perceived growing materialism, was raised in the 1880's (Meiji 13-22). However, more pressing issues muffled any significant protests until after the Sino-Japanese War (1895;

217Ibid., p.109.
218"The Meiji government took steps to impose the samurai-type of family structure on the entire population." Ike, 1973, p.160.
Meiji 28), when problems became immediately evident.\textsuperscript{219} Nevertheless, social displacement--associated both with military conscription and with the increased burdens placed on the still majority, yet ever decreasing, rural population through taxation and absentee landlords--continued to intensify.\textsuperscript{220}

After the war with Russia (1905; Meiji 38), recognising such social problems, and associated voices of protest, became unavoidable:

Victory in the war was achieved at a heavy cost: 60,083 killed in battle and 21,879 victims of disease. The people had been willing to endure the suffering and sacrifice because they were convinced that a better life would follow the war. The amelioration of conditions did not, however, come about as anticipated, and the struggle for social and economic justice became more intense.... The working class was getting more restless and the socialists, though suppressed temporarily, were emerging as a force with whom the ruling class would very soon have to reckon.\textsuperscript{221}

The end of the Meiji Era (1912, Meiji 45) brought further anxiety and a stronger sense of social contradictions, "underscored" by the ensuing suicide of General Nogi Maresuke.\textsuperscript{222} Harmful effects of World War I on Japan’s countryside culminated in the rice riots of 1918.\textsuperscript{223} The devastating 1923 (Taisho 12) Kanto Earthquake and financial collapse of the late 1920’s (Showa 1-3) only worsened already widespread, difficult conditions.\textsuperscript{224} Militarism arose in the 1930’s (from Showa 5), offering an alleged solution to such ills.

To help complete the overall picture, mention must be made of Taisho Japan’s

\textsuperscript{219}Petralia, 1981, pp.61-65; Kosaka, 1958, p.299.
\textsuperscript{220}Irokawa, 1985, p.242.
\textsuperscript{221}Hane, 1992, pp.179,183.
\textsuperscript{222}Yoshida, 1967, pp.28-29.
"thriving popular culture. Popular novels, magazines, newspapers, and the new media of radio and motion pictures" abounded. Furthermore, "the number of colleges, higher schools, and middle schools increased significantly."225 Indeed, A new class had been produced by modernization--professors, doctors, lawyers, writers, and white-collar workers. These people were thirsty for knowledge. They favored individualism. They were opposed to the traditional family system with all its inhibitions. They rejected ascetic Confucian ethics and began to pursue the fuller life openly: sports, dancing, mountaineering, and other leisure pursuits became fashionable.226

Thus while not completely "orderly" or "smooth," Japan’s Meiji growth was not all "gloom and doom," either. That growth had helped produce--by the Taisho Era, at least--a colourful, new urban culture and society.

As for where Takakura personally fits into the overall socio-economic developments of his day, earlier comments indicate his small town and merchant family background, his being educated into a "white-collar intellectual," and his being at least interested in such social issues as the labour movement. Later descriptions of his career--which was based primarily in Tokyo--will confirm his place as a migrated urbanite. And looking from a more sociological angle at the major change in his life wherein he, against his father’s wishes, left Tokyo Imperial University, it could be argued that Takakura fits a pattern of intellectuals rebelling against their families, i.e., both immediate relatives and the wider "family," the Japanese state.227

As pointed out earlier, "the Meiji government took steps to impose the samurai-type of family structure on the entire population." However, the author of this statement continues:

225Hane, 1992, p.220.
226Yoshida, 1967, p.34.
227This was in contrast to Western intellectuals, who had rebelled against God and the Church. Arima, 1969, p.3.
What they did not foresee was that with the passage of time this type of ethical family code forcibly carried over from a past age would become increasingly incompatible with living realities, thus giving rise to tensions and unresolved conflicts. Professor Nakagawa Zennosuke noted: 'There is, on the one hand, the Confucian idea of filial behavior which makes filial piety the basis of all action, while, on the other hand, there exists the rather strong individualistic economic life. A great many of the causes (of disputes between parents and children) can be found in the fact that it is not so easy as it used to be to reconcile the two'. Economic independence, city life, sophisticated education—these were not conducive to the perpetuation of the old Confucian family system.

While not financially independent from his father during his extensive years of education, Takakura lived in the midst of an urban setting where many around him were in fact economically independent, and where daily life was conducted on a more contractual, individualistic basis. This environment, coupled with Takakura's "sophisticated education," was not terribly supportive of traditional notions of filial piety directed towards one's own family and nation.

Furthermore, by the time Takakura entered the Imperial University in 1906 (Meiji 39), both the nature and conception of Japanese society had undergone some fundamental changes since the beginning of the Meiji Era a generation earlier. Although "Western liberal democracy" may not have emerged, Japan nevertheless had experienced "the development and triumph of that conception of private interest and atomized individuality which is at the heart of the liberal political and social creed." The days of late Meiji and Taisho "were not only characterized by the tensions rising from the process of industrialization but were also the consequence


230Note also comments concerning the atomised and independence of life in industrialised society in, e.g., Yamamori, 1974, p.15.
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of tensions growing out of a revolutionary transformation, in the early Meiji period, of the conception of society; from a prescriptive conception of natural moral order to a secular voluntaristic one.  

In collective, group-oriented Japan, Takakura paradoxically lived in the midst of a "secular voluntaristic" society that, against its political fathers' wishes, promoted "private interest and atomized individuality." In this time of anxiety, contradiction, and "spiritual starvation," many fixed their hope on religion as the strongest and most trustworthy authority possible.  

All of these socio-economic factors thus make it not at all surprising that Takakura, like many others like him, rebelled against the wishes of his filial superiors--both familial and national. He wanted to pursue a course that was more appealing personally, and which promised something more permanent and unshakeable.

5. Intellectual Currents - Philosophy and Literature

Individualism was a noticeable thread woven into the fabric of life in late Meiji and Taisho Japan. Socio-economic realities, such as urbanisation and a more contractual way of economic interaction, helped promote the role of the individual in Japanese society. Political reactions against this "new ethos of individual self-consciousness"--particularly the 1908 (Meiji 41) Imperial Rescript--reveal the extent of its importance. Tracing this strand of individualism thus gives a helpful overview of the entire intellectual world of the day.

Within intellectual circles, "individualism" per se was new to Japan, having emerged largely via connections with the West:

---


234Maruyama distinguishes four patterns of a growing individualism (a process which he terms "individuation" instead of "individualization"): "individualization, democratization, privatization, and atomization." Maruyama, 1965, p.494.

235op.cit., p.763.
Japan really did not have a tradition of individualism which predated her 19th century contact with the West. The expressions of self in traditional Japanese literature, the individual feelings, emotions, and personal reactions, which were major features of early narratives, diaries, and dramas, were not related to the 19th and 20th century concepts of individualism, which was rooted exclusively in Europe and America.236

Although late Meiji individualism was novel, absorbing thought from beyond its shores was nothing new to Japanese intellectual history: Japan had synthesised Chinese thought for more than a millennium prior to the nineteenth century, including the very script in which "the expressions of self in traditional Japanese literature" were written.237 By the early the nineteenth century, however, there was a heightened awareness of domestic weakness and the threat of foreign invasion by the West. This sense, coupled with knowledge of China’s humiliation by the West, brought about a major shift in intellectual value being removed from China, and placed on things Western.238

French positivism and English utilitarianism239 were the initial Western philosophical imports, and Darwinian evolutionary thought soon followed.240 But from the 1890's (Meiji mid-20’s) it was German philosophy which became predominant.241 Hence German neo-idealism was able to play an "instrumental role...in stimulating the consciousness of individuality and rationalizing the individual's pursuit of self-gratification." Moreover, Christianity spread amongst

---

236Hopper, 1976, p.224.


238Jansen, 1965, pp.54-60.

239E.g., J.S. Mill was introduced very early. Irokawa, 1985, p.69.

240Hane, 1992, p.226.

intellectuals, also encouraging individualism.\textsuperscript{242} With the correlative introduction of such works as T.H. Green's \textit{Prolegomena to Ethics}--"an ethical philosophy of self-realization"--individualism thus became more tightly woven into some thinkers' minds. However, since the concept was still closely associated with Western thought,\textsuperscript{243} the constant opposition of government was able to maintain the weak and frayed condition of the threads connecting individualism with the rest of Japanese thought.\textsuperscript{244}

Different groups of philosophers and writers coped in their own ways with the situation. Many used Western philosophical categories to buttress arguments for the imperial ideology, for "the German influence paralleled in time the revived interest in Japanese philosophy as interpreted from Buddhist and Chinese thought stimulated by the new nationalist awakening. Thus German Idealism was adapted to the new nationalism which espoused loyalty and patriotism as primary virtues."\textsuperscript{245} This response was not uncommon, and in its indigeneity at least it characterised the entirety of Japanese intellectual wrestlings with imported Western thought. As one analyst of world history has written, "Cultural traditions have deep roots--far deeper, usually, than the civilization grafted on to them."\textsuperscript{246} Other intellectuals were not so explicitly "patriotic," however. While remaining within

\textsuperscript{242}How Christianity encouraged individualism becomes clearer upon examining the \textit{type} of Christianity which was imported from the West, something to be considered later in the thesis. At this point in the discussion, one can see how embracing an alien faith, against the collective Japanese grain, would require \textit{individual} commitment.

\textsuperscript{243}Similar to the case of the slow process of assimilating various Chinese ideas throughout earlier centuries, the importance of the language gap must not be underestimated in evaluating the time necessary for such Western concepts as "individualism" to be digested within the Japanese language. Cf. op.cit., p.192.

\textsuperscript{244}Petralia, 1981, pp.8-10.

\textsuperscript{245}Hopper, 1976, p.144.

their own deep-rooted, cultural tradition, they sought to blaze new trails of thought.

Perhaps the most well-known philosopher of the era was Nishida Kitaro (1870-1945; Meiji 3 - Showa 20), mentioned above as one of Takakura's high school teachers. Nishida is commonly recognised to be a "representative thinker of modern Japan," exhibiting "the prototype of a peculiarly Japanese way of thinking...." He was extremely well-versed in Western thought, using its forms and methodologies in articulating a Japanese philosophical system. Nishida thus was able to produce an experienced-based, emotionally-moving philosophy that was thoroughly theoretical. At the same time, Nishida's philosophy was not unduly abstract or intellectualised, a pitfall that can remove thought from real life.

Nishida was rooted in the East, yet renewed Eastern thought by means of the West. In the field of literature, Natsume Soseki and Mori Ogai accomplished similar ends. In light of this it is interesting to note that "most Japanese if asked to name the two greatest writers of the Meiji and Taisho periods would reply with little hesitation, Natsume Soseki and Mori Ogai...." Along with the philosopher Nishida, these two great literary figures are representative of many currents of Meiji and Taisho intellectual life.

The thought of Natsume Soseki (1867-1916; - Taisho 5) resembled Nishida's in ways other than just the use of Western thought in furthering the progress of Eastern. Both were interested in Zen Buddhism, helping to explain their interest

---
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in the meaning of the "self." Unlike the next generation of thinkers, however, their "quest for the self...began from itself as center and reached outwards instead of simply turning further inwards in search of itself." Thus while being a novelist whose major concern was individual ethics, Natsume was aware of and concerned about wider social problems as well.

*Kokoro* is one of Natsume's most famous and best-loved novels. It was written in 1914 (Taisho 3), two years before the author's own death, and two years after the deaths of the Emperor Meiji and General Nogi. In grappling with the ambivalence in Nogi's suicide—an act which exhibited, within the new era, qualities of the previous one—Natsume deals with the problem of loneliness within the modern world, a common theme in all of his novels. In a suicide note from "Sensei" ("Teacher") to his young friend (the protagonist), the former writes:

> It was two or three days later that I decided at last to commit suicide. Perhaps you will not understand clearly why I am about to die, no more than I can fully understand why General Nogi killed himself. You and I belong to different eras, and so we think differently. Of course, it may be more correct to say that we are different simply because we are two separate human beings.

Through such Dostoevsky-type introspective wrestlings, Natsume representatively agonized over the issues of his generation.

---


255Ibid.

256Ibid., p.246.
One example of Natsume’s importance within the literary world was a group of younger writers who, having been influenced by Natsume, began a literary journal called Shin Shicho (New Thought).\textsuperscript{257} Natsume’s importance within the philosophical world—surely reflective of his beloved place within the wider public—is seen in the following remarks by the well-known Kyoto School philosopher Nishitani Keiji:

The main thing I learned from Soseki was the true meaning of courage: to be truly serious about the most important things in life, never to forget that the self is always the self, never to forfeit one’s personal independence and freedom. Heartened by the lesson, I found that I was able to hold on without giving in to despair, however far my spiritual state may have deteriorated. In short, Soseki showed me the way to a higher world of interiority.\textsuperscript{258}

Like the rudder of a ship, Natsume Soseki helped steer many of his contemporaries through the turbulent and rough waters of late Meiji and Taisho Japan.

Mori Ogai (1862-1922, - Taisho 11)\textsuperscript{259} was an amazingly versatile person. He served as a medical officer in the Imperial army, all the while producing some of Japan’s most beloved novels and short stories.\textsuperscript{260} Mori returned to Japan in 1888 (Meiji 21) from a period of studying medicine in Germany. Eager to enlighten the intellectual public, Mori found Japanese science still a decade away from being able to use logical, systematic thinking—to Mori, the essence of Western thought\textsuperscript{261}--

\textsuperscript{257}Hane, 1992, p.222. Hane goes on to point out how one leading member of this group, Akutagawa Ryunosuke (1892-1927; Meiji 25 - Showa 2), "had a pessimistic, almost cynical, attitude toward life, which he viewed as a wretched affair in which man is hopelessly entrapped in his egoism.... Finally, in 1927, he committed suicide...." pp.222-223.

\textsuperscript{258}Nishitani, 1991, p.5.

\textsuperscript{259}Mori’s birth and death dates were confirmed by consulting Heibansha’s World Encyclopedia. Vol.30. Tokyo: Heibansha, 1981, p.308.

\textsuperscript{260}Kato, 1965, p.428.

\textsuperscript{261}Mori’s view is somewhat in contrast to Natsume’s view of the West. Ibid., pp.428,433; cf. below, Part I, p.72.
for producing its own inventions and research results.\textsuperscript{262} Furthermore, while he himself advanced scientific arguments based on his belief in "the oneness of medical research, the universal nature of scientific inquiry," Mori found many of the educated elite in Japan arguing for a uniquely Japanese scientific method. Moreover, in line with the government's object of importing Western techniques while preserving the Japanese spirit,\textsuperscript{263} Japan's intelligentsia were adapting Western science and other forms of Western thought to the new Japanese nationalism.\textsuperscript{264} Mori's intellectual challenges thus included both specifically scientific, as well as wider political, aspects.

In his zeal and frustration to see both the scientific and political mindsets become more inclined towards employing what he had come to understand as logical, systematic thinking, Mori early on resorted to "extreme lengths of belligerent journalism" in both the medical and literary fields.\textsuperscript{265} So that his countrymen could "truly [come] to understand the nature of the European mind," Mori expended a great deal of energy translating European prose and drama from 1889 to 1892 (Meiji 22-25).\textsuperscript{266} He also wrote his first piece of fiction in 1890 (Meiji 23), "Maihime" ("The Dancing Girl"), which was one of the earliest examples of the "shi-shosetsu" ("I-Novel" or "I-story"). This is an "autobiographical, confessional"

\textsuperscript{262}Hopper, 1976, p.109.

\textsuperscript{263}Ivan Morris, ed., Modern Japanese Stories. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1961, Introduction, p.11; Ali A. Mazrui, A World Federation of Cultures: An African Perspective. New York: The Free Press, 1976, pp.359-360. The latter emphasises the importance of the Japanese importing Western thought while preserving their own Japanese language, thus preserving their own values longer than would have been the case had they "become linguistic converts to an alien idiom...."

\textsuperscript{264}Japanese scholars particularly adapted German idealism, to which they had been introduced by German lectures in the Tokyo Imperial University, to their own nationalist context. op.cit., pp.116,143.

\textsuperscript{265}Bowring, 1979, Preface, pp.x-xi, p.23.

\textsuperscript{266}Ibid., pp.44-46.
style which has been important within modern Japanese literature. Over the next several years his own intellectual struggles were over such issues as European racialism and how scientifically to approach art.

During the period from 1893 to 1912 (the last two decades of Meiji), Mori endured "much personal suffering and alienation in both his official life and the literary world." This especially included an appointment in 1899 (Meiji 32) to a post in Kyushu, far away from Japan’s cultural centre of Tokyo. Entering the Taisho Era, then, Mori still faced more than ever the same challenge of seeing the intellectual world grow in the way he was convinced it must.

While not deviating from this conviction, Mori had come to realise that Japan’s solutions to its own problems must somehow be indigenous. Hence Mori’s last approach to his dilemma was to follow the "time-honoured practice--more often seen in China than in Japan--"of writing historical works, which were in effect indirect social commentaries. He was thus on the one hand able to avoid remaining silent, while on the other hand free to offer his personal proposals in a publicly-accepted manner.

Mori’s adjustment to the reality of his situation could be interpreted as a capitulation to public forces stronger than his own private convictions. However, further examination reveals that what happened was the use of lessons learned in Germany for personal reconciliation to his own Japanese context. In other words, Mori

found his harmonization of private individualism and public service to the state in his interpretation of the German main-stream of individualism which stood in opposition to the French. German

---

269Ibid., pp.98-100,125.
270Ibid., pp.142,194.
thought was characteristically nationalistic, suggesting that individual self-fulfillment and total development of the personality could be found in the organic unity of the individual and the society. This meant a transformation of the personal individualism of German romanticism into a nationalistic theory of community.\(^{271}\)

Rather than as a simple surrender, Mori’s complex struggle should be seen as a translation of Western thought and life—including Western individualism—into contemporary Japanese thought and life.

Mori’s "conflict between private and public requirements" was a painful and common experience for many intellectuals of his day.\(^{272}\) Also, "In the sense that Ogai’s experience was one of the conflict between public and private, science and art, and Western learning and Japanese tradition, his life represents in microcosm the whole process of the modernization of Japan."\(^{273}\) Furthermore, as perhaps the only writer of the age to maintain substantial links with the bureaucracy, and...[i]n the light...of the number of Japanese writers who either came to grief or fell into an uneasy silence as a result of the conflict between the intoxicating effect of an individualism learned abroad and the appalling comfort of authoritarianism sanctioned by tradition, Ogai’s balance and his never-ending effort to live within the system and yet maintain intellectual honesty and integrity, is a vitally important subject for study.\(^{274}\)

Mori grasped the West’s "scientific spirit," which arguably is one of the most significant aspects of all of European history, as well as of recent world history.\(^{275}\) He also sought to see that spirit transplanted into Japanese scientific and political soil. Particularly in light of Takakura’s total context as examined so far, the life and thought of Mori Ogai seem to embody almost all of the crucial

---

\(^{271}\) Hopper, 1976, p.229.

\(^{272}\) Ibid., p.224.

\(^{273}\) Bowring, 1979, p.257.

\(^{274}\) Ibid., Preface, pp.ix,xi.

\(^{275}\) Barraclough, 1979, pp.25-27.
issues facing the intellectual world of late Meiji and Taisho Japan.

While appreciating the greatness of both Natsume and Mori, it is important to note their differences, along with some possible explanations of the underlying sources of those differences. The different ways in which they understood and used Western thought—Mori’s focus on scientific method, Natsume’s sense of an internalised, individualistic morality—has already been noted. Mori continued throughout his life in government administrative posts, whereas Natsume never had any such position: Natsume even resigned from teaching at the Imperial University and focused on writing.276 The latter difference especially may be explained by historical circumstance, and even the former could as well hinge on the encounters with the West that each man "happened to have." There could be a more substantial explanation, however, based on different strands of thought within their common historical context.

The confusing, complex intellectual situation of late Meiji and Taisho Japan was caused in large part by the huge and rapid influx of a staggering assortment of Western ideas and institutions into Japanese thought and culture. Not surprisingly, however, resident Japanese thought and language continued, albeit often changed or adjusted to varying degrees. Japan’s multi-faceted forms of Confucian and Buddhist traditions were significant parts of this continuing thought and culture.

Mori Ogai was educated as a child in orthodox Chu-tzu (Chu Hsi) neo-Confucianism. This cultivates a dualistic mindset "which separates facts from their ‘Reasons’ or ‘Principles’." Natsume Soseki, on the other hand, was a student of Zen Buddhism, which has a close affinity with the Yang-ming (Wang Yang Ming) school (as opposed to the Chu-tzu). Accordingly, Natsume reflected the Yang-ming monistic inclination and emphasis on "Life" and its activity.

Furthermore, Chu-tzu and Yang-ming learning methods are different: "The former

enquires into the reasons for individual things in the world and seeks to acquire in the long run complete wisdom or awakening, and the latter asks for an all-comprising ‘Mind’ directly.\textsuperscript{277} It could be said that the former lends itself to scientific inquiry, and the latter towards a more immediate, passionate search for awakening. Might not their respective backgrounds, therefore, help to explain Mori’s and Natsume’s different emphases?\textsuperscript{278}

Within the wider intellectual community:

Despite the relative unanimity of opinion that Japan was undergoing a grave socio-cultural trauma, there was an unbridgeable cleavage in intellectual circles about the constitution of the ‘ideal’ whose realization would ostensibly lead to its renaissance. That is, intellectuals were divided, as they had been since the Restoration, according to whether the perceived ‘ideal’ was ‘objective’, ‘rational’ and ‘scientific’, or, in exact antithesis, ‘subjective’, ‘emotional’ and ‘intuitive’.\textsuperscript{279}

Clearly, Mori and Satsume were representative of the respective sides of this broad, "unbridgeable cleavage." Perhaps, then, explanations of the broad struggles within late Meiji and Taisho Japan’s philosophical and literary worlds could be sought in traditions inherited from previous eras. How traditional thought might aid us in explaining Takakura’s own particular world of thought will be examined later in the thesis.

Attention could of course be given to many mor: individuals and groups before concluding this section on philosophical and literary currents. However, only two more movements and one individual will be singled out in particular for brief

\textsuperscript{277}Iki, 1979, pp.102-103.

\textsuperscript{278}In offering this explanation, Iki suggests that the Japanese preference for Natsume over Mori is due to the former’s monistic inclination, which matches a similar, deep Japanese mindset. Ibid. It is also interesting to note that Mori, in the midst of his struggles while posted in Kyushu, turned to Yang-ming thought because of its "main tenet that knowledge and action should be identical...." Bowring, 1979, p.128.

\textsuperscript{279}Petralia, 1981, p.31.
The first movement, "Naturalism," had the distinction of being opposed by both Natsume and Ogai, whatever other differences the two might have had.\textsuperscript{280} It emerged around the turn of the century as one example of an attempted "return to a more primordial reality" by intellectuals that was "antienlightenment, antirational, antipositivistic, and antireductionistic."\textsuperscript{281} It was part of the emergence of a nihilistic fatigue that plagued the time,\textsuperscript{282} as well as a reflection of a biological, evolutionary view of life imported from the West.\textsuperscript{283} Having become particularly dominant after the Russo-Japanese War, the Naturalist school of literature was different from its European counterpart in that "it sought to liberate the individual from traditional norms."\textsuperscript{284}

In its stress on individuality, Naturalism was but one instance in literature of the increasingly strong, overall trend towards individualism after the war with Russia.\textsuperscript{285} Another example was the "Shirakaba" ("White Birch") School. Such well-known authors as Shiga Naoya and Arishima Takeo emphasised individuality and subjectivity, explicating their philosophy through a journal begun in 1910


\textsuperscript{282}Kosaka, 1958, pp.472-473,485.


\textsuperscript{285}Yoshitake, 1982, p.199. Along with other sources, Yoshitake points out that this trend towards individualism had been encouraged by the recent introduction from the West of Nietzsche and Ibsen.
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Through this journal and the "I-novel," the White Birth School exerted a tremendous influence over the young people of the Taisho Era.

One individual who came into contact with the White Birch School was the philosopher and writer Miki Kiyoshi (1897-1945, Meiji 30 - Showa 20). Living amidst the individualism of late Meiji and Taisho, Miki continually grappled intellectually with the problem of individuality within Marxist and nationalistic ideologies during the late 1920's (the early Showa years). Miki is thus described as one who "represents not so much a mode of thought as the mood of an era.... It was a bewildered generation, groping for ideologies to answer their unsettled existence." Upon entering Kyoto University in 1917 (Taisho 6) he encountered a strong neo-Kantian influence—which stayed with Miki—along with an aesthetic affinity for Goethe. It is interesting to note that Miki later attested that his teacher in Kyoto, Nishida Kitaro, had not only formed his own thought, but also remained a constant inspiration.

Although impossible adequately to be seen in one glance, the picture one gets from surveying the overlapping worlds of philosophy and literature in Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa Japan is a rich, varied scene that dovetails with Japan's overall context at the time. The furious pace of growth in the first two Meiji decades, plus the ensuing consolidation period of the 1890's--conjoined with two major wars--had
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286 As noted above, this was a form of writing which was used earlier by Mori Ogai.

287 Hane, 1992, pp.221-222.


290 Ibid., pp.145-146. It is also fascinating to note here that Takakura sometimes quotes Goethe in his messages, along with frequently referring to Kant and neo-Kantian thought. Occasionally he mentions them together, for example in his "Kirisutokyo Sekaikan" Seisho no Kensan No.131, November, 1927 (Showa 2), p.18-19; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.123-124. Cf. Part III, p.332.
placed the Japanese intelligentsia in the position of somehow to trying to grapple with a dazzling, and yet murky, mixture of imported Western and indigenous issues. Individualism was one current in the raging river of the times, and most intellectuals either swam alone, or together in schools, within that same stream. It was the abundance of other strong currents that especially made it a time of "agonizing contradictions." Some swimmers drowned; all had to struggle mightily.

Although determining where Takakura himself was swimming must wait for further explanation, it is helpful at this point to note that he attempted to stay abreast of the latest developments within Japan’s rapidly changing intellectual world. Although firmly planted within Christian religious circles, Takakura, too, was one of the many intellectuals who was somehow trying to make his way along a very confusing course. Surely the way often must have seemed to be ever proceeding towards an elusive and unknown goal.

6. Religious Developments - Organisations and Unstructured Movements

In making the transition into a consideration of religious developments, it is intriguing to note that, while having the reputation of a sage philosopher, Miki Kiyoshi was in fact a deeply religious person. In his memoirs he wrote of his hope to remain until death a devout believer in True Pure Land Buddhism. Furthermore, Miki regarded the basic preoccupation of his mentor in philosophy at Kyoto
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291 Kosaka, 1958, p.312.

292 E.g., in an October, 1921 (Taisho 10), letter sent to his wife from Scotland, Takakura requested her to send the newly-published magazine Shiso (Thought). Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," p.272.

293 Takakura described the confusing situation to a student audience as follows: "Today as we know there are various thoughts and trends which are intricately entangled, mutually contradicting each other." ("Gendai ha warera no shiru gotoku iroirona shiso ya keiko ga funkysakuzatsu shite, aitagai ni mujun shite oru.") "Kirisutokyo SekaiSan" Seisho no Kansen No.131, November, 1927 (Showa 2), p.1; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.101.
University, Nishida Kitaro, to be religion.\textsuperscript{294} Interestingly, the uniform opinion of others regarding Nishida is in agreement with Miki's,\textsuperscript{295} Nishida's own statements in fact support such a claim.\textsuperscript{296}

To enlarge the circle, other individuals and groups named in the previous section could be labelled as "religious." One could quickly point to Natsume Soseki's interest in Zen Buddhism. Also, there is the description of the Naturalist School's emphasis on the self and individuality as part of a wider "spiritual revolution," following the earlier political revolution of 1868.\textsuperscript{297} In fact, the size of the "religious circle" could be increased so as to enclose, or at least overlap, other areas examined in this subdivision C of Part I of the thesis. Japan's political ethos would be an obvious example, particularly in connection with the government's alliance with Shintoism in formulating its imperial ideology.\textsuperscript{298}

One factor in the resulting uncertainty as to what and whom should be described as "religious" is the extensive and inconclusive discussion about the meaning of

\textsuperscript{294}Piovesana, 1963, p.160.

\textsuperscript{295}E.g., "For Nishida religion is the ultimate philosophical problem." Shimomura, 1988, pp.200-201. Also, "His books show us one whose eyes have been opened by Zen meditation...." Nishitani, 1991, p.40.


\textsuperscript{297}Kosaka, 1958, p.187.

\textsuperscript{298}There are numerous analyses--for the most part extremely critical--of this alliance, from a vast variety of perspectives, e.g. A. Morgan Young, \textit{The Rise of a Pagan State: Japan's Religious Background}. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1939; John M.L. Young, \textit{The Two Empires in Japan}. Tokyo: The Bible Times Press, 1958; Anesaki, 1930 (Showa 5), pp.334-336.
"religion," a discussion that will not be extended here.299 A group of analyses that help to explain both the difficulties of categorising "religious" subjects and the seeming widespread phenomenon of religion in Takakura's Japanese context is an "Eastern," and particularly Buddhist, approach. This mindset contrasts the Western differentiation between philosophy and religion to an Eastern approach, which sees the two as "undifferentiated and inseparable."300 Such an analysis thus entails that any object of rational inquiry is "religious," given the two categories' inseparable amalgamation.301 Furthermore, the problems of distinctions, in this case between religion and anything else, associated with "Western, scientific" analyses never arise.302

It should be clear that this discussion is part of the central concern of the thesis. On the one hand, the thesis' theological posture particularly comes to the fore

299 The discussion is succinctly summarised, with constructive suggestions on how to proceed, in Reid, 1991, pp.64-68.


301 This would thus include Takakura's total context, which has been under "rational" examination here. That is, our discussion has been proceeding within "scientific" categories concerning his "life" (e.g., "home and family") and "times" (e.g., "political" ethos, "socio-economic" trends).

within a consideration of religious matters—including their categorisation, extension, and definition. Additionally, the thesis’ concern with cultural issues is embedded in "examining" Takakura’s thought in a way that requires using the English language and a "scientific" perspective. There is a problem in that both the language and methodology being employed here could be considered alien to Takakura’s own thought.

What we must bear in mind is that looking at Takakura’s thought involves not only Takakura and his context, but the thesis writer and reader as well. Indeed the relationship between the object and subject of the discussion—just assumed to be distinct in the immediately preceding sentence—must somehow be considered in light of suggestions which have been made within "Eastern, Buddhist" contexts, and in particular Takakura’s own culture. The difficult task, "fraught with uncertainties and tensions," is how not blindly to "dichotomize subject and object," yet to operate within a process of examination that seemingly demands such a mindset.

Proceeding with caution, then, various religious developments within Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa Japan will briefly be considered here by giving attention both to identifiable, structured religious organisations, as well as to more difficult-to-identify "unstructured" developments.

There was increased vitality and change in organised religion during Meiji Japan, just as there had been during previous periods of social and political upheaval.
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303 "Perspective...symbolically expresses the world-view which founded modernity, and in which the position of the individual subject is so enhanced as to become transcendent (as, for example, in Descartes’s cogito)." Augustin Berque, "The Self in Relation to the Environment," in Rosenberger, ed., 1992, p.97.

Throughout Japanese history.305 Regarding the political status of religions in Japan, the overall government objective of national consolidation included establishing Shinto as the religious foundation of the state in 1868 (Meiji 1).306 However, government was forced to adjust its policies and administration both by revived Buddhism, as well as by those raising the question of freedom of religious conscience. The latter group included Western governments, particularly in relation to the presence of Christianity. Thus in 1882 (Meiji 15) Shinto was legally divided into "nonreligious" shrine Shinto and "religious" sect Shinto. The former consisted of most shrines throughout Japan, all of which were to be administered by a special Bureau of Shrines in the Department of Home Affairs. Thirteen branches of sect Shinto were considered religious, along with Buddhism and Christianity: all recognised groups within these three traditions were to be supervised by the Department of Education, specifically its Bureau of Religions.307

Buddhism had entered the Meiji Era as a large number of denominations. These had proliferated within the streams of six established sects that had begun in Japan during earlier centuries: Nara (7th century), Tendai (9th), Shingon (9th), Pure Land (12th), Zen (12th), and Nichiren (13th).308 Having been used by the Tokugawa government as a means of eliminating the possibility of religious strife by being forbidden to engage in any inter-sect quarrels, as well as by registering all births and deaths at its various temples, Buddhism had become the de facto national


306Shinto thus replaced Buddhism as the established state religion, the latter having been declared as such by the Tokugawa government. H. Byron Earhart, *Japanese Religion: Unity and Diversity*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1974, pp.94-95.

307Ibid., pp.96-97. David Reid clarifies dates in pointing out that the Shrine Bureau and the Religions Bureau were established separately in 1900 (Meiji 33), and that the Religions Bureau was transferred from the Ministry of Home Affairs to the Ministry of Education in 1913 (Taisho 2). op.cit., p.164.

religion. In Meiji Japan, however, Buddhism was faced with the challenges of disestablishment, its own preoccupation with ancestral rites and funerals, and new, aggressive Western rivals, namely Christianity, science, and philosophy. The growth of new forms of Buddhism, the vigorous growth of Buddhist scholarship in apologetics, translation, and publishing, and "the tenacity of the Buddhist faith among the people at large" demonstrated the strength resident within Buddhism to meet these challenges.

There were many other "new religions" besides the new forms of Buddhism. Most of these had Shinto leanings and helped meet immediate social needs, of both rural and urban people, that had been created by the rapid changes in both the late Tokugawa and Meiji years. Although difficult to categorise due their tremendous variety, many of these new religions were founded by a single, charismatic, and often a woman leader, many of whom performed faith healing. Tenrikyo, founded in 1838 by a farmer's wife, Mrs. Nakayama Miki, is the most well-known of these new movements. Another of particular note due to one of its three main headquarters being located in Takakura's hometown of Ayabe was "Omoto," begun in 1892 (Meiji 25) by Deguchi Nao.

---

309 Earhart, 1974, pp.87-88.
310 Christianity's being "Western" refers specifically to the historical situation at hand. Christianity's development in Takaku'a's time and context will be considered in Part II, ch.1.
312 This particularly included Soka Gakkai in the Nichiren tradition. Earhart, 1974, pp.110,114-117; Reid, 1991, pp.28-29.
313 Earhart, 1974, pp.102-103; Anesaki, 1930 (Showa 5), p.384.
316 Earhart, 1974, pp.110-114.
317 The Ayabe headquarters, in fact, are adjacent to the elementary school where Takakura attended.
Besides new religions arising in the midst of acute social needs, there were new literary and communal movements that began amidst the measure of "prosperity and stability" brought to Taisho Japan by a "maturity of capitalism."\(^{318}\) Of particular note were writings and groups led by Kurata Hyakuzo and Nishida Tenko. While Buddhist in character, both of these men and their followings had drawn Takakura’s attention by the early 1920’s (around Taisho 10).\(^{319}\) These and other similar efforts clearly were an important part of the overall socio-religious context in which Takakura’s thought developed.\(^{320}\)

The rise of these new religious movements reveals the vibrancy of popular, "folk" religion, particularly in rural Japan.\(^{321}\) As described above, Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa intellectuals felt deep "spiritual trouble and agony"\(^{322}\) in light of "the worldwide divisions and deep fissures in the minds of the people that were caused by the completion of the emperor system and the surfacing of internal crises."\(^{323}\) With all of the changes concerning the more structured, traditional Shinto and


\(^{318}\)Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.396.

\(^{319}\)Takakura mentions them in his essay, "Omoidazuru Mama" ("As I Recall") Fukuin Shinpo (Weekly Gospel) Nos.1369,1370, 22,29 September 1921 (Taisho 10), pp.4-5,5; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.31-35.

\(^{320}\)op.cit.

\(^{321}\)Irokawa Daikichi has a fascinating analysis of how this folk religiosity meshed with the imperial ideology, especially following the Russo-Japanese War. Irokawa, 1985, pp.215ff.

\(^{322}\)This phrase is Anesaki’s translation of the oft-used word "hanmon." Anesaki, 1930 (Showa 5), p.376.

\(^{323}\)op.cit., p.216.
Buddhist organizations, one can infer that many adherents’ own religious experiences must have been affected in significant ways.

In seeking to understand the nature of such popular religious developments during Takakura’s time, four general types of analysis can serve as examples of how to proceed. One type used by many writers is an attempt to discover an indigenous, native "Japanese" religiosity. This is done either by seeking to identify through direct examination the "Japanese religious psychology," or by appealing to historical origins. The latter approach can focus on pre-Buddhist Shintoism, i.e., before any religion was imported into Japan, the religious ideas and practices of Japan’s early agrarian society, or the religion of Japan’s (and all of humanity’s) alleged pre-agrarian, original hunting and gathering stage. Once determined, then, the basic, underlying "Japanese religiosity," which, it is assumed, "still lives deep in the hearts and minds of the Japanese even into modern times," can be seen as it is manifested in a particular historical form(s) during the Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa years.

324The changes in Meiji and Taisho followed the many changes throughout previous centuries, of course, especially including the interpenetration of Shinto and Buddhist beliefs and practices. This process has been described in many analyses, e.g. Umehara Takeshi, "The Japanese View of the ‘Other World’: Japanese Religion in World Perspective" Japan Review: Bulletin of the International Research Center for Japanese Studies No.2, 1991, pp.184-185. We should at least mention as well influences of other "religions," such as Taoism and Confucianism.


326This search for early Shintoism is perhaps best exemplified in the "National Learning" movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as outlined in, e.g., Tsunoda Ryusaku, Wm. Theodore de Bary, and Donald Keene, comps., Sources of the Japanese Tradition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958, pp.507-514.


329Ibid., p.169.

83
A second type of analysis is that of inductively identifying "persistent themes in Japanese religious history." This resembles the first type in focusing on Japanese religious history, but differs in seeking to be more broad in historical scope. These themes would thus be expected to be exemplified during Takakura's time as well. A third approach places particular emphasis on the immediate context, seeing religious aspirations as emerging within, and being in large part determined by, the overall politico-socio-economic circumstances of the period being considered. While overlapping with the second category of approach in its aim to see religion understood as it is inductively examined within its historical context, this third type focuses more on the particular time period under study, instead of looking for the emergence of historically broad themes.

The fourth style seeks simply to be descriptive, taking an historical, survey type of approach. Whether considering the whole sweep of history or limiting the time period, this approach seeks to avoid either trying to identify themes, or explicitly supporting any particular view of religion's relationship to the rest of societal life.

In seeking to understand what was happening religiously amongst the "real people" living "on the ground" in Takakura's day, the wisest approach here seems to be the most cautious one. That is, this thesis will attempt both to recognise valid insights gained from all four styles just outlined, as well as to take into account the tremendous variety and complexity of Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa religious developments. Hence such propensities as "psychic unity" (i.e., between intellect, 

---

330Earhart, 1974, pp.5-8.

331E.g., Irokawa, 1985. In fairness, it should be pointed out that Irokawa also gives due attention to the continuation of traditional religious beliefs and practices in his account.

332The prime example of this approach is Anesaki Masaharu's deservedly oft-cited History of Japanese Religion, 1930 (Showa 5).
will, and emotion) and people’s close relationship to nature\textsuperscript{333} could be expected to have been particularly prominent in the continuing, traditional religious expressions in rural villages.\textsuperscript{334} A displaced urban labourer, for example, would have found solace in a way somehow dependent on the particular Buddhist tradition with which his/her family was affiliated. When and where one had been formally educated would have affected the depth of control exerted over that person by the "spiritual structure\textsuperscript{335}" known politically as the "tennosei" (imperial ideology) of the day. Obviously, then, an approach carefully taking into account both general and specific historical, traditional, and contextual factors is required in considering the religious developments relevant to Takakura’s own situation and experience.

In Takakura’s case, factors in his childhood religious experience to be considered include his ancestral connection, down through his great-grandparents and grandparents at least, with Jodo Shinshu ("True Pure Land" Buddhism), and specifically the powerful Hongwanji ("Primal Vow Temple").\textsuperscript{336} Besides this obviously crucial relationship with one of Japanese Buddhism's most influential traditions, Takakura grew up in Ayabe both surrounded by various Buddhist temples and Shinto shrines\textsuperscript{337} and participating in traditional religious festivals.\textsuperscript{338} It can be inferred as well that as a young boy Takakura had at least some acquaintance with "new religions," e.g., the previously-mentioned Omoto sect

\textsuperscript{333}Branley, 1966, pp.69-75.

\textsuperscript{334}Irokawa, 1985, pp.21-23.

\textsuperscript{335}Ibid., p.245.

\textsuperscript{336}Oshio, pp.6,10. The Takakura family is here described as having its religious affiliation with Pure Land Buddhism "for generations" ("dai
dai" or "yoyo"). Furthermore, Takakura’s (great-) grandparents were "earnest" ("nesshin") affiliates of the Hongwanji.

\textsuperscript{337}A quick glance at a current map of Ayabe indicates the variety of temples and shrines still there.

\textsuperscript{338}Takakura recalls such a childhood festival in his 1924 (Taisho 13) sermon, "Hoshi o Aoide" ("Look Up at the Stars"), in Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.60-61; Zenshu, Vol.1, pp.349-350.
located next to his elementary school in Ayabe.\textsuperscript{339}

As seen earlier, Takakura’s formal education put him in constant exposure to the post-1890 (Meiji 23), uniformly taught imperial ideology. It is difficult to tell what living away from home during his junior high (Tokyo), high school (Kanazawa), and university (Tokyo) years meant in terms of contact with organised religion. It can be assumed that Takakura continued to observe customary religious practices, such as shrine visits.\textsuperscript{340} Takakura’s specific contact with Zen Buddhism in high school through his teacher Nishida Kitaro, as well as with Christianity, has already been noted.\textsuperscript{341} Takakura of course came into intimate contact with Christianity soon after moving to Tokyo in the fall of 1906 (Meiji 39): his Christian conversion will be described shortly.

Specifically religious implications of Takakura’s move to urban Tokyo can only be conjectured from analyses already given of his life context. Such conjectures might include his being moved towards a more individualistic faith versus a corporate religiosity, or his experiencing a feeling of "lostness" experienced by many other intellectuals. As for Takakura’s post-conversion dealings with other religious developments of his day, examination will be forthcoming in the midst of looking at the development of his thought. Suffice it here to say that Takakura consciously dealt with movements that he considered religiously relevant to Christianity, e.g. social problems, the imperial ideology, naturalism, and Buddhism.\textsuperscript{342}

Offering some sort of specifically theological evaluation—i.e., according to the

\textsuperscript{339}Cf. above, Part I, p.81(n.317).


\textsuperscript{341}Cf. above, Part I, pp.35-37.

\textsuperscript{342}Takakura specifically mentions these four topics in, e.g., a 7 December 1920 (Taisho 9) letter to his parents. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," p.264.
thesis' basic Christian, theological posture—of Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa religious developments would at this point be entering prematurely into such complicated, ongoing discussions as those involving interreligious dialogue and the uniqueness of Christianity. However, the thesis' interdisciplinary approach as described in the Introduction allows for an openness to constructive contributions to the discovery and discernment of "truth" made by areas of thought and life outside a strictly protected domain of Christian theology. Thus in thinking of the entire historical context of Takakura's life and times—including that context's "religious" developments—the position here is to see Jesus Christ as somehow working in and through all sectors of humanity's movements and gropings, as well as moving at all times and in all places of human history. Hence Takakura's times are understood here to be within the ultimate control of Jesus Christ. That control included the ways in which the period exerted its multi-faceted influences on people like Takakura who consciously followed Christ in that context.343

D. Conversion and Career

The thesis will now move to consider Takakura's own embracing of Jesus Christ as Master and Redeemer, as well as the implications of such for Takakura's career. Although details of his thinking will not be considered until later in the thesis, overviewing his conversion and career should begin to give an appreciation for the

343 The reader may have sensed along with the thesis writer a tension between maintaining a Christian, theological posture towards Takakura's life context, and examining that context with scientific categories. This tension was addressed at the beginning of the section on "Religious Developments." Hopefully those comments, plus the remainder of the thesis, will deal constructively with what seems to be an unavoidable difficulty. Cf. Introduction, p.5, above, Part I, pp.76-79.

Also, throughout this entire section C, the discreet and infrequent use of the terms "modern" and "modernisation" in describing Meiji and Taisho Japan may have been noticed. This largely is due to the confusing notions that these terms present, as discussed in such works as Hall, 1965, and Kawamura Nozomu, "The Concept of Modernization Re-examined," in Gavan McCormack and Sugimoto Yoshio, eds., The Japanese Trajectory: Modernization and Beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp.264-283. The latter is among several articles pointing out some of the pitfalls (cf. pp.268-270,278-279) of Ruth Benedict's monumental and influential book (Ruth Benedict, The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1946), thus explaining the lack of references to that work as well.
complexity of the man who lived in the fascinating context just examined.

1. Baptism

One of the most extraordinary features of modern Japanese history is that of sudden change in its view of the world. The Japanese as a people demonstrated extraordinary "intellectual mobility"--an unusual flexibility of thought... Some Japanese underwent a gradual metamorphosis in their world view; many others seemed to have undergone swift emotional conversions.344

While this quotation refers specifically to Japan's attitudes towards the West, on the surface at least it could apply to Takakura's "sudden change in [his] view of the world" and "swift emotional conversion." Only three months after realising his dream of beginning law studies in the Imperial University, Takakura was baptised at the Fujimicho Church by Uemura Masahisa at the Christmas worship service on 23 December 1906 (Meiji 39).345 Furthermore, subsequently finding his studies monotonous and unrelated to his wrestlings over the problem of life, one year later Takakura quit law school and entered Uemura's seminary in order to pursue theological studies.346 Thus over the course of just a few months Takakura threw away that for which both he and his father had planned and worked since his childhood.

Why the sudden change? First, the context--particularly the time--of Takakura's baptism and decision to pursue theological studies must be kept in mind. Personally, Takakura was in his early twenties, he had just completed a period of study in high school that was extremely stimulating and challenging, and he had just moved back to the ever-burgeoning metropolis of Tokyo. Those personal factors alone make a dramatic, life-changing decision not that unexpected. When the overall context of the period immediately following the Russo-Japanese War is


taken into account, not only is a change "not that unexpected," but the absence of some sort of a change is what would have been surprising.

Additionally, the change towards Christianity per se, including a relationship with the Church, might not have been that sudden after all. Takakura’s father and stepmothers all devotedly lived their Christian faith before Takakura from the time he had entered elementary school, and they quite possibly took him to Sunday School.347 His parents sent Christian reading materials to Takakura when he was in the Kanazawa High School,348 and he actively attended worship services back in Ayabe during his high school vacations.349 It will be recalled as well that Takakura had some kind of connection with the church in Kanazawa. Either through that connection or some other, Takakura even read one of Uemura Masahisa’s published collections of sermons.350

Upon going to Tokyo in September, 1906 (Meiji 37), for studies in the Imperial University, Takakura visited various Congregational churches, including the one in Hongo pastored by Ebina Danjo. However, he soon settled into the Fujimicho Church because of Uemura’s deeply moving sermons.351 By November he could write:

Intellectually I have acknowledged God’s existence, but I couldn’t believe that that God had mind, emotions, and will like me, nor that

347Oshio, p.35.


349op.cit. Recall the engagement to the pastor’s daughter, described earlier. The Ayabe (Congregational) church had been established as a preaching point in April, 1896 (Meiji 29), i.e., about the time Takakura turned eleven. Sakamoto Taketo, "The Early History of Christianity in the Tanba District" The Japan Christian Quarterly 30, No.3, July, 1964, p.208. According to a 13 December 1993 conversation with the pastor of the present Ayabe church, Takakura’s father Heibei was a central figure in the church’s beginning.


351Ibid.
He accepts our prayers, nor that He loves us. I have agonized extremely hard over believing these things, and usually when I think about them my brain is vague as if I’m in a fog, but in the midst of that vagueness, I have come to understand that God’s hand is upon me and that He accepts me. I am thinking of moving ahead in faith still more and receiving baptism.\footnote{This is in a 21 November 1906 (Meiji 39) letter from Takakura to his parents. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," pp.189-190.}

As described earlier, Takakura was indeed baptised the next month. He also became zealously active in the life of Fujimicho Church, especially including drinking in Uemura’s messages, wherever the latter spoke.\footnote{op.cit., p.38.} Soon to come was Takakura’s change from law school to theological seminary.

How further to understand and interpret Takakura’s conversion to Christianity and baptism into the Church will be addressed as the thesis progresses.\footnote{At this point, it is intriguing and somewhat startling to note one interpretation that sees in Takakura’s conversion not self-denial and struggle, but self-fulfilment and self-acceptance. Accordingly, this interpretation reads a grandiose pride in the decision to quit law school and pursue theological studies. Ishihara, 1964, pp.11-12.} What can be noted here is the radical change of course for Takakura’s inner and outer lives brought about by his embracing the Christian faith.

2. Church Ministry

In writing over ten years later about the events just described, Takakura remarked that both his decision to convert to Christianity and to enter seminary were related to solving the problem of the "self," i.e., its nature, how to set it free, and how to see it become fully realised: "I was baptised because I believed that somehow through Christianity I could solve the problem of the self.... I entered seminary not because I intended to become a pastor, but because I thought it would be good to be able freely to read books that I liked, and because I wanted to lead a more
earnest and serious life.” He goes on to say that all the way up to his graduation from seminary, he still did not feel a call to become a pastor. Furthermore, Takakura says that upon actually entering the pastorate he did so indecisively and without firm resolve, and that becoming a pastor was simply due to his teachers’ influence and to circumstances. Nevertheless, a pastor is what he became: upon graduating from seminary in June, 1910 (Meiji 43), Takakura accepted the position as youth pastor/evangelist at Uemura’s Fujimicho Church.

His service at Fujimicho Church was interrupted by one year (from December 1910; Meiji 43) of voluntary, enlisted military service, during which time he was stationed in Fukuchiyama. Takakura resumed his former position at Fujimicho Church in late 1911 (Meiji 44). After getting married in May, he was ordained as a teaching elder in the NKK on 28 December 1912 (Taisho 1).

---

355“Shukufukuseraruru Made,” in Oncho no Okoku, pp.1-2; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.18.

356Ibid., in Oncho no Okoku, pp.2-3; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.19.

357Zenshu, Vol.10, “Kashin,” pp.241-243. In the first part of this letter to his parents, Takakura expresses his gratitude to God in the midst of describing how his fellow graduates and students were spread out from Taiwan to the Bering Strait, as well as how Uemura was in Manchuria on an evangelistic tour. It is unclear as to whether Takakura means gratitude for the widespread preaching of the gospel, or the fact that he himself was still relatively close to home.

358By attending "Higher School," Takakura had gained the privilege of postponing military conscription; by graduating, he could join the Army as a one-year volunteer. Department of Education, 1904, Part IV, p.12. Ishihara asserts that Takakura retained his registration in the Imperial University even after entering seminary so as to retain this privilege of exemption from compulsory conscription, thus supporting his interpretation of Takakura’s motivations for leaving law school. Ishihara, 1964, p.12; cf. above, Part I, p.90(n.354).

359Oshio, pp.56-57. Oshio describes the year’s monotony as almost unbearable for Takakura, writing that he waited for his discharge day as a prisoner awaits release from prison. It is interesting to recall that Fukuchiyama was the hometown of Takakura’s biological mother Sayo, as well as near Takakura’s own hometown of Ayabe.

360“kyoshi”
Because he felt that Takakura needed a responsible position that would provide further training, Uemura recommended that he take the pastoral responsibility of a small mission in Kyoto, the Yoshida Church, a position Takakura accepted.\(^{362}\) He began his work there in January, 1913 (Taisho 2), but within several months Takakura had been called by the larger, more established Kitatatsu Church in Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan’s northernmost major island.\(^{353}\) Having spent a meaningful summer there during his seminary years,\(^{364}\) Takakura accepted the call, arriving in Sapporo on 24 October. While breathing the clean, country air of Hokkaido until the time of his return to Tokyo in October, 1918 (Taisho 7)—and while Europe was engaged in the horrors of World War I--Takakura enjoyed his five most pleasant years of pastoring.\(^{365}\)

At least since the December prior to his going to Tokyo in the fall of 1918 (Taisho 7), Takakura had been planning on going to the West for three to four years of study. His reasons for wanting to do so were: [1] the Kitatatsu Church was in a good, healthy condition;\(^{366}\) [2] as the years passed, he only would get busier, and once past forty, he would become less capable of learning; and, [3] he had not yet discovered the life work to which he should devote himself, and thus he wanted

\(^{361}\) op.cit., pp.57,67.

\(^{362}\) Ibid., pp.67-68.

\(^{363}\) Cf. Figure 1 above, Part I, p.16.


\(^{365}\) Oshio, p.72. Although accurately listing the beginning and ending dates, Oshio mistakenly identifies Takakura’s time in Sapporo as lasting only four years.

\(^{366}\) For instance, in a 21 February 1916 (Taisho 5) letter to his parents, Takakura writes that during the previous year the church had had fifty baptisms, bringing the membership up to five hundred--thus making it the fifth or sixth largest NKK congregation. In a 29 October letter written in the same year, Takakura writes that there had been eighty baptisms on the previous Sunday alone. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," pp.255,256.
three to four years quietly to prepare, think, and decide. Takakura’s hope was to leave for the United States in the summer of 1918 (Taisho 7), spend two years, then study one year in Edinburgh, Scotland. If the war in Europe prevented going then, he could delay his trip for one year, and study and prepare in Tokyo.\footnote{Takakura writes of such a plan in a 12 December 1917 (Taisho 6) letter to his father. Ibid., pp.258-259.}

Be that as it may, Takakura spent the next three years in Tokyo, teaching, preaching, pastoring, writing, and studying. At Uemura’s invitation he taught at the seminary; perhaps part of the delay in Takakura’s leaving for study was Uemura’s intention to give him increasing amounts of responsibility, so as to keep him in Tokyo at the seminary. Takakura had numerous other preaching and pastoring responsibilities as well, however. Among the most significant were months of filling in for a sick pastor, Mori Akira,\footnote{Mori and Takakura became dear friends, as described, e.g., by Oshio. Oshio, No.2, 1954, pp.44-46,64. Interestingly, Mori was the son of the famous Meiji Minister of Education, Mori Arinori. Conversation with Sato Toshio, 11 May 1994.} at the Naka Shibuya Church, as well as pastoring a new church in Kamakura. As he had done during his time in Sapporo, Takakura wrote articles for several publications; and, his first published collection of selected sermons and articles, \textit{Oncho no Okoku (Kingdom of Grace)}, was published in July of 1921 (Taisho 10).\footnote{Besides regular essays written for the \textit{Fukuin Shinpo} and \textit{Seisho no Kensan}, Takakura contributed several entries for the \textit{Tetsugaku Dai Jiten (Large Dictionary of Philosophy)}. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1920 (Showa 9).} While maintaining his focus on study and research, then, Takakura was busy with numerous and varied activities.\footnote{Oshio, pp.84-87.}

Takakura’s trip to the West finally worked out in 1921 (Taisho 10). He left Kobe by ship on 4 August, and arrived in London on 25 September.\footnote{Ibid., pp.92,94.} He spent
October until the last part of June studying at New College, Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{372} During the summer of 1922 (Taisho 11) Takakura toured in Germany at the invitation of his friend, Ishihara Ken, who was studying in Heidelberg.\textsuperscript{373} From the fall, Takakura was in Oxford as a student at Mansfield College for one year, although in the spring (April) he enjoyed a trip with an artist friend to Barbizon, France.\textsuperscript{374} After failing to receive a scholarship to attend Union Seminary in New York,\textsuperscript{375} Takakura decided to stay in Britain until the spring of 1924 (Taisho 13). However, the shocking news of the 1 September 1923 (Taisho 12) Kanto Earthquake made him want to return to Japan immediately.\textsuperscript{376} He eventually reached a sort of compromise,\textsuperscript{377} studying for the fall term at Westminster College in Cambridge. On 25 January 1924 (Taisho 13), Takakura boarded a ship out of London, eventually sailing back into Kobe on 4 March.\textsuperscript{378}

Takakura’s second book, \textit{Oncho to Shinjitsu (Grace and Truth)} was published in February of 1925 (Taisho 14). In the preface, Takakura describes his travels to and from Europe, along with of course the time spent there. He begins by saying that at the outset he was ambivalent about going, preferring rather to find some quiet, rural place in Japan for research and reflection. However, realising that such a scenario was impossible, in retrospect he is thankful for the opportunity, and says that it was good that he was able to interact theologically with so many people.

\textsuperscript{372}According to the Winter, 1921 term \textit{New College Edinburgh, Hand-book} located in New College Library, Takakura was a “Non-Regular Student.”

\textsuperscript{373}op.cit., p.100. Takakura toured several places in Germany besides Heidelberg. Thus although Oshio mentions the time in Germany as lasting one month, as letters written to his wife indicate, Takakura’s total time there was two months. \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.10, “Kashin,” pp.275-276.

\textsuperscript{374}Oshio, p.101.


\textsuperscript{377}This comes out in letters to his wife, \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.10, “Kashin,” pp.279-280.

\textsuperscript{378}Oshio, pp.102,144,145.
Before dedicating the book to Uemura, Takakura further writes of his sense of calling to address various issues crucial to Christianity in Japan.379

During his remaining years back in Japan, Takakura wholeheartedly gave himself to that calling, carrying "superhuman" responsibilities as pastor, seminary professor and president, as well as author.380 Initially faced with a choice between three work offers, Takakura finally elected to be in Tokyo, and to teach at Uemura's seminary.381 While others may have had different plans for his pastoral career,382 Takakura and a group of Christians started gathering for small meetings in June only two months after he had arrived in Tokyo. By December this group had formally started planning on forming a new church.383 After being organised as a "Dendo Kyokai" ("Evangelism Church") of the NKK in the fall of 1925 (Taisho


382These included Uemura and his own Fujimicho Church, as well as those at the Naka Shibuya Church, where Mori Akira the pastor was still quite ill. Oshio, pp.153-154.

383The group consisted of people who had sat under Takakura's teaching years earlier, either in Sapporo or Kamakura. Several of these individuals could be singled out for their close friendships with Takakura, as well as for their own personal achievements. One couple worthy of particular note is the Masutomis, Yasuzaemon and Teruko. Having become acquainted in the Fujimicho Church with Takakura during his student days, the Masutomis had Takakura contribute commentary articles on Romans for their Seisho no Kensan publication while Takakura was pastoring in Sapporo. Before Takakura went to Britain, the Masutomis were pillars of the new church in Kamakura that Takakura helped to start. Furthermore, they bore the full expenses for publishing Takakura's first book in 1921 (Taisho 10), Oncho no Okoku. According to a conversation with Sato Toshio on 11 May 1994, Masutomi not only owned a factory in Korea, but started schools there as well. Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.5, pp.393-394; Oshio, p.84.
14), this group became a "full-fledged" church two years later.384 Called the "Toyama Church," it was renamed and relocated into the present Shinanomachi Church in 1930 (Showa 5). Takakura continued as pastor until his death in 1934 (Showa 9).385

Along with increasingly heavy pastoral responsibilities, Takakura had many and varied duties at the seminary. Upon Uemura’s death in January, 1925 (Taisho 14), Takakura became president of the Tokyo Shingakusha Shingakko; he continued as president and professor until April, 1930 (Showa 5). At that time, the seminary was merged with the theology department of Meiji Gakuin to form, under the jurisdiction of the NKK, the Nihon Shingakko (Japan Seminary). Takakura was named "head teacher";386 he remained as such until October, 1932 (Showa 7), when he had to assume the duties of president upon his predecessor’s resignation.387

Takakura’s writing production as well only increased upon his return to Japan from overseas. His third book, Oncho to Shomei (Grace and Calling), came out in November, 1926 (Showa 1). His best-known publication, Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo (Evangelical Christianity), was published the following October. Takakura produced other smaller books and articles, and as the leader of a newly-formed, reform-minded theological research and fellowship group, he started a new

384 Becoming a fully established church was enabled by the church’s receiving approximately one hundred members on transfer from Fujimicho Church. This was a result of a split, associated with choosing a successor to Uemura, that rocked not only Fujimicho Church, but the entire Church in Japan. Oshio, pp.200-237.


386 "kyoto"

387 The merger with Meiji Gakuin was in accordance with Takakura’s and others’ long-standing wishes--but contrary to Uemura’s, thus explaining the delay. Oshio, pp.250-252,315,321.
magazine, *Fukuin to Gendai (The Gospel and Modern Times)*, in 1930 (Showa 5).  

In connection with all of these responsibilities, Takakura travelled and spoke extensively. Many trips and speeches are worthy of comment, but one especially interesting talk was the aforementioned "Christianity and the Spirit of Civilisation", delivered in June, 1925 (Taisho 14). In giving this lecture to a gathering of over three thousand students in Tokyo, Takakura shared the podium with none other than Uchimura Kanzo. Many of his lectures were to such student groups in Tokyo; however, Takakura spoke throughout all of central Japan, and even as far away as Japan’s southernmost (Kyushu) and northernmost (Hokkaido) islands.

Being the primary successor to Uemura Masahisa’s position as the most influential leader within the NKK, Takakura poured himself out in work and service. After his return from Britain in early 1924 (Taisho 13), and then especially after Uemura’s untimely death one year later, Takakura had to assume many responsibilities as a teacher, preacher, pastor, administrator, and writer. However,

---

388 The group called itself the "Fukuin Doshikai" ("Gospel Association of Kindred Spirits"), and with Takakura as the focal leader consisted of students who were deeply interested in church reform. Although the group began with high hopes and a strong vision, various problems soon emerged, and Takakura suffered great personal pain. The magazine ran for two and one-half years, with thirty-one monthly issues, from March, 1931 (Showa 6), through October, 1933 (Showa 8). All thirty-one issues are housed in the Tokyo Shingaku Daigaku Library. Oshio, pp.269-279; Sato, 1983, pp.206-218.

389 Cf., e.g., Oshio’s listing of the events of Takakura’s life from 1924 (Taisho 3), pp.315ff.


391 In his diary entry for that date (6 June), Takakura writes that Uchimura’s talk was quite "dogmatic" (the word is written in English), but that there were "flashes of genius" ("tensai no hiramekiaru") as well. *Zenshu*, Vol.10, "Nikki," p.225. More will be said about Uchimura in Part II, ch.1.

97
unlike his predecessor Uemura, who during his almost seventy years became the single, great, church-founding statesman that he was, Takakura had his life and service cut short at the age of forty-nine, falling as it were in the middle of his excruciating sprint.\(^\text{392}\) Not only did he not become the famous politician that as a child he had envisioned himself becoming, but a lack of both time and political astuteness in carrying his many responsibilities within the Church prevented Takakura from having the organisational influence he otherwise might have attained.\(^\text{393}\)

Despite his political failures, Takakura’s influence in the NKK and beyond was substantial. As the thesis’ continuing examination will bear out, his thought is a fascinating and complex articulation of the Christian faith. However, much of the interest that has been shown in Takakura’s life and career has focused on his untimely death.\(^\text{394}\) Thus, here at the conclusion of this examination of Takakura’s total life context, his death will be given its own, brief consideration.

**E. Death**

Takakura Tokutaro died on 3 April 1934 (Showa 9), just twenty days short of his forty-ninth birthday. Even though he had been ill for two years,\(^\text{395}\) Takakura’s death came as a shock to the NKK. As one would expect, there was a large gathering of family, friends, colleagues, and students at his funeral two days after his death, held at the Shinanomachi Church.\(^\text{396}\)

Takakura’s diary entries throughout his life show occasional mention of stomach

---


\(^{393}\) Ibid., p.216.

\(^{394}\) Ibid., pp.219-237; Oshio, pp.298-309. The thesis writer has been both advised and asked by several parties concerning the interpretation of Takakura’s death.

\(^{395}\) Sato, 1983, p.221.

\(^{396}\) Oshio, p.308.
pains, sleeplessness, and gloominess, but there are increased complaints of fatigue from 1932 (Showa 7). His growing incapacity to bear up forced Takakura to give up many of his responsibilities at the Japan Seminary and Shinanomachi Church. His dismantling of the theological fellowship group "Doshisha," plus his resignation as editor and primary writer for the *Fukuin to Gendai* magazine in October, 1933 (Showa 8), were the final big shocks to those who had been hoping for his recovery.

Takakura took prolonged periods of rest: he went to the nearby Izu Peninsula and Hakone, checked into hospital in March, 1933 (Showa 8), and spent the first week of June through the first week of October back in Ayabe. Upon returning to Tokyo in October, Takakura’s health collapsed, and he was in hospital from Christmas, 1933 (Showa 8), until 30 March 1934 (Showa 9). His death occurred within just four days after returning to his Tokyo residence.

As shocking and difficult as his relatively early death was at the time, the struggle over Takakura’s passing was in many ways intensified when it became publicly known twenty years later that he had committed suicide. As might be expected, reactions to this news ranged from doubts and questions about the

---

397 E.g., 14 April 1919 (Taisho 8), 15 September 1921 (Taisho 10), 9 September 1923 (Taisho 12), 30, 31 May 1928 (Showa 3), from 22 January 1932 (Showa 7). *Zenshu*, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.95,147,206,273,363ff.

398 *op.cit.*, p.299. Oshio goes on to mention, however, that expectations for Takakura’s recovery and resumption of responsibilities continued with some people, e.g. Masutomi Yasuzaemon. p.302.

399 These are resort areas southwest of Tokyo. Cf. map, above, Part I, p.16.

400 *op.cit.*, pp.321-322.

legitimacy of Takakura's own Christian faith and theology,\textsuperscript{402} to defences of Takakura, to expressions of regret that knowledge of the suicide had not been made public earlier.\textsuperscript{403} Also, as might be expected, questions over Takakura's suicide remain to this day.

Despite these lingering questions, increased public awareness of depression as a medical condition, along with continued examination of Takakura's own case, have made the view that Takakura died due to that particular illness the predominant one (including this thesis' view).\textsuperscript{404} Takakura did not die because of a lapse of faith, but because he was sick. Increased recording of dreams in Takakura's diary,\textsuperscript{405} along with expressions of guilt, were aspects of the sickness. If anything, Takakura's journal entries reveal a faith that endured to the end, as he exhorted himself to give thanks, pray, and worship.\textsuperscript{406} Even so, the genuineness, or lack thereof, of faith really is not a relevant factor. As is the case with many other sufferers of depression, it was illness that was the direct cause of Takakura's death.\textsuperscript{407}

\textsuperscript{402}These doubts extended to the faith and theology of the entire Protestant Church in Japan. Kikuchi Kichiya, "Takakura Tokutaro to Sono Jidai--Takakura Tokutaro no Shi no Mondai o Megutte" (The Life and Times of Takakura Tokutaro--A Return to the Problem of Takakura Tokutaro's Death) Seisho to Kyokai (Bible and Church) No.1, 1984, "Shohyo" ("Book Reviews"), pp.45-46.

\textsuperscript{403}Sato, 1983, pp.219-220.

\textsuperscript{404}The most recent, persuasive treatment of Takakura's death is Sato Toshio's. Ibid., pp.221-234. In reviewing Sato's book, Kikuchi Kichiya devoted most of his attention to the chapter on Takakura's death, and proclaimed himself convinced by Sato's argument. op.cit., p.46.

\textsuperscript{405}These are cited and described by Oshio, pp.285ff.


\textsuperscript{407}Sato, 1983, pp.224ff. In an informal discussion about Takakura's suicide with a Japanese pastor on 29 April 1994, the comment was made that there were at least five members of this pastor's present congregation who were suffering from depression, and that often they did things, due to being sick, that they later could not remember.
It is the thesis writer's hope that the nature of Takakura's death, given only brief consideration due to the view that it was simply illness that was the direct cause, will not in the least overshadow an appreciation for his fascinating total life context. Takakura's own particular home, family, personality, and career are interesting enough in and of themselves. But when the accompanying and interrelated factor of Takakura's experience of Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa Japan—viewed in the refracted categories of education, international relationships, politics, socio-economic trends, intellectual developments, and religion—is considered, the brightness and complexity of the entire scene become too difficult to capture in a brief glance. Takakura's life spanned a volatile, dramatic period of history, and his own life was no less event-filled than his times. Therefore, instead of being unjustifiably straight-jacketed by a short summary statement, Takakura's life context is highlighted by the timeline on the ensuing page. Such a visual representation should aid us in allowing Takakura's life and times, with all of the complex shades and hues involved, to illuminate his thought at various points throughout the rest of the thesis.

Takakura's conversion to Christianity and baptism into the Church, as well as his career of distinguished service within the Church, are of course of central importance to this thesis' consideration of his thought. Takakura's thought developed as he encountered Jesus Christ both within his own life context and via the Christian Church--including both Japanese and Western expressions of that Church. It is thus to an examination of how Takakura received the Christian faith, through both the Church in Japan and the Church in the West, that the thesis will now turn in Part II.
Figure 2. Life and Times of Takakura Tokutaro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Takakura’s Life</th>
<th>Historical Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born, Reared in Ayabe</td>
<td>1885—Meiji 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Divorced</td>
<td>1889—M 22 Meiji Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890—M 23 Education Rescript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School in Ayabe</td>
<td>1892—M 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Mother</td>
<td>1893—M 26 Sino-Japanese War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894—M 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895—M 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High School in Tokyo</td>
<td>1900—M 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepmother Dies; 3d Mother in Feb. / HS in Kanazawa</td>
<td>1902—M 35 Britain-Japan Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903—M 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904—M 37 Russo-Japanese War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905—M 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptised by Uemura Masahisa/Student at Tokyo Imp. Univ.</td>
<td>1906—M 39 Social Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student at Tokyo Seminary</td>
<td>1908—M 41 Imperial Rescript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Pastor at Fujimicho C. Military Service in Kyoto Fu</td>
<td>1910—M 43 Annexation of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911—M 44 Zen no Kenkyu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor in Kyoto</td>
<td>1912—M 45 / Taisho 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor in Sapporo</td>
<td>1913—T 2 World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1914—T 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother Dies / Teacher-Preach in Tokyo</td>
<td>1917—T 6 Bolshevik Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student in Britain</td>
<td>1918—T 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1921—T 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Pastor in, Tokyo (Tokyo Seminary-Toyama Ch.)</td>
<td>1923—T 12 Kanto Earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1924—T 13 Manhood Suffrage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1925—T 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo</td>
<td>1927—Showa 2 Economic Depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinanomachi Church</td>
<td>1929—S 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness Worsens</td>
<td>1930—S 5 Manchurian Incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death in Tokyo</td>
<td>1931—S 6 Prime Min. Assassinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1932—S 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1934—S 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II, Chapter 1. The Christian Faith
Conveyed to Takakura Through
The Church in Meiji Japan

Takakura confessed his faith in Jesus Christ and was baptised into the Christian Church in December, Meiji 39 (1906). His thought as a Christian and church leader then developed as he lived and served as part of the Church in the remaining years of the Meiji Era, through the Taisho years, and then into the early Showa period. Takakura and his generation of Christians inherited the Christianity of their Meiji predecessors, and then sought to live out the Christian faith within their own fascinating period of history. Pertinent aspects of his conversion and career, as well as his historical context, were outlined above in Part I.

How Takakura himself incorporated what he received from the Meiji Church—as compared with what the Meiji Church conveyed in terms of its own self-understanding and expression of the Christian faith—will be addressed more directly in Parts III and IV of the thesis. The objective here is to focus on the Christianity of the generation prior to Takakura’s by considering various aspects of that Church’s life which are relevant to Takakura’s life and thought. Thus while making a distinction between Takakura’s reception and the Meiji Church’s transmission of the Christian faith, a comprehensive history of Meiji Christianity is not the present goal. Just as was the case in examining Takakura’s life context in Part I, the thesis’ overall search for Takakura’s own thought will serve as a guiding criterion for selecting what sections of the Church in Meiji Japan to consider.¹

¹The thesis’ continuing theological and historical task must not forget Polanyi’s instructive words. Those comments caution us against naively assuming that we who are historically removed from and "beyond" the past situation thus automatically will arrive at a more "objective," and thus more "accurate" or "true," understanding than Takakura and his contemporaries concerning what "really" was happening at the time. In fact, our present posture can maintain a more healthy perspective by remembering: "After all, every attempt at interpreting the past is indirectly an attempt at understanding the present and the future." David J. Bosch, Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1991, p.183. Cf. Part I, p.79(n.304).
In order to gain as well-rounded a perspective as possible of the Christianity which the generation of Meiji Christians passed on to Takakura in particular, Part II, Chapter I will successively consider three areas of the overall, general situation of Meiji Christianity: socio-political context, organisational developments, and theological understandings. While considering these three areas, Takakura's own denomination, by his day known as the Nihon Kirisuto Kyokai ("Japan Christ Church," being referred to here as the NKK), will be examined in particular. Furthermore, both throughout this Part II, Chapter 1 of the thesis and in a separate section at the end of it, we will especially look at the life and thought of the single most influential figure in the NKK, if not the entire Protestant, Meiji Christian Church--and accordingly in Takakura's own life--Uemura Masahisa.

A. Meiji Christianity's Socio-political Context

By the time Takakura embraced Christianity in 1906 (Meiji 39), the Church had experienced a period of extreme change and intense pressure since its inception in Japan only one generation earlier. Properly speaking in terms of broader historical accuracy, of course, the Christian Church had begun in Japan in the mid-sixteenth century. This first beginning came about with the coming of Francis Xavier and other Jesuit missionaries, all of whom had come out of Europe and headed East to propagate the faith of the Holy See under the protective banner of the Portuguese crown. There was a half century of prosperous growth fostered by favour and protection granted by several sympathetic "daimyo," or regional feudal lords, many of whom had converted to the new faith. However, the Church began to encounter stiffer political opposition with the rise to "national" power of Tokugawa Ieyasu following his decisive military victory in 1600. Ieyasu's unfavourable attitude towards Christianity arose largely due to the arrival just a few years earlier on his domain's shores of Spanish Franciscans, followed soon thereafter by their and the Jesuits' arch-rivals, English and Dutch (i.e., Protestant) traders.2

Ieyasu, along with his son and then grandson who succeeded him as Shogun, of course did not want these barbarians' internal political and religious rivalries disturbing their land's newly-founded unified order; they were interested in consolidating their control in those early decades of the seventeenth century. Much less would they entertain the possible threat of invasion by an alleged, aspiring world conqueror based in Iberia. They also were not about to tolerate the presence of an ideology which asserted loyalty to an alien power more ultimate than their own, whether that power be in Rome or in Heaven. The Shogunate thus subjugated, often by extermination, adherents of the barbarians' superstitious religion. This process culminated in the successful squelching of the Shimabara Rebellion of 1637, which had been at least fuelled and supported by Christian Messianic hopes. The Shogun then in 1638 issued an edict effectively sealing off his country from any outside contact, except for a tightly-controlled trickle of Dutch and Chinese traders. This edict was accompanied by the strict enforcement of a ban on Christianity. This required everyone to register at the local Buddhist temple, as well as to demonstrate a disavowal of the despised foreign superstition by stepping on a "fumie," or picture of Jesus. For Christian adherents, this meant either apostasy or martyrdom. The net result was the disappearance from Japan of


3Shimabara is near Nagasaki in southwest Japan; cf. Figure 3 below, Part II, ch.1, p.127.

4In 1638 the "danka seido" was established, requiring "every Japanese household to register with and financially support a local temple." In 1662 the "terauke seido" began, which obliged all adults to obtain every year from their temple "a certificate attesting that he or she was innocent of association with subversive religion, namely, Christianity." Reid, 1991, p.10.

the Christian Church within a century of its founding.\(^6\)

In contrasting this uprooting of the newly-planted faith from Japanese soil with the continuation of Buddhism, George Elison observes that

> Edo period Confucians...maligned Buddhism in practically the same language they used for Christianity. They and their employers knew, however, that history can at best be bent, not done away with. Buddhism had set deep roots in Japan and adapted to Japanese conditions. Christianity could do neither, and was an alien religion. That was the crucial difference. Buddhism could not be erased and was used; Christianity could not be used and was erased.\(^7\)

Thus it was that the first chapter of Christian history in Japan came to a rude and abrupt end.

### 1. First Two Decades of Meiji

As the new chapter of Christianity in Japan began to be written in the Meiji Era, the existence and removal of the Church over two centuries earlier had not been erased from people’s minds. Nor had the official government proscription of Christianity been altered: adherence to the alien faith was still strictly forbidden. Time had not stood still over the course of two hundred years, though, and social, economic, and intellectual conditions had changed. The coming of U.S. Admiral Perry’s "Black Ships" in 1853 provided the catalyst for political change leading to the Meiji Restoration, i.e., the "restoration" of ruling power back to the Emperor from the Tokugawa Shogunate, in 1868.

As outlined earlier, however, effective political control was not in fact "restored"

\(^{\text{6}}\)This is not to neglect the continued existence of the well-known "Crypto-Christians," the mid-nineteenth discovery of whom is described in, e.g., Joseph Jennes, *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan: From its Beginnings to the Early Meiji Era* (1549-1873). Tokyo: Oriens Institute for Religious Research, 1973, pp.216-218. Rather, in terms of public presence—and "for all practical purposes" relative to this section of the thesis’ consideration of the Christian faith that was passed on to Takakura from the prior generation--Christianity was removed during the Tokugawa (or "Edo") period.

to the emperor, but was seized by some of the Tokugawas' long-time rivals: regional leaders from the southern and western provinces of Choshu, Satsuma, Tosa, and Hizen.\textsuperscript{8} The capital was moved from Kyoto to Edo (which was renamed "Tokyo," or "Eastern Capital"), and the new oligarchy instigated reforms aimed at building a bureaucratic monarchy. One of the most significant social reforms was to remove the special privileges of the samurai class, a move coupled with the attempt to placate--temporarily at least--many of these proud warriors with financial pensions. While some of the former samurai may have been appeased briefly, most were left financially destitute and without any of their former social status. They were thus hungry for a revival of the greatness and prosperity that their families and clans had once known.

It was out of this widespread group of dispossessed former samurai that the early Meiji, Protestant Christian converts came. Such well-known figures as Uchimura Kanzo, Ebina Danjo, Kozaki Hiromichi, Honda Yoichi, and Uemura Masahisa\textsuperscript{9} were groping for the meaning and stability that their forbearers had known in the past, but which elusively hovered out of their reach in the present. The missionaries' Western ideas, the dazzling array of which were starting to become in vogue, as well as the missionaries' impressive "Bushido-type" of personalities\textsuperscript{10} attracted these young stalwarts to the Westerners' Christianity. The converts' hope was that their newfound faith would facilitate the refounding of a new society--a new order that somehow would have to be constructed in the midst of the rubble lying all around them.

\textsuperscript{8}McNelly, 1972, p.10. As McNelly points out, power increasingly became concentrated in the hands of those from Choshu and Satsuma.

\textsuperscript{9}These are the five converts examined, along with five American missionaries through whom they respectively learned of Christianity, by John Howes in his influential study, "Japanese Christians and American Missionaries," in Jansen, ed., 1965, pp.337-368.

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., pp.350-351. The correlation between the samurai converts and the American missionaries in terms of a common "Bushido-type spirit" ("bushidoteku seishin") is noted specifically by Kuyama Yasushi in Kuyama, ed., Meiji vol., 1956, p.58.
In Uemura's case, he had been born in 1857 as the oldest of three sons born to Tojuro and Tei Uemura. Uemura's father Tojuro was a member of the "hatamoto," or honour guard of the Tokugawa Shogunate, a special privileged position which had been passed down for generations within the Uemura family. The Uemuras lost their high, samurai status with the coming of the Meiji Restoration, however, and they were forced to move from place to place, living in cramped conditions. Masahisa himself had to resort to selling firewood and raising pigs in order to help provide some sort of income.11

Yokohama12 was where many of the early Protestant missionaries settled, the first ones having arrived there in 1859 according to early treaty agreements. It was while living in Yokohama that Uemura first met one of the missionaries, the American, Dutch Reformed James H. Ballagh. In Uemura's own words,

Fired with ambition to restore the family fortunes, at fifteen I entered...Ballagh's school in Yokohama.

My family were Shintoists and I devoutly worshipped at the shrine of a blacksmith who had risen to be a great soldier and patriot, praying that I might rise in like manner. But my fellow-students ridiculed my piety, and I stopped my visits to the shrine. One day I learned from Mr. Ballagh that Westerners also worshipped, but only one God. This greatly impressed and astonished me. I immediately grasped and accepted the idea.13

Having "met Christianity and Western society for the first time" in Ballagh's school, and being "completely awed" and "in an impressionable position emotionally," U14 Uemura embraced the Christian faith. His future course of action was thus redirected: "I found my ambitions radically changed. I no longer cared

---


12Yokohama is near Tokyo; cf. Figure 3 below, Part II, ch.1, p.127.


to become a high official, and in a short time I felt a deep desire to be a Christian minister."\textsuperscript{15} Uemura’s objective of using political statesmanship to reform Japan had been replaced by proceeding along a more explicitly religious route instead.

Even though the first two decades of Meiji were a time of great openness to all things Western, as mentioned above the memory of Christianity’s superstitious and potentially subversive character still loomed large in people’s minds, including the oligarchs’. Thus it was not until 1873 (Meiji 6) that the public notice boards banning Christianity were taken down. This action to remove the proscription of Christianity was taken only after consistent protests by Western governments, most especially during the Iwakura Mission’s visit to the United States and Europe from 1871-1873 (Meiji 4-6). The Japanese government’s official explanation for their decision to remove the ban was that the populace knew the laws so well that the public proscription boards were no longer necessary.\textsuperscript{16} At any rate, there were greater challenges facing the new Meiji government than an alien religion which posed no serious threat to Japan’s political and social structure.\textsuperscript{17}

Because it was foreign, coupled with its historical background in Japan, Christianity was not held in the highest esteem by those holding political power. Additionally, because the Church’s early adherents were from clans different than those of the ruling oligarchs, Christianity as an organised movement generally was not well-liked by the government. The corollary was also true: the samurai Christian converts were not particularly well-disposed towards those in government, either. Furthermore, the Christian samurai were now in a different social class than those in government, a reality which further opened the possibility of anti-establishment ideas and activities. This posture served the Meiji Church well in helping it to

\textsuperscript{15}op.cit., p.673.
\textsuperscript{16}Iglehart, 1959, p.47.
\textsuperscript{17}Elison, 1973, pp.246-247.
maintain its independence from government patronage and control.18

Whatever the case may have been in terms of the attitude of those holding political power, the 1880's (the second Meiji decade) saw the Church flourish in an accelerated way. This was a period of tremendous openness to the West, and Christianity thus benefited from its association with Westernisation. Several mission schools, although often no more than informal classes taught in missionaries' homes, were established. There was an "enlightened" atmosphere in these schools, including the teaching of Western languages and Western science, as well as the relatively high importance given to educating women. There was also "fresh air" in the churches whose ranks they were helping to fill.19 These mission schools were thus very attractive to many youth whose parents had become fallen nobility. Along with the former samurai, many of the rural elite had been migrating to the cities for educational purposes. Like their noble counterparts these leaders from the countryside were becoming the intellectuals of the day, and they began to embrace the faith of the modern West as well.20 The Church thus continued to take on the flavour of a progressive, intellectual movement.21 Its members "were asking the same questions as many other former samurai critics of the government, and both groups tended to fuse problems of identity with problems of social status so that, in their eyes, social reform and self-cultivation became

---


19There is much documentation of the high percentage of Meiji Protestant Church membership coming from the mission schools: "In the early days most Christians were mission school students or graduates." Vincent Gilpin Stubbs, III, "Presbyterian and Reformed Missions in Japan, 1859-1940," Unpublished Th.M. thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary, School of World Mission, Pasadena, California, 1984, p.49.


21op.cit., pp.174-175.
one."\textsuperscript{22} The Christian faith had taken hold of these young men in a way that seemed to match their aspirations for a recently lost past:

For the young samurai Protestant converts..., the radicalness of their choice of a Christian value system to replace the past one, was as much subject to their taste for their past positions and values as to a sense of dissatisfaction with them. Their estrangement from power and from the institutions that gave status meant that they had to build an intellectual structure which could restore their sense of identity and a new world within which they could succeed to authority. Christian samurai lent their strength to associate themselves with a value system that seemed to offer structural similarities to their past order, gave a meaningful order to the new world, and promised future success for the believer....\textsuperscript{23}

It seemed for a while that Christianity actually would be able to provide the value system for a new order which would in fact be realised very soon. There were even some in official circles--and many others without--who advocated the adoption of Christianity as the state religion, in order to elevate Japan to the status of the enlightened, Christian nations of the West.\textsuperscript{24} Regarding his understanding of the leavening effect of the Word of God in Japan during the first half of Meiji, James Ballagh reflected as follows at a 1909 (Meiji 42) meeting in Tokyo commemorating fifty years of missionary work in Japan:

I do not want us to forget the on-going influence on Japan’s transformation of Christian morals and religion. ‘The good seed of the Kingdom of God’ was being sown throughout this period by education, medicine, Bible translation, liturgy, hymnology, study of foreign languages, publication of dictionaries, printing of sermons and books, lectures, and direct evangelism. Although I have just mentioned direct evangelism last in the list, perhaps it is the most


\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., pp.4-5.

\textsuperscript{24}One such advocate was Nakamura Keiu (Masanao), a leading Confucian scholar, the translator of J.S. Mill’s \textit{On Liberty} and of Samuel Smiles’ \textit{Self-Help}, and member of the highly influential Meirokusha ("Society of Meiji Six"). A. Hamish Ion, \textit{The Cross and the Rising Sun: The Canadian Protestant Missionary Movement in the Japanese Empire, 1872-1931}. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1990, p.38; Anesaki, 1930 (Showa 5), pp.352-353.
important for having reduced the biased view of Christianity held for several centuries by Japanese scholars, officials, and ordinary citizens. In a word, people now recognize that Protestant missionaries are not Jesuit missionaries.\footnote{Recorded in Mizugaki Kiyoshi, \textit{One Hundred Years of Evangelism in Japan: Ballagh, McAlpine, McAlpine}. Translated by J.A. McAlpine. English ed. publication rights assigned to Mission to the World, Presbyterian Church in America, Decatur, Georgia. Columbus, Georgia: Quill Publications, 1986, p.73.}

Besides the Protestant missionaries shedding the image of being confused with the dreaded Jesuits, the Protestant Church seemed to be exerting real political influence. As Ballagh observed, the 1889 (Meiji 22) Imperial Constitution granted "freedom of conscience and freedom of religion," and the newly-established Diet "legislated freedom of the press, Sunday as a day of rest, and other laws which led to an improvement in public manners and society. The practical application of almost all Christian culture followed in rapid succession..."\footnote{Ibid.}

Furthermore (and apart from a Western missionary's interpretation), in July of 1890 (Meiji 23), nine Christians were actually elected as representatives to the Lower House of the new Imperial Diet.\footnote{Ibid., p.54.} Other Christians entered prominent positions in education, journalism, and other intellectual activities.\footnote{Richard H. Drummond, \textit{A History of Christianity in Japan}. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1971, pp.168-169.} Despite the Church consisting of only a relatively small group of intellectuals amounting to one percent of the total population, "the weight of their influence exceeded that of their number."\footnote{Elison, 1973, p.254.}

2. Nationalist Challenge

However, the political and social gains that apparently had been constitutionally guaranteed and manifestly secured proved to be small in comparison to the challenge of the solidified imperial ideology which undergirded the 1889 (Meiji 22)
Constitution and 1890 (Meiji 23) Rescript on Education. This was the overriding challenge facing the Christian Church in Japan from the third Meiji decade through the mid-twentieth century, and its manifestations came with force and regularity.\(^{30}\) In Takeda’s words:

> In modern Japan...the conflict between heterodoxy and orthodoxy in intellectual history was centered on the ideology of emperor worship, the single element that has hung most heavily over the thought and behavior of the people.... Those who embraced different values, or worse, who dared to criticize or oppose the national orthodoxy, were guilty of heresy against the state. They could not be pardoned....\(^{31}\)

The earliest and best-known incident of alleged "heresy" against the imperial "orthodoxy" by a Christian was the "lese majesty" case involving Uchimura Kanzo on 9 January 1891 (Meiji 24).\(^{32}\) Uchimura was an English teacher at the First Higher College in Tokyo, a feeder to the Imperial University. At a ceremony held to acknowledge the Imperial Rescript on Education, the instructors and students were to proceed individually to the platform on which a copy of the Rescript had been placed; each was to bow to the Imperial signature. Being only the third person to go up, and having had no time to think and prepare, Uchimura, out of "hesitation and conscientious scruples...at that moment," did not bow. Again in

\(^{30}\)Numerically speaking, Jansen remarks that "except for a period in the 1880s when the number of converts to Protestantism seemed to be growing rapidly--a phenomenon not unrelated to the exigencies of treaty reform--the young Meiji church probably did not enroll more than about thirty thousand converts." Jansen, 1989, p.480. Furthermore, to demonstrate the adverse effect which the nationalism of the 1890's had on Christianity due to the latter's Western association, one source is cited as reporting that "of the 7,700 people baptized between 1891 and 1899, 3,795 later left the church." Irokawa, 1985, p.211.


\(^{32}\)This incident has been described in numerous works, perhaps most helpfully by Uchimura himself in a letter (written in English) to an American friend two months after the incident. Uchimura Kanzo, Uchimura Kanzo Zenshu (The Complete Works of Uchimura Kanzo). Vol.36. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1983, pp.331-336.
Uchimura’s own words, "It was an awful moment for me, for I instantly apprehended the result of my conduct." After subsequent discussions with the school principal, Uchimura consented to bow, having become convinced that bowing in such a ceremony was not worship, but merely a means of showing respect to the Emperor. The damage had been done, however: news of the story spread, and the lingering suspicions about Christianity’s ultimate disloyalty to Japan were aroused.

Soon after the incident, Uemura Masahisa and other Christian leaders wrote a public letter in defence of Uchimura. On the other side, Professor Inoue Tetsujiro of the Imperial University led a systematic attack against Christianity through published articles, arguing that Uchimura’s act only served to demonstrate that Christians could not be loyal Japanese subjects. The ensuing debate, involving many well known parties on each side (including Uemura), lasted for several years and came to be known as the "Conflict between Education and Religion." For their part, the Christian leaders had come "from samurai

33Emphasis original. Ibid., pp.332-333.
34Iglehart, 1959, pp.99-100.
37op.cit., p.128.
38This confrontation will be further discussed below.

The ongoing struggle can be seen through various subsequent events. In 1899 (Meiji 32), the Education Minister issued a prohibition against religious education and ceremonies in both public and private schools, a severe blow to the mission schools. Many of the schools, e.g., Meiji Gakuin, Aoyama Gakuin, and Doshisha, were determined to continue religious education, and thus surrendered to the government their official documents of recognition; consequently, their enrolments dropped dramatically. The pendulum swung back, however, when the government reversed its position in 1906 (Meiji 39). Yamamoto Masaya, "Image-Makers of Japan: A Case Study in the Impact of the American Protestant Foreign Missionary Movement, 1859-1905," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio
background; they were trained in Confucian traditions, and thus regarded themselves as an intellectual elite with great responsibility for the welfare of the nation." They argued that, while emphasising spiritual life, Christianity had an indispensable role to play in the future of the Japanese nation.39

It should be pointed out, however, that the Christian spokesmen were not united in their approach to defending Christianity in its conflict with the state. In words that anticipate the discussion to come below on theological developments in the Meiji Church, one author describes the varying Christian approaches as follows:

Some...adopted the 'new' German liberal and American unitarian theologies upon which they attempted to construct a Japanese Christianity which was compatible with Shinto and nationalism. Uemura Masahisa and other more traditionally orthodox Protestant leaders advocated that a distinction be drawn between personal, subjective Christian faith and outward conformity to the demands of the surrounding social and political systems. The God-given right to personal autonomy was not inconsistent with freely chosen compliance with the demands of the state.40

Reasons for the division between these different Christian approaches, as well as the tension underlying the distinction drawn by "Uemura Masahisa and other more traditionally orthodox Protestant leaders" between personal, spiritual belief and outward conformity,41 will both be discussed below.

State University, 1967, pp.293-294.


40Robert Enns, "'Slander Against Our People': Tamura Naomi and the Japanese Bride Incident" Japanese Religions 18, No.1, January, 1993, p.38. I am indebted to Andrew Walls for directing me to this article.

41It can be pointed out now that Uemura and others drew this distinction not so much as a "positive" articulation of a world view, but instead in the context of seeking to protect religious freedom amidst the growing imperial ideology during the 1890's (Meiji 20's). In that sense Church leaders and government policies were on a "collision course," for the Protestants were tended towards an individualistic democracy, as opposed to government's building a new Japan that was to be a "particularistic, hierarchical society build upon an ideological foundation of loyalty to the emperor, filial piety, and ancestral veneration...." Ibid., p.37. Cf. also Germany, pp.16-17.
Amidst all of the rhetoric, the Church had the opportunity to demonstrate its valuable and loyal role in the life of the nation during the wars with China and with Russia. During the 1894-1895 (Meiji 37-38) war with China, Christians proved their loyalty and bravery, both within the military and as civilians. Military officers especially earned a great deal of respect from their comrades; chaplains served the troops in Manchuria; women made and sent articles to the soldiers; medical efforts were carried out in the name of Jesus Christ. Uchimura Kanzo, now involved in journalism, supported the war as a just cause, thus further demonstrating his loyalty to the nation he so dearly loved.42

By the time of the 1904-1905 war with Russia, however, there were signs that the Christian community might not be so loyal. Some Christians had opted for pacifism: Uchimura, having changed his position since the previous war with China, was the best-known example. Christian Socialists had been prominent in the brief and largely uninfluential (at the time, at least) socialist political movement around the turn of the century.43 They, too, were outspoken against the war effort, although they were unable to make much impact beyond a limited circle of intellectuals.44 Furthermore, the Japanese government somewhat feared a possible Russian exploitation of the theme that the war was an altercation between a Christian nation and a non-Christian one, and thus took specific measures to ensure the Church’s support.45


43Earlier comments about Marxist thought becoming especially influential after the 1917 Russian Revolution and World War I should be recalled here. Although the Christian Socialist movement around the turn of the century was short-lived, it nevertheless provided a springboard for the later, more prominent movements (during Takakura’s day) led by Nakajima, Kagawa, and others. Cf. Kumano Yoshitaka, "Social Christianity in Japan" The Northeast Journal of Theology No.8, March, 1972, pp.1-22; Germany, pp.32,49,51ff.


45Iglehart, 1959, p.117.
Nevertheless, generally speaking the Christian Church declared and demonstrated its backing of the war effort.\(^{46}\) Japan was seen as attempting to recover its fairly-secured position on the continent: this was the rational and political framework, more than a religious one, within which Christians in Japan understood the war. By giving similar support as they had in the previous war with China--and only improved support, due to lessons learned from of the previous experience--Christians enhanced their position in their countrymen's, and government's, eyes as loyal Japanese subjects.\(^{47}\)

3. End of Meiji

Sociologically speaking, as the Meiji Era closed and Taisho opened (1912), the Church's membership continued to be comprised of the urban, middle class. By the end of a fifteen-year period of growth ending in 1918 (Taisho 7), the Protestant constituency had "shifted from the old middle class to the new [the white-collar urbanites who had emerged due to industrialisation] and from male predominance to female."\(^{48}\) Nevertheless, in terms of social status, the urban, middle class

---

\(^{46}\) One author writes that Christianity "actively" or "positively" ("sekkyokuteki ni") cooperated with the war effort. Gono Takashi, *Nihon Kirisutokyo Shi (History of Japanese Christianity)*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1990, p.289.

As far as Uemura's posture is concerned, Germany states that "Uemura staunchly opposed the war with Russia...." Germany, p.41. Perhaps Germany meant "'Uchimura," for Uemura's own comments indicate otherwise. Cf., e.g., Uemura's address "Kirisutokyo to Senso" ("Christianity and War"), delivered October, 1904 (Meiji 36). Saba, ed., Vol.5, 1966, pp.873-875. Furthermore, at least one author clearly states, "The Russo-Japanese War divided Protestant Christianity into two camps. The position of Ebina, Uemura, Ibuka, Honda, etc., was that of advocating war, whereas Uchimura...emphasised pacifism." Miki Fumiko, "Meiji Purotesutanto no Nihonteki Tokushitsu" ("Japanized Characteristics of Protestantism in Meiji Era") *Kirisuto Shingaku (Christ Theology)* No.3, 1986, p.87. English translations of both the article and journal titles were taken from the journal.

\(^{47}\) op.cit., pp.117-119. Implications of this situation will emerge in the ensuing discussion.

\(^{48}\) Yamamori, 1974, p.161. In the 1880's (second Meiji decade), due to educational advantages as well as disapproval of women's involvement in public activities, men had outnumbered women two to one in the single largest Protestant denomination, the NKK. Stubbs, 1984, p.71.
continued to make up the bulk of the Church during the Taisho years, just as it had during Meiji. They were the ones who were open to new ideas, especially including Christian and Western ideas; they had mobility, time and energy for church activities; and, they were almost the exclusive "target group" for Christian outreach.49

Comprised of such a membership, the Church had at least in some measure become aligned with the status quo. A. Hamish Ion explains one part of the process leading to this situation as follows:

In the context of their own society and its values, Japanese Christians were outsiders, representing a heterodox alternative. Many Christian leaders sought to remove this stigma by accommodating themselves to Japanese society, which meant that the Christian movement tended to align itself with the Japanese status quo. During the late nineteenth century, the Christian movement had been identified with opposition to the government; after 1905, it was largely unable to attract those who were opposed to the status quo.50

In working for acceptability, peace, and a legitimate place in society, the Church had simultaneously gained a station that was allied with national and social conservatism.

That conservatism was soon recognised and exploited by the government. In seeking to calm some of the clamour over social problems in the aftermath of the Russian War, the government sought the assistance of religious groups. In 1°12 (Meiji 45) a meeting of leaders representing various Buddhist, Christian, and Shinto bodies was convened by the government in order to secure "their co-operation in ameliorating the situation, thereby implying the fight against radicals."51 From the

49Yamamori, 1974, p.235.


51This meeting was known as the "Sankyokaido," or "Three Religions Meeting Together." Anesaki, 1930 (Showa 5), pp.388-389. Anesaki gives 1911 (Meiji 44) as the date, but the meeting actually took place the following February.
government's perspective, securing religious assistance in achieving state ends was fully consistent with the "assumption...that religious organizations existed to serve the interests of the state." At the urging of the Vice-minister of internal affairs, Tokonami Takejiro, and with Home Minister Hara's support, the meeting was called.

From the perspective of the Christian Church, participating in the meeting would bring the promise of having a recognised voice, particularly in educational matters. It would also help secure the benefit of being considered on the same level as Japan's two long-standing historical religions, as well as clarify religion's proper legal status and freedom. The danger, of course, would be to cooperate with the government in a way that would be tantamount to submitting, albeit unwillingly and largely unwittingly, to government control. Participation also could be construed as condoning the government's posture of treating certain aspects of Shintoism as nonreligious. Some Christians considered the meeting as relatively meaningless, having only temporary value. Whatever the case, the Christian churches agreed to participate, sending a total of seven representatives to the meeting, which was also attended by thirteen Shinto representatives, fifty Buddhists, and twenty-one government officials.

52Reid, 1991, p.79.

53During the few years prior to the meeting, Vice-minister Tokonami had toured Europe and the United States, had become interested in (and had written about) Christianity's fundamental place in Western civilisation, and had argued for Christianity to have a similar role of contributing to the life and spirit of the Japanese nation. Saba, ed., Vol.2, 1966, pp.702-715; Hiyane Antei, Nihon Kirisutokyo Shi, Zen (A Complete History of Christianity in Japan). Tokyo: Kyobunkan, 1949, p.386. I am grateful to Asaka Toshio for introducing this latter book to me.

54Some of the Christian discussion of the day concerning the meeting is recorded in Saba, ed., Vol.2, 1966, pp.722-725.

Although the soundest assumption is that he would have taken a disapproving posture, Uemura’s own position regarding the meeting is difficult to discern, since he was travelling through America and England at the time. However, one can surmise that his distinction between personal spirituality and outward political conformity would have come into play in determining his posture. Takenaka writes of him:

Masahisa Uemura, one of the most influential leaders of the Presbyterian stream...insisted upon the separation of church and state. Moreover, he began to withdraw (after 1912) from participation in the affairs of the public world and concentrated on the training of members of the church. He was not an isolationist nor an individualist, but he concentrated on building a strong church through which he intended to train members to serve society.

Uemura further asserted that a Christian minister should not play an active, leading role in social reform movements. Rather, a pastor’s and church’s practical work is to send out into the world men and women who, while thinking freely and independently, aspire for improvement, and thus work in accordance with the proper purpose of the state.

This posture, however, did not prevent Uemura from taking public stances on political issues, whether that meant voicing protest when he believed the government was in the wrong, or being willing to suffer potentially dire consequences.

---


57Takenaka, 1957, p.70. Charles Germany comments, "In later life Uemura, and indeed the church he led, the...Nihon Kirisuto Kyokai..., showed a declining interest in coming to grips with matters in social life outside the church." Germany, p.18.

58Drummond, 1971, p.212.

consequences due to standing with fellow Christians. In addition to supporting Uchimura following the lese majesty incident, Uemura conducted a public memorial service for a Christian who was one of twelve "anarchists" who had been executed for allegedly plotting to assassinate the emperor in the famous High Treason Incident of 1910 (Meiji 43). Nor was the wider Christian Church unaware of political realities and dangers: it continually resisted the passage of the controversial Religious Bodies Law, until eventual militarist take over proved overwhelming in the late 1930's (second Showa decade).

What can be concluded is that the 1912 (Meiji 45) meeting was a type of foreshadowing of the official political control which the government would eventually exercise over all religious groups in the realm. Furthermore, the Church's "attainment" of a certain level of status, coupled with the task of maintaining that "status quo," undoubtedly reflected the unseen but dominant politico-spiritual realities of the day. These realities were unseen on the one hand

60op.cit., pp.211-212. Drummond goes on to affirm the previous quotation in stating: "From this point on, however,...the Christian church in Japan as a whole became more timid toward the national authorities."

61Regarding the 1912 (Meiji 45) meeting, Takenaka remarks, "The prophetic and critical spirit of the Christian leaders of the early Meiji era was gradually dimming." Takenaka, 1957, p.70.

There were subsequent, similar meetings of representatives of the "Three Religions" called by government, in 1914 (Taisho 3) and 1924 (Taisho 13). The Christian community became increasingly less wary of participating, coming to believe "that the days of discrimination and suspicion were over." Iglehart, 1959, pp.185-186.

62This "positive" side of the church's socio-political situation is summarised by Merrill Morse in his Kosuke Koyama: A Model for Intercultural Theology. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1991, p.46:

By the turn of the century the Protestant church in Japan had moved into a new stage in its development.... [N]umerous stable churches had been established. Christians had already met with considerable success in founding schools and hospitals and in leading social reforms. They enjoyed a reasonably wide degree of public acceptance. The first decades of this century were, then, a period of consolidation and some growth....
due to the lack of foreknowledge of the militarism of the upcoming decades, but also because of the imperial ideology's implicit grip on the majority of the population.\textsuperscript{63}

The subtlety and power of the imperial ideology of the day has already been described briefly in Part I.\textsuperscript{64} To pursue the matter somewhat further here, we can note how at least one analysis sees a significant reason for the state's position of power as lying in its success in inducing the voluntary delimitation of intellectual discourse to matters of personality, ethics, education, and culture.... [Hence] most Japanese intellectuals at the turn of the century retreated from direct critical inquiries into the specifics of the political, social and economic structure embodied in the state under the Imperial Constitution.

...the state, by the beginning of the Taisho era, circumscribed legitimate public discourse in ways which encouraged privatization.\textsuperscript{65}

On a somewhat contrary note, this same author continues: "Privatization was only one aspect of Taisho intellectual life. The emergence of a middle class urban culture had created new markets for serious discussions of culture and society, and of the state and the individual...."\textsuperscript{66} Nevertheless, the tennosei as a "spiritual structure"\textsuperscript{67} was successively administered through "tight government controls... which were not strongly resented by most of the common people, because along

\textsuperscript{63}Looking back on these events, we can see some of what the Church of late Meiji could not, including how their efforts eventually were for the state's benefit.

\textsuperscript{64}Cf. Part I, pp.44-55


\textsuperscript{66}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{67}Irokawa, 1985, p.245. By comparison, Western studies were categorised as a "skill" or "technique," not having to do with "spirit" or "thought." This included the study of English, through which Christianity was first embraced by many Meiji intellectuals. Omura Haruo, \textit{Nihon Purotesutanto Shoshi (A Short of History of Protestantism in Japan)}. Tokyo: Inochi no Kotoba Sha, 1993, p.28.
with the leadership they shared a view of a basically hierarchically ordered society in which the individual could best express himself by serving the collective body."68 Particularly, then, following the "dramatic turnover in the ideological policy of the Japanese state towards nationalism [which] coincided with the transition of Japanese capitalism and imperialism,"69 i.e., before and after the Russo-Japanese War, the government had the Church in a position of relative weakness and vulnerability. This was particularly the case given the Church's social encapsulation within the politically-impotent intellectual class.

The oft-cited Sumiya Mikio is "the most pronounced representative" of a sociological approach to studying Meiji Protestantism's relationship with the class-structure of Japanese society and the development of the Emperor system.70 He confirms the picture painted here of the Church's relationship to the political and social structures of late Meiji.71 Having developed together with Japan's modern society, the Church was, "in a word, subordinate to the theory of nationalistic sovereignty." It had lost its "energy of criticism," a situation thus connoting the emergence of "the imperial ideology structure." Furthermore, having taken on new life alongside the rapid development of capitalism from 1901 (Meiji 34), the Church grew in numbers, but almost exclusively amongst the middle-class intelligentsia and students. Having been separated from their various communal


69B.V. Pospelov, "Evolution of the Ideological Structure of Nationalism in Modern Japan," in Ian Nish, ed., Contemporary European Writing on Japan: Scholarly Views from Eastern and Western Europe. Woodchurch: Paul Norbury Publications. 1988, p.168. The decade surrounding the Russo-Japanese War saw government taking various measures to secure and maintain social order, e.g., the creation of the Higher Police, and then the reinforcing Special Higher Police, in 1904 (Meiji 37) and 1911 (Meiji 44), respectively. Mitchell, 1976, p.25.


settings, these groups were the most individualistic, and were thus receptive to the Christian faith. However, they also easily slipped into the safety of middle-class living and thus readily shirked the responsibilities of dealing with social problems.

Sumiya points to the Church’s general support for Japan’s wars with China and Russia, as well as to the 1912 (Meiji 45) “Sankyokaido,” as confirming evidences of late Meiji Christianity’s alliance with both the imperial ideology and Japan’s growing capitalism. Nevertheless, he points to three basic exceptions to this alliance, although Sumiya also notes each of these groups’ particular shortcomings. There were the individualistic Uchimura Kanzo and his followers, who uncompromisingly criticised Japan’s war efforts. Second, there were the socially interested Kumiai Churches (Congregationalist), who all too often left the essentials of classical, theological orthodoxy. Finally there were the church-centred orthodox Christians, best represented by Uemura and the NKK, who were at times critical of the government, but were effectively separated from the political process as well as from constructively dealing with social problems.72

Such were the socio-political circumstances of the Church at the end of the Meiji Era, i.e., just at the time when a promising, aspiring politician and migrated urban intellectual named Takakura Tokutaro was baptised into the Protestant Church. How the Church’s circumstances mixed and merged with the thought and career of the politician-turned-preacher Takakura over the course of the ensuing years must wait to be examined later, in Parts III and IV.

B. Organisational Developments

The seven Christian bodies represented at the 1912 (Meiji 45) "Sankyokaido" meeting were the Catholic, Harisutosu (Orthodox), NKK, Kumiai (Congregational), Epispocal-Anglican, Methodist, and Baptist Churches. At the time, the approximate memberships of these seven largest and oldest church groups in Japan numbered as follows:

---

72Ibid.
Catholic:  64,000
Orthodox:  13,000
NKK:  22,000
Kumiai:  17,000
Episcopal-Anglican:  14,000
Methodist:  12,000
Baptist:  4,000

Due to its intentional lack of any officially-recognised organisational structure, Uchimura Kanzo's well-known and influential Mukyokai (Non-Church) did not have a representative at the meeting.  

The Catholic Church could trace its beginnings in Japan back to Xavier's arrival back in the sixteenth century. Japan's re-opening to the West in the 1850's included signing a treaty with France, which allowed French priests to enter Japan beginning in 1859. An estimated 20,000 "Crypto-Christians" were discovered, although they suffered renewed persecution after disclosing their identity before the proscription on Christianity had been lifted. The Church eventually established dioceses in Tokyo, Nagasaki, Osaka, and Hakodate, along with several educational institutions.

"The Russian Orthodox Mission to Japan has been called the most spectacular achievement in the long history of Russian missionary work." This was in large measure due to the incomparable, highly-respected Bishop Nicolai, who first arrived

73 The lack of organisation also makes the Non-Church membership totals difficult to determine. Especially if one includes what must have been several thousand Mukyokai adherents, Protestants thus would easily be the largest single category. The figures listed here come from comparing 1912 (Meiji 45) totals as listed in Ouchi, 1970, p.461, and 1913 (Taisho 2) totals given by Kuyama in Kuyama, ed., Taisho-Showa vol., p.154.

74 Jennes, 1973, pp.216-218. Jennes notes how some of these believers first approached a Protestant missionary, but after finding out that he was married, concluded that his religion was different and never went back!

75 Ebisawa Arimichi, co-authored by Ouchi, 1970, pp.120-122. For the locations of these four dioceses, cf. Figure 3 below, Part II, ch.1, p.127.

in Hakodate (northern Japan) in 1861, and then remained in Japan until his death fifty-one years later in 1921 (Taisho 10). His major accomplishments included overseeing the construction of a magnificent cathedral in central Tokyo (consecrated in 1891; Meiji 24). Bishop Nicolai also stayed in Japan throughout the war with Russia, all the while conducting his ministry in a non-confrontational, amicable manner.77

Takakura must have known of these two significant Christian bodies by the time of his conversion, if through no other means than seeing their cathedrals in Tokyo. There is, however, no indication of any significant interaction with either of them.78 Apparently, neither had Takakura had much acquaintance with the last three groups listed above, i.e., the Episcopal-Anglican ("Seikokai"), Methodist, and Baptist.79 The branches of Meiji Christianity with which the young Takakura by far had the most contact were the Kumiai Churches and his own church, the NKK.

1. Kumiai

As described in Part I, Takakura’s father Heibei came into contact with Kumiai


78Takakura had an interest in Catholicism as well as in Anglicanism while he was in Britain, matters to be considered later.

79It is noteworthy enough, however, to mention here two things in connection with these bodies. [1] The first Protestant missionaries to arrive in Japan were Episcopalian Americans, J. Liggins and C.M. Williams. They had been transferred from the China Mission; the former arrived on May 2, 1859. They also had the honour of constructing the first Protestant church building, in Nagasaki, but necessarily only for foreign residents. Yamamori, 1974, p.27; Otis Cary, A History of Christianity in Japan: Vol.II, Protestant Missions. New York: Fleming H. Revell, Co., 1909; reprint ed., Surrey: Curzon Press, 1993, p.55. [2] The Methodist representative to the 1912 (Meiji 45) "Sankyokaido" meeting was Bishop Honda Yoichi. Along with three other Japanese churchmen, he had also attended the 1910 Edinburgh Conference. Honda had been baptised by James Ballagh in 1872 (Meiji 5) and thus initially was involved with the Presbyterian-Reformed tradition (and what became the NKK). However, he soon returned to his hometown of Hirosaki in northern Japan (cf. Figure 3, ensuing page). There Honda became connected to an American Methodist missionary, and thus subsequently received permission from the church in Yokohama to become affiliated with the Methodists. Iglehart, 1959, p.149; Yamamoto, 1929 (Showa 4), p.51.
(Congregationalist) Christians during his sojourn in Gumma Ken, and it was with Kumiai congregations that he was involved once he returned to Ayabe; Heibeï’s return home was about two years before Tokutaro entered elementary school in 1892 (Meiji 25).80 In all likelihood, then, Takakura’s first contact with the Christian Church was with the Kumiai branch of it.

**Figure 3. Meiji Christianity**

Understanding both the Kumiai and NKK streams of Protestantism requires some knowledge of what have been called Christian "Bands." Most accounts of the history of Protestant Christianity in Japan include descriptions of three such

---

"Bands,"81 named according to the towns of their origination: Kumamoto, Yokohama, and Sapporo. The last, located in Japan’s northernmost main island of Hokkaido, is associated with Uchimura Kanzo and the Non-Church Movement. The Yokohama Band led to the eventual NKK. Kumamoto, in Kyushu,82 was the location of the group of young converts who became a main part of the foundation for the Kumiai Churches.

Captain L.L. Janes, a graduate of West Point, had come to Kumamoto in 1871 (Meiji 4) to teach English and science, at the invitation of the Lord of Kumamoto. Janes’ military discipline and fervent Christianity—although he never formally taught the latter—so impressed his students that finally in 1876 (Meiji 9) thirty-five of them, at dawn atop the nearby hill of Hanaoka, took an oath of loyalty to Christ, vowing as well to "enlighten the ignorance of the people."83 Among that group of later-to-become well-known figures were Miyagawa Tsuneteru,84 Kanamori Tsurin,85 Yokoi Tokio,86 and Ebina Danjo;87 Kozaki Hiromichi88 soon joined

81There were other Bands, not quite as well-known but nevertheless important. Iglehart, for example, mentions the Hirosaki Christian Band, which was foundational for the Methodist Church. Hirosaki was Honda Yoichi’s hometown, and Honda was the Band’s leading figure. Iglehart, 1959, p.53. The Shizuoka and Koishikawa Christian Bands are also worthy of mention. Cf. A. Hamish Ion, "Edward Warren Clark and the Formation of the Shizuoka and Koishikawa Christian Bands (1871-1879)," in Edward R. Beauchamp and Akira Iriye, eds., Foreign Employees in Nineteenth-Century Japan. Boulder: Westview Press, 1990, pp.171-189.

82Kyushu is the southernmost of Japan’s four main islands; cf. Figure 3, preceding page.

83Unuma Hiroko, Shiryo ni yoru Nihon Kirisutokyo Shi (History of Japanese Christianity according to Historical Records). Saitama Ken: Seigakuin Daigaku Shuppankai, 1992, p.27. I am grateful to the author for directing me to this book.

84Miyagawa was the Kumiai representative to the 1912 "Sankyokaido." Hiyane, 1949, p.386; Saba, ed., Vol.2, 1966, p.717.

85Kanamori sometimes went by the name Paul, and he lived up to it by becoming one of the most successful itinerant evangelists during the late Meiji and Taisho years. His extensive ministry included tours in Hokkaido and Tokyo at times when Takakura was ministering in each of those places. Cf. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.42,91, "Kashin," p.255.
the Band as well. Because of their Christian allegiance, many of the young men endured severe social mistreatment and ostracism.

Upon Janes’ return to America and the Kumamoto school’s sudden closure, the group of students then affiliated with Nishima Shimeta (often called Joseph Hardy, or Nishima Jo), who was in Kyoto beginning what became Doshisha University. The infusion of the young samurai from Kumamoto turned Doshisha into "a kind of Christian West Point." With the cooperation of missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Doshisha became the sending station for young evangelists, who radiated out from Kyoto planting new churches.89

From the earliest days there had been hopes amongst Japanese Christians and missionaries alike of creating a single Protestant denomination in Japan. In particular there were concrete negotiations between the Kumiai Churches and (what became) the NKK, since those two groups were the oldest and largest Protestant bodies in Japan. However, there were of course differences in church polity. And for the Kumiai’s part, the combination of American Board objections and Nishima’s commitment to maintain the independence of the school and churches that he and others had laboured to establish proved decisive in preventing any hoped-for union. The official end to the negotiations—which had been especially

86Yokoi will be considered later.

87As mentioned earlier, Ebina pastored the Kumiai Hongo Church in Tokyo, which Takakura attended briefly before settling in at Uemura’s Fujimicho Church. Cf. Part I, p.89.


89Hiyane, 1949, p.297; Iglehart, 1959, pp.50-52,54. Proximity to Kyoto would explain the beginning of new Kumiai congregations near, and eventually in, Takakura’s hometown of Ayabe. That the influential Nishima’s hometown was in Gumma helps explain the Kumiai growth in that area.
active since 1886 (Meiji 19)—came in 1890 (Meiji 23) when the Kumiai Churches announced that they were no longer going to pursue the proposed union.90

2. Nihon Kirisuto Kyokai

Upon realising that a union with the Kumiai Churches was not going to take place, the following year (1891; Meiji 24) the NKK adopted its name, organisational structure, and doctrinal stance.91 The beginnings of the NKK stretched back three decades with the co-arrival in Yokohama of American missionaries—notably the Dutch Reformed Samuel R. Brown and James H. Ballagh, as well as the Presbyterian James C. Hepburn—and certain displaced samurai, such as Ibuka Kajinosuke, Honda Yoichi, and Uemura. Despite having to be discreet due to the proscription of Christianity (until 1873; Meiji 6), the missionaries were eager to share the gospel with any who would be so bold as to express an interest. For their part, the disenfranchised samurai went to the missionaries for language and scientific studies, both of which promised social advancement. The "Yokohama Band" then emerged out of these young men who studied from the missionaries.

In January, 1872 (Meiji 5), there was a "Pentecost-like" prayer meeting in Yokohama, involving missionaries93 and then Japanese as well. This initiated a

---

90Ouchi, 1970, pp.229-240; Hiyane, 1949, p.298; Iglehart, 1959, p.82. Iglehart conjectures that, in addition to Nishima’s samurai-type of loyalty to the American Board, "regional clannishness as between Kyoto and Tokyo, and the differing loyalties of the Yokohama and the Kumamoto Bands may have exerted an unconscious influence."

Interestingly, just as was the case later in 1912 (Meiji 45/Taisho 1), Uemura was away in the United States and England during most of 1888 (Meiji 21), which was a crucial year in the midst of the four years of active negotiations. Saba, ed., Vol.4, 1966, pp.555-567. Cf. above, Part II, ch.1, p.120.


92Ibuka succeeded Hepburn as president of Meiji Gakuin; he also was the NKK representative to the 1912 (Meiji 45) "Sankyokaido." Drummond, 1971, p.166; Hiyane, 1949, p.386; Saba, ed., Vol.2, 1966, p.717.

93The prayer meetings were being held according to the pattern of The World Evangelical Alliance. op.cit., p.175.
time recalled later by Uemura as the bursting forth of a "stopped-up fountain."\textsuperscript{94} As a continuation of this powerful spiritual movement,\textsuperscript{95} Japan's first organised Protestant congregation came into being on 10 March: the "Nihon Kirisuto Kokai."\textsuperscript{96} There were nine baptisms that day, making the new church's membership eleven; the two previously-baptised believers\textsuperscript{97} were chosen respectively as elder and deacon; and, Ballagh was named pastor.\textsuperscript{98}

Uemura himself had entered Ballagh's English school in January, during the time


\textsuperscript{95}The prayer meeting had to be extended beyond its originally-scheduled one week.

\textsuperscript{96}The church was called by other various names as well. The first name was "Iesu Kokai," or "Yaso Kokai"; both "Iesu" and "Yaso" were used early on as equivalents for the English "Jesus." "Yokohama Kokai" and "Yokohama Kaigan Kyokai" were also used, the latter in association with the church's building, newly constructed in 1875 (Meiji 8). Omura, 1993, p.29; Saba, ed., Vol.2, 1966, p.172.

One should note the distinction between the designations "kokai" and "kyokai." The latter, literally translated as "teaching-meeting," came to be the standard Japanese equivalent for the English term "church." The former term is comprised of two characters literally translated as "public-meeting." There has been much discussion concerning the meaning of the designation "kokai" in terms of the original members'—and in turn subsequent Christians'—ecclesiological understandings, including the implications for church-state relations. The primary interpretations of the term's shades of meaning have included Japanese autonomy, non- or supra-denominationalism, simple creedalism, and nationalism. Yamaguchi Yoichi, "Kyokai to Kokka" ("Church and State") Kirisuto Shingaku No.3, 1986, pp.96-97. I am grateful to Maruyama Tadataka for directing me to this article.

Although highly relevant to Takakura's own understanding, the specific issue of the meaning of "kokai" is beyond the scope of this thesis. Suffice it here to say that the various interpretations all have their own important contributions to make, particularly those which point out the fundamental and problematic issue of the church's relationship to the state implied by this designation "kokai."


\textsuperscript{98}Yamamoto, 1929 (Showa 4), pp.23-24. Since the cooperating missionaries were reformed and presbyterian, the church government was presbyterian in form, or as Ouchi describes it, "between episcopalianism and congregationalism." Ouchi, 1970, p.178.
of the prayer meetings. By his own testimony:

The first sermon I ever listened to was on the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The missionary’s Japanese was hard to be understood; but somehow the Christian idea of God which seemed to be so old and so new took possession of my soul. The idea was grand and elevating. A new world was opened to the worshipper of the hero-god, Kato Kiyomasa. My youthful soul was stormed by the wonderful faith in the one true God, ever and everywhere present, holy and merciful. Without discussion, and before making any inquiry, I felt myself to be already a Christian....

A few months after that memorable January, I was baptized.99

To be exact, Uemura was baptised into the Yokohama Church by Ballagh over one year later on Sunday, 4 May 1873 (Meiji 6).100

The NKK’s roots extend as well to more explicitly presbyterian ground. Christopher Carrothers, another American Presbyterian missionary, in 1873 (Meiji 6) at the home office’s instructions started the Japan Presbytery ("Nihon Choro Kai") as part of China Synod--despite the fact that there were no Presbyterian churches in Japan yet!101 However, five Presbyterian churches were organised in and around Tokyo between September, 1874 (Meiji 7) and July, 1877 (Meiji 10).102 On 10 October 1877 (Meiji 10), these five congregations united with four Nihon Kirisuto Kokai congregations to form a new "Nihon Kirisuto Itchi Kyokai" ("Japan Christ United Church").103 With the union, the Itchi Kyokai had a total

---

99Uemura Masahisa, "Retrospect by a Convert of 1872." This was originally published in October, 1909 (Meiji 42), in a special issue of the Fukuin Shinpo, commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of Protestant missions in Japan. The quotation is from the reproduction of the essay in Saba, ed., Vol.1, 1966, pp.681-683.

100Mizugaki, 1986, p.31.


102Ozawa, 1964, p.123.

103The four Kokai churches included the original Yokohama Church. Ibid., p.124. Ozawa’s helpful chart shows that there actually were seven Kokai congregations at the time, and what denominational affiliations they then took on:
Over the course of the next thirteen years, i.e., by its sixth general assembly in 1890 (Meiji 23), the United Church had grown to 10,495 members and seventy-two congregations, located nationwide. The number of cooperating mission organisations had increased as well. There had been three in the "Council of Three Missions" who had helped broker the 1877 (Meiji 10) formation of the Itchi Kyokai. Four more missions joined in the efforts during the 1880's (second Meiji decade). At the time of the Itchi Kyokai's reorganisation into the NKK, then, the "Council of Three Missions" had been reconstituted and it became the "Council of Missions Cooperating with the NKK." 

The Itchi Kyokai's growth through pioneering church-planting efforts is exemplified in the first two NKK churches with which Takakura had contact. The Kanazawa Church, with which Takakura had some acquaintance during his high school years, was begun in October, 1879 (Meiji 12), through the evangelistic

---

* Four joined the "Itchi Kyokai" ("United Church"). They were located in Yokohama, Tokyo, Nagasaki, and Ueda (about 140 kilometres northwest of Tokyo; cf. Figure 3 above, Part II, ch.1, p.127).
* Two became "Kumiai" congregations. These were in Kobe and Osaka, i.e., the Kansai region, near the Kumiai base of Kyoto.
* One became Methodist. This was Honda Yoichi's (the eventual Methodist Bishop) church in Hirosaki.

---

104 Yamamoto, 1929 (Showa 4), p.72.

105 Ibid., pp.98-101. 1890 (Meiji 23) was the year of the breakdown of union negotiations with the Kumiai Churches, and just prior to the Itchi Kyokai's reorganisation and being renamed the NKK in 1891 (Meiji 24).

106 These three missions were the American Presbyterian, American Dutch Reformed, and United Church of Scotland. Stubbs, 1984, pp.50-51.

107 The newer missions were the (American) German Reformed, American Southern Presbyterian, Woman's Union Missionary Society of America, and Cumberland Presbyterian. op.cit., p.163.

108 op.cit., p.66.
efforts of an American Presbyterian, T.C. Wynn. As for Uemura’s Fujimicho Church, into which Takakura was baptised in 1906 (Meiji 39), it was started by Uemura as the Bancho Kyokai in 1887 (Meiji 20). It then moved to nearby Fujimicho—and was thus renamed—in April, 1906 (Meiji 39).

3. Other Developments

Educational institutions played an important role in the life and growth of all of the churches, including the NKK, right from the beginning. As noted earlier, the missionaries rode the wave of popularity enjoyed by Westernisation in teaching English and, in some cases, science and medicine. Following the lifting of the ban on Christianity in 1873 (Meiji 6), the gospel could be preached lawfully and taught openly; hence, schools expressly for teaching theology were soon begun, e.g. by Carrothers. These schools became more structured as their leaders joined forces and as church organisations developed. This led to, for example, the formation of the Itchi Kyokai’s theological seminary in 1877 (Meiji 10) and...
As Uemura conveniently was in Tokyo pastoring his newly-founded Bancho Church, he started teaching at the newly-established Meiji Gakuin in April, 1887 (Meiji 20). However, in 1903 (Meiji 36) Uemura broke away and started the following year his own school, the Tokyo Shingakusha ("Tokyo Seminary"), where Takakura studied a few years later. In Uemura's own words,

Finally, in 1903, some conservative missionaries objected to my using W.N. Clarke's Christian Theology, so I resigned and in 1904 started an independent Theological School. Three years later a converted stockbroker gave the school a site and building and a small endowment. It has continued ever since to have twenty or thirty students.

The objecting missionaries were (American) Southern Presbyterians, who were relatively recent arrivals in Japan. They had hesitatingly, due to theological reservations, started cooperating in teaching at Meiji Gakuin only two years before Uemura's departure. Their conflict with Uemura illustrated some of the

---


119 They started arriving in 1885 (Meiji 18), similar to other bodies based in the devastated southern region of the United States following the 1861-1865 Civil War. The Southern Baptists, for example, first arrived in Japan in 1889 (Meiji 22). Ozawa, 1964, p.72.

120 Soltau, 1982, pp.94-95. After the incident with Uemura, the Southern Presbyterians started their own seminary in Kobe. An interesting related "historical accident" involved the famous Kagawa Toyohiko, who was a student at Meiji Gakuin at the time. Because of having been baptised by a Southern Presbyterian missionary in 1888 (Meiji 21), he was obliged to transfer to their new Kobe seminary. Nihon Purotesutanto Shi Kenkyukai, eds., Nihon Purotesutanto Shi no Shomondai (Various Problems in Protestant History in Japan). Tokyo:
problems in church-missions relations that had existed throughout the Meiji period.  

Uemura had long been a champion of self-reliance and autonomy for the Japanese Church relative to the foreign mission organisations. This especially included financial self-support, something Uemura exemplified from his days of raising pigs in Yokohama, through the founding of his first church, until the formation of the seminary.  

Both for strength to endure the rigours of the Christian life in Japan, as well as for developing the most faithful, indigenous Japanese Christianity possible, Uemura insisted that Japanese Christians had to stand on their own. Recalling the previous discussion on socio-political matters, Uemura’s spirit can be characterised as one of independency from both the state and the missions.  

However, whereas Uemura’s preaching of a "Baptised Bushido" might clearly reveal his advocacy of independence from missionaries, and whereas Uemura’s similar posture of fighting for the church’s autonomy from state control must be kept in mind, his samurai, bushido spirit compelled him to sense a "great

It was then in Kobe that Kagawa moved into the slums, leading to his becoming a leading advocate of a form of "Social Christianity"--which, as shall be seen later, Takakura strongly opposed. One can conjecture that Kagawa’s and Takakura’s paths might have intersected more compatibly had Kagawa not had to transfer away from the de facto NKK seminary in Tokyo.

Such problems included organisational control and theological understandings.


This autonomy of course was to include the training of pastors by Japanese teachers and administrators. Soltau, 1982, pp.98-99.


responsibility for the welfare of the nation."126 As pointed out earlier, Uemura’s and other Meiji Christians’ relationship to the state was at best complicated, and more properly described as extremely perplexing and deeply problematic. It was surely no mere coincidence, therefore, that Uemura’s resignation from Meiji Gakuin took place after Japan’s conservative reaction against things Western was over one decade old.

The interrelatedness of church-state-mission relationships is further illustrated by the independence gained by the Home Mission Societies of both the NKK and the Kumiai Churches vis-à-vis their respective cooperating missions in the mid-1890’s (late Meiji 20’s).127 It is important to note that these movements toward church autonomy occurred during the months following the Sino-Japanese War. That coincidence notwithstanding, the timing of these decisions possibly could be attributed simply to adequate time having passed since the churches’ beginnings two decades earlier. However, the NKK’s decision followed by only a few years its formation as the NKK in 1891 (Meiji 24). That was the event described by a contemporary as establishing NKK independence,128 and it happened soon after both the granting of the Meiji Constitution and the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education. Such a progression strongly suggests an instance of a correlation between national assertiveness and church autonomy relative to cooperating missions.

In the midst of these various developments, the powerful influence of leading

---


individuals such as Uemura and Nishima is striking.\textsuperscript{129} In a statement that notes as well the Meiji Christian Church's overall relationship with the missions, one author boldly states, "The Japanese Christian movement was characterized by groups of followers centred around charismatic leaders and represented a largely independent Christian movement."\textsuperscript{130} Given the prominent place in the Church of Confucian-trained former samurai leaders--men who were intensely loyal to their Lord, and who expected the same loyalty and compliance with hierarchical order from all of Jesus' followers--one would be hard-pressed to disagree with such an overall characterisation.\textsuperscript{131}

No description of organisational developments in Meiji Christianity\textsuperscript{132} would be complete without mentioning two more areas. One is the so-called "Social Christianity." This movement really did not become known to the churches until the 1930's (early Showa), after there had been certain social upheavals following World War I, the Student Christian Movement of the late 1920's and early 1930's,\textsuperscript{133} and the Kagawa-led Kingdom of God Movement in the early

\textsuperscript{129}Takenaka comments on the "predominant recognition of 'personal charismatic authority'..., to use Max Weber's terms," regarding the overall "source of authority in the Protestant groups...." He then notes the importance of this "authority which depended upon respect for noted individuals" for Protestantism's dealing with social problems. Takenaka Masao, "The Relation of Protestantism to Social Problems in Japan, 1900-1941," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 1954, p.260.

\textsuperscript{130}Ion, \textit{The Cross and the Rising Sun}, 1990, p.8.

\textsuperscript{131}Compare as well the compatible perspective--which this thesis advocates--that understands Meiji Christianity not so much as part of Western mission history, but as part of Jesus Christ building His worldwide Church in its Meiji, Japanese setting.

\textsuperscript{132}This is meant to include this particular description as well, which has in mind the guiding theme of relevancy to Takakura.

\textsuperscript{133}This SCM emerged out of the background of the YMCA, which had evolved from a Tokyo base established in mid-Meiji Japan. Germany, pp.55-58; Ouchi, 1970, pp.507,636-638.
1930's. The intellectual roots of Social Christianity began to take hold in the second Meiji decade (from 1878), when social thought was introduced by Christians teaching at Doshisha. Those who accepted the ideas began to develop them in a more organised way with the formation, in the late 1890's (early Meiji 30's), of the "Shakai Mondai Kenkyu Kai" ("Association for the Research into Social Problems"). It was these Christians who were wanting to deal with social problems at fundamental, political levels; that is, they were interested in taking social action instead of just offering social service. Moreover, they participated in the formation of the short-lived socialist party at the turn of the century (early Meiji 30's).

A second area deserving attention here is that of inter-denominational organisational developments, particularly for evangelistic purposes. The first missionaries hoped to avoid transplanting the denominational splits and separations of their homelands, but several significant efforts towards union failed, e.g., between the Itchi Kyokai (eventual NKK) and the Kumiai Churches. Nevertheless, the longing for such union remained, and one of the first expressions of this desire for united cooperation was the holding of four meetings, between 1878 (Meiji 11) and 1885 (Meiji 18), of the "Zenkoku Kirisutokyo Shinto Shinbokai Undo" ("National Movement for the Friendly Gathering of Christian Believers"). The three- to five-day meetings were held alternately in the Kanto (Tokyo) and Kansai (Osaka and Kyoto) regions, reflecting the desire to accommodate both of the main strands of Meiji Protestantism.

134Kumano, 1972, pp.4-8; Germany, pp.51ff. Of pertinent interest is that Kagawa considered Takakura an opponent to his own program of Social Christianity, and that Nakajima Shigeru wrote his well-known Shakaiteki Kirisutokyo (Social Christianity) as a contrasting reaction to Takakura's Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo (Evangelical Christianity). Germany, pp.88-89.

135Takenaka, 1954, p.73. The English title is from Takenaka.


This organised movement developed into the formation of the "Fukuin Domeikai" ("Evangelical Alliance"), resembling in name and purpose its Western predecessor formed in 1846. Between 1885 (Meiji 18) and 1906 (Meiji 39) there were twelve "taikai" ("conventions"). At these meetings, sermons, reports, and lectures were shared by the approximately one hundred thirty delegates who represented their respective, participating ecclesiastical bodies. Particularly noteworthy was the Tenth Convention in 1900 (Meiji 33), which established, at the outset of the new century, an evangelistic plan for a united effort to reach Japan with the gospel.

As progress reports were being received at the meeting two years later, there was some dissatisfaction over the relative lack of progress being made in the central region. The problem was perceived to be due to theological laxity, and a motion was thus made and passed clarifying the meaning of "evangelicalism." This decision also qualified membership in the Alliance by stressing commitments to the Bible, the divinity of Christ, and Christ’s place as the Saviour of humankind. A committee of ten—including Uemura, Honda, and others—was then appointed to create new standards for the Alliance.

The eventual organisational result was the Alliance’s dissolution in 1906 (Meiji 39), then its succession by the "Kirisuto Kyokai Domei" ("Christian Church Alliance")

Kanto and Kansai were the respective areas of strength for the "Presbyterian-Reformed" (eventual NKK) stream and the "Congregationalist" Kumiai.

138 Nakamura Satoshi, "Nihon Shoki Purotesutantizumu ni oyoboshita Fukuin Domeikai no Eikyo" ("The Influence of the Evangelical Alliance Exerted on Early Japanese Protestantism") Kirisutokyo Shigaku (The Journal of History of Christianity) 38 December, 1984, English Summary, pp.86-87. English translations of these two titles were taken from the journal.

139 The pre-1885 (Meiji 18) meetings were more attended by the general Christian public than were the later meetings, e.g. five to six hundred daily at the first one held in Tokyo, 15-17 July 1878 (Meiji 11). op.cit., pp.2,23,37,38.

in 1911 (Meiji 44).\textsuperscript{141} A more immediate and well-known correlative drama was the captivating, public theological debate--carried out through their respective journals--between Uemura and Ebina Danjo. The debate had lasted for six months leading up the spring meeting of the Alliance, and it provided the Protestant Church of late Meiji with "a long journey of stimulating and guided thinking as to just what should be one's personal faith within the context of the church life [sic]."\textsuperscript{142}

This organisational-theological connecting point serves as an appropriate transition to a consideration of various theological facets of Meiji Christianity.

C. Theological Understandings

"There seems to be no question about the fact that the expression of Christianity during the early part of the Meiji period was essentially non-theological in character. The emphasis was, rather, ethical and evangelistic. Puritanism and church extension were the primary interests."\textsuperscript{143} This sort of evaluation understands "theology" in a technical sense, conveyed by such phrases as "the science of the church."\textsuperscript{144} Within such a notion, doctrinal articulations and church creeds become the centrepiece of theology. As the quotation above indicates, one will indeed search in vain for any such original, theological statements within early

\textsuperscript{141}Miyakoda, 1967, p.2; Ouchi, 1970, p.638; Iglehart, 1959, p.82. This "Domei" ("Alliance" or "Federation") was succeeded a decade later by a "Renmei" ("Council").

\textsuperscript{142}Iglehart, 1959, p.112. As Iglehart points out, including the writings produced subsequent to the 1902 (Meiji 35) Alliance meeting, the debate lasted for almost two years. Much has been written--some of which will be considered shortly--about this first great theological debate in Japanese Protestantism. The relevant original contributions have been reproduced in Saba, ed., Vol.5, 1966, pp.243-438.

\textsuperscript{143}Germany, p.3. Germany bases this judgement on the research findings of Japanese historians of Meiji Christianity. He later attributes the "first systematic statement of theology in the Japanese Christian world" to Takakura. p.87.

\textsuperscript{144}This is the definition self-consciously taken by Kumano Yoshitaka in his article, "A Review and Prospect of Theology in Japan" The Northeast Journal of Theology No.4, March, 1970, pp.66-75. The heritage of the Western "theologia" as "Queen of the Sciences" is evident here as well. Cf. Introduction, p.5.
Meiji Christianity.

The new churches instead adopted Western creedal statements. The first organised Protestant church, the Nihon Kirisuto Kokai, adopted a doctrinal position similar to that of the Evangelical Alliance.\textsuperscript{145} The Kokai’s successor, the Itchi Kyokai, took on three Western confessional statements as the bulk of its doctrinal standards: the Canons of Dordt, the Westminster Standards, and the Heidelberg Catechism.\textsuperscript{146} With the reorganisation of the Itchi Church in 1891 (Meiji 24) as the NKK, however, the Church’s theological statement was greatly simplified to a concise, evangelical statement, affixed as a preamble to the Apostles’ Creed.\textsuperscript{147}

The cooperating Presbyterian and Reformed missionaries, especially including James Ballagh, were terribly distressed by this last action of the church. Ballagh reportedly viewed the decision as the work of the devil. For days he angrily glared at, and he refused even to shake hands with, the pastor who introduced the motion, even though he was one of Ballagh’s most trusted, closest sons in the faith.\textsuperscript{148}

What was happening, of course, was that "Underneath the surface of seeming unity..."
of thought were great differences in perception and understanding."\textsuperscript{149} The early Meiji missionaries had come to Japan preaching the gospel of individual salvation through faith in Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{150} In the case of the Presbyterian and Reformed missionaries, the creeds of the Church were understood as propositionally true, the best expressions of Christian doctrine that God had led His Church to develop throughout its long history. In most cases the missionaries were flexible enough to want to cooperate with those they viewed as Bible-believing, theologically-sound Christians. But to the missionaries there were limits to theological soundness, and the central truths of Scripture were considered manifestly clear.

As has been seen already, however, for the vast majority of the early Japanese converts, embracing the Christian faith did not mean simply trusting in Christ’s sacrificial death on the Cross for forgiveness of sin—the core of the gospel message that the missionaries preached. As Uemura himself testified, "It was not until some time after my first conversion that the sense of sin, and of forgiveness through the atonement of Christ, came to be properly appreciated."\textsuperscript{151} Much less did the Christians’ conversions, and their incorporation into churches, involve a complete adherence to the missionaries’ church confessions and creeds. From the beginning, the Meiji Church (and churches) were intent on being autonomous. That was exactly the way their nation always had been, and would by all means remain: free from the domination of any foreign power. Thus the new churches did not base themselves on the deep, argumentatively-formed tradition of their Western counterparts. As Protestant Christians, they sought to identify simply with the so-called basic, general traditional beliefs, e.g., the inter-denominationally-recognised

\textsuperscript{149}Ion, in Beauchamp and Akira, eds., 1990, p.172. There were also more conscious, immediate concerns at the time. Beside the needs both to simplify and "Japanise" the confessional statement for the benefit of the "average, theologically unversed church member," there was also the problem of counteracting the growing movement--brought about by the recently-arrived Plymouth Brethren--of criticism of church polity, organisation, and creed. Mizugaki, 1986, p.55.

\textsuperscript{150}Yamamori, 1974, pp.14,58.

\textsuperscript{151}Saba, ed., Vol.1, 1966, p.682.
What the displaced samurai were seeking was a new value system, a new basis for a renewed nation. They found the cornerstone and central focus for their renewed worldview in the One Whom the missionaries worshipped and of Whom they spoke. This Jesus was the new Lord to Whom they could give their full loyalty. And the prerogative for how they would understand and articulate how to follow Jesus in building a new order lay with them, the recipients of the message about their new Lord, not with the foreign message-bearers.

In exercising this freedom and responsibility to understand both where and how their Lord Jesus was leading them, the Meiji Christian leaders' "theological intention" was on building a free and national church. That meant "free" in relation both to the state and to the foreign mission boards. This is not to say that creedal statements were ignored. But in building their church, the leaders focused their "theological concerns" more on the Christians' ethical behaviour and on various social problems, i.e., matters pertaining to a Christian worldview that would give guidance relative to the nation, family, civilisation, etc. Such concerns were

---


153 This was the case as well with the allowance of foreign ideas to penetrate the wider society. Ion, in Beauchamp and Akira, eds., 1990, p.171. Note the parallel case in Africa with the reception, and transformation, of both Islam and Christianity as described by Lamin Sanneh in his *West African Christianity: The Religious Impact*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1983. Cf. as well Bosch’s comment: "Nobody receives the gospel passively; each one as a matter of course reinterprets it.... [T]his circumstance...is an inherent feature of the Christian faith, since it concerns the Word made flesh." Bosch, 1991, p.182.

simply part of dealing with the reality of the times during the Meiji Era.\footnote{Kumano, 1970, pp.69-70.}

If one thus allows a wider definition of "theology," i.e., one which goes beyond strictly doctrinal statements and takes the literal meaning of "theology" as "'words' referring to 'God'," the first Meiji Christians "did theology" right from the beginning. They thought and spoke of God, and they lived as His followers. Moreover, those who became leaders set the pace for the Meiji Christians' formation of their understanding of how to think and live as Jesus' followers.

Uemura Masahisa and the other early leaders blazed the trail of understanding, i.e., they "theologised," particularly through preaching.\footnote{Kato Tsuneaki, \textit{Nihon no Sekkyoshatachi} (Japan's Preachers). Tokyo: Shinkyo Shuppansha, 1972, p.18.} Both in sermons delivered to the faithful and in messages directed to the wider public,\footnote{Many of the public sermons were delivered in large, public meetings associated with revivals. For example, open-air preaching was conducted in Ueno Park in Tokyo in October, 1880 (Meiji 13), which reportedly thousands came to hear. Miyakoda, 1967, p.25.} preachers exhorted their hearers to join them in serving their Lord, and in building His kingdom. Such theologising included most of the published writings which were made readily available in journals and other forms: they had the flavour and style of sermons.\footnote{This characterisation includes Uemura's well-known 1884 (Meiji 17) apologetic treatise \textit{Shinri Ippan} (Outline of Truth), to be considered below. Kumano, 1968, p.30.}

All of the preceding remarks help to demonstrate the fact that making general statements about Meiji theology is therefore exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. The familiar route of labelling individuals' and churches' theologies as "reformed," "orthodox" or "liberal" runs the risk of giving undue preference to religious
wineskins into which Meiji Christian thought and experience would not be poured. Furthermore, seeking precise identification of all theologising that took place would lead into an endless, painstaking search for every individual’s and church’s statements. Parts of that task have been ably attempted elsewhere; clearly such a venture is beyond the scope of this thesis.

The most helpful approach here seems to be to consider four major theological developments that have received tremendous attention in the literature about Meiji theology, thus demonstrating their recognised importance: [1] the "robust apologetic writing" produced during the 1880’s and 1890’s (second and third Meiji decades); [2] the movement advocating a "Japanisation" of Christianity; [3] the controversy associated with the co-entrance into Japan of so-called German Liberalism and American Unitarianism in the latter half of the 1880’s (from Meiji 18); and, [4] the aforementioned Uemura-Ebina "Shingakujo no Ronson" ("Theological Controversy"), which took place over the course of almost two years after the turn of the century. Each of these involved Uemura in some way, and thus indirectly Takakura, and will therefore serve the specific concern of this thesis.

1. Apologetic Writing

While benefiting from Japan’s openness to all things Western after the ban on Christianity was lifted in 1873 (Meiji 6), the Church had to contend with Western imports that were perceived to be incompatible with sound Christian teaching and living. By the latter half of the 1880’s (the few years surrounding Meiji 20), Western positivism, materialism, agnosticism, and evolution had become very influential. The writings of Spencer, Darwin, and Huxley were widely read in Japan, and Westerners such as the American Edward S. Morse, who taught

\[159\] Of course, there was no "orthodox," indigenous Christian tradition to be either "reformed" or "liberalised." Cf., too, Takeda Kiyoko’s 1978 article (already cited), "Japanese Christianity: Between Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy," in which she examines the meanings of orthodoxy and heterodoxy for Christianity in Meiji Japan.

\[160\] Iglehart, 1959, p.98.
evolutionary science at the Tokyo Imperial University, were shaking the intellectual foundations of much of the Christian community.161

To combat these currents of thought—hostile to the Christian worldview which they themselves were seeking to advance—spokesmen for the "traditional" Christian faith spoke and wrote with force and conviction. Not surprisingly, two of the most prominent Christian apologists were Uchimura Kanzo and Uemura Masahisa: "Proclaiming Christian truth on the background of a complete worldview based on creation and consummation, they forcefully demonstrated God's existence and Christ's atonement, and on the other hand showed deep insight into humankind's spiritual nature and the problem of sin." There was the presence of what could be called a "philosophy of religion" forming the respective frameworks for Uchimura's and Uemura's defences of the Christian faith.162

Uemura's most significant single apologetic contribution in this regard was his 1884 (Meiji 17) Shinri Ippan (Outline of Truth).163 The book was written in the wake of the previous year's revivals as one of a series of monographs, all produced by prominent Christians and dealing with various aspects of the Christian faith.164 Shinri Ippan sought specifically to contend with the contemporary influential currents of agnosticism, materialism, superstition, and evolutionism.165 The work


165Ishihara Ken, "Shisoshijo no Uemura Sensei" ("Rev. Uemura from the Perspective of the History of Thought") Shingaku to Kyokai (Theology and Church)
both argues rationally and gives careful attention to practical ethics. Uemura also employed a Japanese literary style while using Western philosophical methods, e.g., those of Pascal, in offering cosmological and moral proofs for the existence of God.166

God’s existence is the subject of the fourth and fifth of the book’s nine sections. Parts six through nine then address, respectively, prayer and the relationship between God and humankind, humankind’s spiritual nature, Jesus Christ, and the relationship between religion and scholarship. These five topics are not set forth from the basis of a simple, protective dogmatism, however: instead, the book was "directed to the contemporary Japanese consciousness and refined culture, and spoke as persuasively as possible for religious truth..."167 Furthermore, couched in a particularly Japanese artistic style, the book quotes ancient Japanese poems and suggests that the pathos therein expressed can only be fulfilled by the gospel of Christ.168

The first three sections of Shinri Ippan lay the foundation for the remaining five parts of the book. Sections one and two contain a general introduction to religion; section three addresses the required attitude for seeking religious truth. The primary problem considered is that of the "religious heart," which is always searching for one’s own origin, destiny, and reason for existence.169 The suggested posture is that of pursuing religious truth from the foundation of self-realisation of one’s own sin and moral inadequacy, a posture common to early Meiji Christianity.170


166Ishihara, 1935, pp.89-90; Ishida, 1993, p.27; Soltau, 1982, p.84.


168Soltau, 1982, p.84.

169"hokyoshin" or "shukyoshin"; op.cit., p.15.

170Ibid., pp.16-17.
The book was well received and highly valued by those both within and outside the Church.\textsuperscript{171} There were other recognised works as well. For his part in the apologetic enterprise, Kozaki Hiromichi wrote \textit{Seikyo Shinron (A New Theory of Religion and Politics)}, first published in 1886 (Meiji 19).\textsuperscript{172} While criticising the heretofore Confucian base of Japanese civilisation,\textsuperscript{173} Kozaki explained that the book was not a strictly religious or philosophical treatise. Instead, he hoped that his readers would come to see how Christianity could help in forming the foundation for a progressive civilisation for a "New Japan."\textsuperscript{174} That is, while written from a Christian perspective, the book was also a political book. It thus gave birth to the enterprise of consciously theorising in Japan about the relationship between religion and politics.\textsuperscript{175}

Christian optimism amidst the Westernisation of the day supported a hope for, and expectation of, significant Christian input into a politically "New Japan." However, the consolidation of the imperial ideology just a few years later helped usher in a new urgency for apologetic defence relative to the state. This was especially true following Uchimura's lese majesty incident in 1891 (Meiji 24) and the ensuing so-called confrontation between education and religion.\textsuperscript{176}


\textsuperscript{172}The book included an appendix of reasons for believing in Christianity. Saba, ed., Vol.5, 1966, pp.191-192. Other English translations of the title include \textit{A New Theory of Church and State} (Germany, p.87) and \textit{A New View of Politics} (Iglehart, 1959, p.80).


\textsuperscript{174}This is from the book's foreword, as quoted by Kumano, 1968, pp.181-182.

\textsuperscript{175}Kumano, 1968, p.182.

\textsuperscript{176}Cf. above, Part II, ch.1, pp.114-115.
As mentioned earlier, Professor Inoue Tetsujiro of the Imperial University spearheaded the attack against Christianity through a series of writings published between 1891 and 1893 (Meiji 24 and 26). Based on a "Kokka Shugi" ("nationalist/absolutist") interpretation of the Imperial Rescript on Education, the crux of Inoue’s arguments consisted of asserting the fundamental incompatibility between Japanese and Christian morality. Inoue pointed out how the Imperial Rescript, as the embodiment of Japanese morality, advocated loyalty ("chuko") to particular relations according to differing levels of obligation. The foundational obligation was to one’s lord or father ("filial piety"); the culminating devotion was to the nation. The Christian ethic, on the other hand, taught equal love for all, regardless of familial or national relationship.

There was a tremendous amount and variety of input into the overall discussion, both by direct participants and third party evaluators. One type of Christian approach was that of arguing along strictly ethical lines, i.e. by making a distinction between an ethical system per se and individual good deeds incumbent upon citizens to perform. Representative of this thinking was Onishi Hajime, a graduate of Doshisha and of the Tokyo Imperial University.

Onishi did not argue against the usefulness of traditional Confucian loyalty ("chuko"): on the contrary, such loyalty was held to be indispensable to the well-

---

177First came his 1891 (Meiji 24) *Kyoiku Chokugo Engi (Commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education)*. The following year he started writing articles on the relationship of religion and education, which were published in the periodical, *Kyoiku Jiron (Contemporary Comments on Education)*. These articles were compiled into one volume, published in 1893 (Meiji 26) under the title, *Kyoiku to Shukyo no Shototsu (The Conflict between Education and Religion)*. Ouchi, 1970, p.283; Unuma, 1992, pp.33-34.


179These are listed in Saba, ed., Vol.5, 1966, pp.775-791.

being of families and of the nation. Rather, Onishi’s objection was to Inoue’s and others’ arguments which advocated "chuko" as the foundation of an ethical system. According to Onishi, the inadequacy of such an argument was the failure to see that the ethical value of "filial piety" itself, i.e., the goodness or rightness of obeying one’s lord or father, would thus stand above or outside the ethical system. What was needed, then, was a more adequate ethical system, which was provided by making freedom of private judgement the basic starting point. Thus whether or not one believed in Christianity, for example, was not to be imposed from without by a legalised Confucian ethic, but should be based on individual, freedom of choice.\textsuperscript{181}

Uemura Masahisa argued similarly to Onishi. In his 1893 (Meiji 26) "Kyo no Shukyoron oyobi Tokuikuron" ("Today’s Discussions on Religion and Moral Education"),\textsuperscript{182} Uemura explained that Christians loved and obeyed God first, then others (including the nation) as themselves second. The similarity with Onishi was in de-absolutising the state, which ran directly counter to the framework for Professor Inoue’s arguments. Furthermore, both Onishi and Uemura placed final ethical authority in God and in man’s inner conscience, while advocating a separation of church and state.\textsuperscript{183}

2. Japanised Christianity

There were other, different sorts of Christian approaches, however. Some of these related strictly to the religion-education controversy; and, some were also part of a more general trend within much of the Church during the few years following the granting of the Constitution and promulgation of the Rescript. An important type was that of seeking to avoid the charge of Christianity being "un-Japanese" by advocating some sort of "Japanised Christianity." This approach either sought an

\textsuperscript{181}Ibid., pp.289-290.

\textsuperscript{182}This was originally published in three successive, monthly issues of \textit{Nippon Hyoron (Japan Review)}, beginning with No.49, 4 March 1893 (Meiji 26), pp.1-4. This journal of Uemura’s will be considered below.

\textsuperscript{183}op.cit., pp.290-291; Unuma, 1992, p.34.
explicit Japanese connection via Shintoism or Confucianism, or it advocated a radical transformation of Christianity via a stripping of all Western elements. Generally speaking, this style avoided a confrontation with the state by attempting to re-plant the Christian faith fully in Japanese soil, and to see it nourished in a fully Japanese environment.  

Yokoi Tokio was a prime example of a Christian spokesman advocating a Japanised Christianity. Relative to the religion-education controversy, Yokoi wrote two articles, one each in 1892 and 1893 (Meiji 25,26). While rejecting Inoue’s specific charges of Christianity’s basic incompatibility with Japanese morality, Yokoi argued for the contribution that a renewed, transformed Christianity could make to national life.

Yokoi’s much more widely known and influential writings, however, were sandwiched around these two religion-education articles. In 1890 (Meiji 23) he published his essay, "Nihon Shorai no Kirisutokyo" ("The Christianity of the Future Japan"), followed by a larger work four years later, *Wa ga Kuni no Kirisutokyo Shomondai* (Various Problems of Christianity in Our Country). In the former, Yokoi argued for a fully indigenised Christianity, claiming that it had to shed its Western garb and don Japanese dress. In 1894 (Meiji 27) he wrote:

---

184 Thelle, 1987, pp.174-175.
185 The first article was entitled "Kyoiku ni kansuru Jiron to Kirisutokyo" ("Contemporary Comments Concerning Education and Christianity"), and the second was "Shototsu Osoruru ni Tarazu" ("Not Adequately Afraid of Controversy"). Both essays appeared in the *Rikugo Zasshi* (Cosmos Magazine), the former in No.144, 15 December 1892 (Meiji 25), and the latter in No.147, 15 March 1893 (Meiji 26). Saba, ed., Vol.5, 1966, pp.775,776.

Like the *Nippon Hyoron*, the *Rikugo Zasshi* will be considered below.

186 op.cit., p.128.
187 This was similarly published in the *Rikugo Zasshi* No.114, 1890 (Meiji 23). Ouchi, 1970, p.327.
188 Hiyane, 1949, p.347; Germany, pp.11-12.
The old theology must be crushed; a new theology must be established. Not the Church's Christianity, but the Christianity of Christ Himself must be expounded.... Christ is God's manifestation.... As humans our most certain duty is to promote the realisation of the ethical ideal. As far as we are concerned, this duty is the most authentic and noble thing. Our dependence upon God, and our belief in God, must in short be grounded in the demands of humankind's moral sense.  

According to Yokoi, then, Japanese Christianity and theology would somehow have to be grounded in "chuko" or "filial piety," that same "moral sense" articulated and supported by Inoue Tetsujiro.

Yokoi Tokio was the oldest son of Yokoi Shonan, the realist ("jitsugaku") Confucian teacher, who also was a strong nationalist. It is not at all surprising, then, that Yokoi and others like him would have advocated an indigenised Christianity in attempting to preserve their own strong sense of Japanese identity. Their motive was to nurture the positive elements so they will blossom into universal, humanistic values. In other words, indigenization here means simultaneously to continue, to renovate, and to develop traditional values. To root Christianity into the Japanese mind and heart...is thus the attempt to renovate Japanese thought and to activate in the traditional value system the dynamics of 'continuity' and 'discontinuity'.

Considering Yokoi's "traditional" background, then, his "Japanised Christianity" could be called both orthodox and heterodox at the same time. That is, relative to the "nationalist/absolutist" interpretation of the Imperial Rescript (i.e., the imperial ideology), it was "orthodox" in supporting traditional Japanese morality. In terms

190 This is quoted in Hiyane, 1949, p.347. Cf. Germany, pp.11-12.

191 Ouchi, 1970, p.327; Germany, p.21. Interestingly, however, Yokoi Shonan was often misunderstood by strident nationalists, due to his advocacy of the study of Western science. He was assassinated in 1869 (Meiji 2) for allegedly advocating Christian, unpatriotic ideas--despite the lack of any evidence that he ever had any leanings towards Christianity. Hiyane, 1949, p.324; Saba, ed., Vol.1, 1966, pp.119-123.

of the Protestantism that developed throughout Meiji Japan, however, Yokoi’s thinking would have to be labelled "heterodox." It was an alliance that on the one hand provided legitimacy before his ingrained, Confucian-Japanese "moral sense" and the official state orthodoxy, yet "proceeded to jostle, torment, and ultimately weaken Christian ‘orthodoxy’ from within."\(^{193}\)

One question to be asked at this point concerns the nature of "Christian ‘orthodoxy’" in Meiji Japan. At least part of the answer lies in looking at the movement in contrast to which orthodoxy was formulated, namely the "New Theology."

3. New Theology

The imported version of Christian theology which provided Yokoi and others the Christian partner in their created alliance of "Japanised Christianity" was what came to be known as "'Shin' Shingaku" ("'New' Theology", sometimes called "'Jiyu' Shingaku" or "'Liberal' Theology"). Stated conversely, many of the "Shin Shingaku" proponents were fervent advocates of the Japanisation of Christianity and of theology.\(^{194}\) Although it thus had implications for much of the Christian community’s political posture, this third area to be considered here was in-and-of-itself a "theological" development in the narrow, technical sense of the term.

Perhaps the reason for its being able to be labelled as "theological" as such is due to its arising out of ideas imported from the West. In 1885 (Meiji 18), the German missionary Wilfred Spinner, soon followed by Otto Schmiedel, arrived in Japan under the "Allgemeine Evangelisch Protestantische Missions Verein" ("Evangelical Missionary Society"). They soon established a church and began publishing a magazine, *Shinri (Truth)*, spreading German liberal and higher critical thought. In 1887 (Meiji 20) the American Unitarian A.M. Knapp arrived, and by 1890 (Meiji 23) he was publishing his monthly periodical, *Yunitarian (Unitarian)*. Although

\(^{193}\text{Takeda, 1978, pp.96-97.}\n
\(^{194}\text{Thelle, 1987, p.179.}\)
this latter movement did not have as great of an influence as did German liberalism—it was perceived as just another, objective type of philosophy of religion—its impact can be seen in its being advocated by the prominent Fukuzawa Yukichi, founder of Keio University.195

These ideas had their effect on the Church, particularly as they were seized by Kumiai leaders such as Ebina Danjo, Kozaki Hiromichi, Kanamori Tsurin, and (as mentioned above) Yokoi Tokio.196 Along with Yokoi, Kanamori defected from "traditional Christianity" and (also similarly) wrote an influential book, providing a "shock to the entire Christian community."197 Two years earlier he had completed a translation of Pfleiderer’s Philosophy of Religion, which was published under the Japanese title of Jiyu Shingaku (Liberal Theology). But it was Kanamori’s 1891 (Meiji 24) Nihon Genkō no Kirisutokyo narabi ni Shorai no Kirisutokyo (Japan’s Present Christianity and Future Christianity) that "shocked" many Christians by speaking of the coming transformation of Japanese Christianity’s old orthodoxy into a new natural, eclectic Christian religion.198

The strong effect of Kanamori’s book can be seen from the fact that it sold out within one week of its initial publication.199 The timing of the book could help to explain the widespread interest in the message of Christianity’s

---


196Unuma, 1992, p.36.

197Iglehart, 1959, p.104.

198Germany, p.11; Ouchi, 1970, pp.327-328; Hiyane, 1949, pp.346-347. It should be recalled that Kanamori later returned to the Church and became one of its leading evangelists. Hiyane mentions this along with the eventual return of Yokoi as well, prior to his death, to the "evangelical faith." p.348. Cf. above, Part II, ch.1, p.128(n.85).

"Japanisation." On the other hand, theologically speaking (in the "narrow" sense), Kanamori, Yokoi, and others embracing the New Theology were raising two basic issues within the Japanese Church of elucidating the Bible using historical-critical methodology, and the divinity of Christ. As had been the case in the West, these two powerful and divisive matters had to be dealt with urgently. Furthermore, in this Japanese case, the Christian waters to be travelled were largely foreign and uncharted, plus there were no ready-made navigation instruments.

As for Kozaki Hiromichi, seeing his name listed above amongst others who embraced the teachings of imported German liberalism and American Unitarianism might appear strange: "Kozaki along with Uemura Masahisa, as far as the world of Meiji Christian thought is concerned, are reportedly a ‘matchless pair’ who stood for sound, conservative orthodoxy." But as the quotation continues, "However, it is very difficult to dispose of the matter that easily." In his basic posture of a religio-political thinker, Kozaki took a moderate stance towards such issues as evolution, materialistic socialist thought, and the relationship between Christianity and science, issues which often accompanied the New Theology. Kozaki’s own "common sense" theological position stood against many of the conclusions and effects of the New Theology, e.g., the merging of divine and human essence, the denial of sin and redemption in Christ. However, while theorising with a "theological colour" in a way that reflected both contemporary thought and Christianity, Kozaki did not deal directly with the intellectual and theological content of the New Theology, i.e., its premises and arguments. For example, he favoured the employment of historical-criticism in examining the Bible, yet warned against pushing such a methodology so far as to threaten the

---

200 The book’s publication in 1891 (Meiji 24) followed the 1889 (Meiji 22) Constitution and 1890 (Meiji 23) Rescript on Education.
201 op. cit.
truth of the gospel.203

In addressing the "Faith of the New Theology," Kozaki directed his criticism towards its best-known proponent, Ebina Danjo.204 Ebina was "a superior child from a good family,"205 and he was "reared in the strict disciplines and atmosphere of Confucianism."206 Having entered the Lord of Kumamoto’s school where L.L. Janes was teaching, and amidst the moral chaos of the early years of Meiji, Ebina became interested in religion through his studies in science.207 His embracing of Christianity came through a statement which Janes made about prayer. As Ebina himself reflected many years later:

He said that prayer was our duty towards the Creator. I truly saw the light. Ah, I was neglecting my duty. I had done something inexcusable. If it is a duty, I will bend my knees; I will lower my head; I will do anything.... God became my central focus. It became a Copernican explanation.... My way of thinking fundamentally changed. Arriving here, I totally prostrated myself.

Ebina went on to explain that through prayer he received an authority for his conscience, the privilege of fellowship with his Lord, and the power for self-denial. Instead of forgiveness of sin or a consciousness of being "saved," it was an ethical lord-servant relationship that he experienced, the power for self-denial coming from conscience and God being "bound together." Furthermore, the experience alone was what was "unmovable," although Ebina’s satisfying and fulfilling religion was


204Kozaki did this even in his later years as well, for example in his 1932 (Showa 7) "Wa ga Kuni no Shukyo Shiso" ("Religious Thought in our Country"), as quoted in Kumano, 1968, pp.211-212.

205Kumano, 1968, p.147.

206Ebina’s Confucian background was the realistic ("jitsugaku") type of the earlier-mentioned Yokoi Shonan. Germany, p.21. Yokoi Shonan’s daughter later became Ebina’s wife. Saba, ed., Vol.1, 1966, p.122.

207op.cit., pp.146-147. Undoubtedly Ebina’s mentor, Yokoi, had directed him towards studying science.
for him no less an object of rational understanding and reflection.  

Ebina's conversion experience—and experience was his "irresistible argument"—was directly connected with his Confucian education, with no signs of contradiction or conflict. Indeed, Ebina's lifelong theologising was not so much a new, religious enterprise involving critical, corrective reflection on his previous thought away from which he had broken. Rather, his specifically theological discussions developed within and on the foundation of his own, established intellectual framework. Along with this continuity between pre- and post-conversion thought and experience was Ebina's place within Meiji enlightenment thought, particularly as that involved a commitment to contemporary scientific ideas. Ebina argued that Christianity must conform to increasingly popular scientific outlooks as well as to experience, lest on both counts the religion die for lack of acceptance.

Ebina's affiliation with the New Theology has been widely assumed, but such a characterisation must be qualified if for no other reason than the New Theology's possession of strong Western qualities. Furthermore, Ebina himself stated that in terms of "religious experience" and his own emphasis on the "ethical will," there was a strong dissimilarity from those embracing the New Theology. Ebina did acknowledge, however, that intellectually they were "well-nigh unified."

As to how that intellectual unity came about in Ebina's own thought processes—and

---

208 Ibid., pp.148-149.

209 This is Kumano's analysis. Ibid., pp.149,156. Kumano thus describes Ebina's theology as a "theology of thought" ("shiso no shingaku").

210 Germany, p.27.

211 op.cit., p.154.

212 This is according to Ebina's 1902 (Meiji 35) "Futatabi Wa ga To no Shimei o Omou" ("I Think Again about my Party's Calling"), as quoted in Ouchi, 1970, p.346.
his case was representative of Christian thinkers of the day—the initiative, as mentioned above, lay with Ebina as opposed to the theological system called "New Theology." That is, particularly within the early Meiji Era, he and others were aggressively thinking within the interconnected issues of self-nation-civilisation, albeit often unconsciously. Moreover, how Ebina articulated his own religious experience was his responsible activity, not any outsider's. Seizing upon and using the "New Theology" added a sort of "theological embellishment" to his thought,213 and it authorised his understanding as lying within Christian boundaries. In apologetic relationship to the outside world, Ebina's and others' New Theology was "a form of rationalistic Christianity...[which]...became intensely preoccupied with the effort to counter an atheistic brand of rationalism then current, whose proponents scorned all religion as superstition."214

The intellectual affinity which Ebina found with the New Theology215 came via his notion of the "logos." Underlying Ebina's understanding of "logos" was the more primary notion of "God's Self-disclosure,"216 the history of which, according to Ebina, can be seen by examining humankind's evolving religious gropings. Fuelling those gropings--so deep in a person's heart as to be incomprehensible--is a "marvellous action,"217 which in reality turns out to be equivalent to God's inner, formless "reason."218 God's inner working as described, i.e., as God discloses himself in human theorising of the universe, is "reason" or "word" as expressed. This is so because God immanently resides deeply within the universe, as opposed to becoming incarnate in the universe in a

213op.cit., pp.156,158.


215Kumano describes the intellectual affinity more as an intellectual link explaining how Ebina's thought could come to be expressed using New Theology terminology. op.cit., pp.158-159.

216"kami no jigen"

217"reimno na sayo"

218"dori"
Buddhist sense. This "word" or "logos"\(^{219}\) is what John expressed in his prologue.

The man Jesus Christ bore the personality of the "logos," supremely in his love-filled suffering. As such he was God's Self-disclosure, and was thus the Christ. Another way of saying the same thing is that in His suffering Jesus Christ bore the world's suffering—which is equivalent to God's Self-disclosure—and thus was the "illuminating Christ."\(^{220}\) Furthermore, in the drama of His wrestling with the world's suffering, Christ was dealing with "original sin."\(^{221}\)

In comparison to what emerged as "orthodox" theological formulations, Christological or otherwise, Ebina's articulations were labelled as "heterodox." This revealed what has been called a "grave division" within Meiji Christianity.\(^{222}\) This cleavage was shown most starkly in the Ebina-Uemura debate, or what has been termed the conflict between the New Theology and Evangelical Christianity.\(^{223}\)

4. Ebina-Uemura Debate

As noted earlier, this public discussion was carried out via the written channels of Ebina's and Uemura's respective journals, Shinjin (The New Man) and the Fukuin Shinpo (Weekly Gospel), from the fall of 1901 (Meiji 34) through the following spring. Evangelistic outreach--particularly to college students--springing out of the Evangelical Alliance's 1900 (Meiji 33) convention was the immediate context for the debate. Although their respective, influential churches in Tokyo belonged to

\(^{219}\)"kotoba"

\(^{220}\)"kogenteki kirisuto"

\(^{221}\)The equivalent term is "genzai." These comments are from Ebina's 1914 (Taisho 3) "Kami no Jigen" ("God's Self-Disclosure"), an essay in his Nihon Kokumin to Kirisutokyo (The Japanese People and Christianity), as quoted in Kumano, 1968, pp.159-164. Some of Kumano's analysis is included here as well.

\(^{222}\)Anesaki, 1930 (Showa 5), p.357.

\(^{223}\)Takeda, 1978, p.97.
this same "Alliance," Uemura's and Ebina's discussions made it apparent that they held widely different understandings of the organisation's defining notion of "Fukuin," or "Evangelical."\(^{224}\)

The discussion begins to take on intellectual substance when Ebina asks Uemura to explain philosophically the statement, "God became man and descended to the world."\(^{225}\) The two then volley back and forth over the course of the rest of the fall, during which time Uemura only goes as far as to note that Ebina seems to have wavered on fundamental historical doctrines such as the trinity, as well as to be utilizing higher critical approaches to the Bible. Ebina then "lays his cards on the table" in his 1 January 1902 (Meiji 35) exposition, "The Doctrine of the Trinity and My Religious Consciousness."\(^{226}\)

In this essay, Ebina traces the dialectical development of the doctrine of the trinity through the notion of the logos. According to Ebina's analysis, "logos" arose out of the interaction between Judaism and Greek philosophy. Christians then identified Jesus of Nazareth with this logos as the mediator between God and man. The accompanying doctrines of the Holy Spirit, and then the trinity, subsequently came to be formulated.

Central as well to Ebina's discussion is his explanation of two aspects of his experience in becoming a Christian. One is the "Copernican-type" of change mentioned above, in which "I realised that the God of heaven and earth became my Lord.... I ceased being my own lord and became a person whose Lord was God." The second experience was that of sharing, in a co-experiential kind of way, the consciousness of Jesus Christ:

\(^{224}\)Unuma, 1992, pp.36-37.


\(^{226}\)The title in the original is "Sanmittai no Kyogi to Yo ga Shukyoteki Ishiki." This essay has been reproduced in Saba, ed., Vol.5, 1966, pp.288-310.
I experienced for the first time the most holy prayer of the Lord in Gethsemane. At that time it was though suddenly something happened at the bottom of my heart whereupon I was conscious that God was my Father and that we were His beloved sons. By means of these two experiences and realisations I caught a glimpse of the consciousness of Jesus Christ. In this I was able to offer the same feeling and sympathy as the infinite religious consciousness of Jesus Christ in calling out, 'Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth', and for a similar period I was able to see Christ.227

The conclusion of the essay helps to illuminate what Ebina means when he says that he "caught a glimpse of the consciousness of Jesus Christ," and that he "was able to see Christ." There he writes:

The believer possessing the spirit of Christ must emulate Christ. The adherent possessing the consciousness of Christ must want to carry out the profession and practice of Christ. There is Christ's religion, and there is the religion which has been constructed making Christ as the essence; Christ's believers should leave behind the latter, and take to heart the former.

In other words, Christians are to practice the religion of Jesus, not the religion about Jesus. The latter has been constructed by other believers--e.g., Clement, Augustine, Luther--who were men of their own day. As Jesus' followers, our allegiance is to Him, not to other theologians. As other Christian thinkers did, we too, both as followers possessing Christ's spirit and His own religious consciousness, and as people of our own day, must use contemporary thought in articulating our own religious awareness. The criticism that we may have different religious formulations than those created in other periods of history, e.g., the trinity, is thus not a valid criticism.228

Uemura's quick rejoinder, published in the 8 January Fukuin Shinpo, graciously praises Ebina for his toil of research and writing (reflecting the cordial tone of the entire discussion). Uemura also expresses gratitude for the essay's clarification of Ebina's position. But while noting that Ebina's historical analysis resembled that

227Ibid., p.297.

228Ibid., p.305.
of the German liberals, Uemura hones in on Ebina’s starting point: did he, or did he not, recognise and worship Jesus as God? Paul certainly did; what about Ebina?229

Ebina’s reply primarily is to clarify misunderstandings by Uemura of his own presentation. Ebina furthermore reiterates his loyalty to his Lord Jesus Christ. He also affirms that his faith is at one with those who worship Jesus as God, for he, too, is ardently looking to, listening to, and following Christ. However, Ebina calls for a posture the same as that of the earliest Christians in seeking the life and truth of Christianity; he also declares a correlative abandonment of confessionalism.230 At this point Ebina and Uemura have reached a gridlock, and the discussion never really moves beyond this impasse.

There is, however, a measure of significant, further elucidation of their respective positions, particularly on Uemura’s part. Ebina’s explanations include attempting to enable fresh theological articulation of Christian religious experience by stripping away inherited confessional baggage. For example, in his 1 April "Yaso Ron" ("Theory of Jesus"), Ebina claims that it is unnecessary and indiscriminate to claim that Jesus of Nazareth was God.231 Uemura’s lengthy exposition was entitled "Kirisuto to Sono Jigyo" ("Christ and His Work"), actually written over the course of several months (January through July).232 The focus throughout is on the person of Christ, particularly His divinity and sinless, supernatural character.

229Uemura also gives specific attention to the question of Ebina’s (dis)belief in sin and atonement. In the following week’s Fukuin Shinpo (15 January), Uemura then seeks clearly to describe the wide gap between his and Ebina’s positions on revelation and historical development, as well as (and especially) on the divinity of Christ. Ibid., pp.311-317, 326-327.

Uemura’s descriptions of the issues have been translated into English by Aoyoshi Katsushisa in his Dr. Masahisa Uemura, A Christian Leader. Tokyo: Kyobunkan, 1941, pp.189-190; that translation is quoted in Germany, p.13.


231Ibid., pp.337ff.

232Ibid., pp.348-421.
Uemura in effect expounds Paul and John, while rebutting Ebina’s explanation of how Jesus became identified with the logos.

In the meantime the Evangelical Alliance met in April of 1902 (Meiji 35), rendering its judgement, so to speak, in favour of Uemura’s evangelical position. Ebina then lamented in the next month’s issue of Shinjin, "Some cry, ‘Ah, the Alliance will fall by the hand of a schemer!’ We don’t know if in the end that will be the case. We only see the Alliance’s unsightly suicide." 233 In July, Ebina published his "Wa ga To no Shucho" ("My Party’s Claims"),234 summarising his positions on "heathenism,"235 the Bible, confessions, and Christ.236 With the simultaneous completion of Uemura’s "Christ and His Work", the active debate was concluded.

In evaluating the discussion, most summaries quite rightly highlight the theological issues of Christ’s divinity and the atonement.237 As such, the debate was between traditional Christian orthodoxy and the New Theology.238 Some question whether or not the discussion went far enough to be termed a "theological debate" per se; they suggest a more modest label of "practical theology topic," given the contemporary context of student evangelism within the Evangelical Alliance.239 As noted earlier, the discussion did come to a deadlock--almost before it ever started--with neither side ever empathetically entering the other’s viewpoint in a way that transformed, or even significantly challenged, either position.
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233Ibid., p.426.
234Ibid.
235"God’s revelation is also given to Eastern peoples, and is not the exclusive possession of the West."
236Ebina emphasises Christ’s humanity.
238Ibid., p.349; Omura, 1993, p.112.
239Kumano, 1968, pp.165,244.
As for further analyses that attempt to consider what happened in ways other than through strictly theological eyes, one emphasises the role of the "Enlightenment world view" within which the gospel was introduced and received during the Meiji Era. Such a view's ordered universe, this analysis points out, ruled by the one true God and open to inspection and precise definition, not only led to the gradual crystallisation of the gospel’s essence, but also its being scientifically debated.240

Another analysis looks at the debate in terms of how Ebina and Uemura respectively dealt with the human concern for "self-realisation."241 A somewhat similar and penetrating explanation places the debate within the categories of "authority" and "freedom":

The European contemporaries of their time placed the issue in terms of either liberalism with its excessive preoccupation with human freedom or orthodoxy with its fanatical allegiance to the divine authority without regard to human freedom. However, both Uemura and Ebina accepted those two elements to be indispensable for theological formulation and thus avoided the complete polarization of the two. The issue in the debate rather focused upon the manners in which these two are related to each other.... The decisive difference between the two is this: for Uemura, the authority of faith in Christ is recognized as the absolute and unconditional one for the realization of self, none other than that which defines the being of the subject. For Ebina, however, the authority of faith is the ‘ultimate concern’ which implicitly allows possibilities for allegiance to lesser penultimate objects.... Protestant theology in Japan at the time of Uemura and Ebina located the key theological question in just how the transcendent God who is, in fact, autonomous and absolute is related to the free will of the human believing subject.242

This analysis notes that, while Western theology affected the way Japanese


theologians responded to the question of God’s authority and man’s freedom. Uemura and Ebina nonetheless represented Japanese responses to the issue within their Meiji context:

Uemura’s concern was the establishment of an indigenous and unified church which would serve as a vehicle for proclaiming the truth of faith in the new Japan. But, Ebina’s concern was the identification of the Christian personality in light of the spiritual turmoil in the transition to the Meiji from the Edo period and also in the search for the identity of the Japanese in the new era.

In these terms, then, the stakes in the debate were high. "The establishment of an indigenous and unified church" and "the identification of the Christian personality" were huge adventures in spacious, uncharted waters. Moreover, the location of the points of arrival had massive implications. In fact, this particular analysis claims: "The underlying question in the debate itself was the nature of the truth of faith." Furthermore, how Uemura and Ebina differed in their "approach to theological thinking made a significant impact upon the development of Protestant thought in Japan." As to "the underlying question" concerning "the nature of the truth of faith," one could elaborate on the analysis just cited which deals with the issues of "authority" and "freedom." Beyond defining the debate’s central concern as the relationship between the absolute, transcendent God and human free will, one could see Ebina’s and Uemura’s contrasting thinking relative to theological tradition. On the one hand, Ebina both rejected tradition and opted for theological pluralism. Uemura, on the contrary, seemed not only to embrace a particular theological tradition, but to argue as well for exclusivity. Seen in this way, the debate between Ebina
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243Ibid., p.57.
244Ibid., p.53.
245Ibid., p.34.
246Ibid., p.56.
247I am indebted to John Parratt for this interpretation of the debate.
and Uemura hinged not so much on content as on the nature of the commitment to particular historical understandings of the Church. Thus the nature of Christian thinking becomes the primary question.

One reason as to why the two men differed in their "theological thinking" can be conjectured from a statement made in one of the above analyses about Ebina's "subjectivism":

The extreme subjectivity which colors Ebina's thought must not be judged...independent of an equal respect which he pays to the authority and lordship of God. Here Ebina disassociates himself from the representatives of the eighteenth and nineteenth century Continental Idealism...who tended to dwell rather exclusively on the greater sureness, or a priori character, of the thinking subject.... [T]he framework in which his thoughts were formed remained the 'Jitsugaku' (realistic) school of neo-Confucianism in the disciplines of which he was reared.

This educational background of Ebina's (and Yokoi Tokio's) has already been mentioned. Furthermore, the differences between contrasting forms of Confucian and neo-Confucian thought--and the implications those differences can have for their manifestations in the thought of different thinkers--has been noted earlier as well. The issues in analysing Ebina's and Uemura's differences in educational backgrounds would be complicated; the available, relevant evidence

248 The analysis is Matsuoka's, whose phrase "theological thinking" was cited above; cf. above, Part II, ch.1, pp.165-166.


251 This was seen in examining Mori Ogai's orthodox Chu Hsi neo-Confucian background vs. Natsume Soseki's affinities with Wang Yang Ming. Cf. Part I, pp.72-73.

252 For instance, amidst all of the varied influences--known and unknown--on Uemura's and Ebina's thought, coupled with the ways in which they personally took those influences and shaped them within their own experiences and contexts, to detect how the respective (neo-)Confucian trainings which each man received had their effects would be an intricate process.

Furthermore, determining the nature of the men's respective (neo-)
is not crystal clear; plus, the matter is beyond the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, aside from explaining the two men's different approaches simply by appealing to personal qualities and to Providence, looking to their contrasting educational backgrounds, within the same general area of pre-Meiji Confucianism, could prove extremely illuminating.254

Confucian backgrounds would require further detailed and expert attention. Ebina's "jitsugaku" education has been noted. The study of Wang Yang Ming by "all the members of the Kumamoto Band" (Soltau, 1982, p.135, n.48)—thus including Ebina—is an additional factor as well. The relationship between "jitsugaku" and Wang Yang Ming, and what that meant for Ebina, would have to be examined.


This is particularly the case regarding the particular (neo-)Confucian training which Uemura received. One could assume that his education was an "orthodox," Chu Hsi neo-Confucian one. Its basic orientation to "ri" (principle or reason), as opposed to Wing Yang Ming's fulcrum point of "shin" (mind or intuition), could help explain certain aspects of Uemura's and Ebina's different approaches. Cf. Tsunoda, de Bary, and Keene, comps., 1958, p.378; Iki, 1979, pp.102-103.

Such an assumption would be only an assumption, however, and not a clearly defensible one at that. Uemura himself mentioned the importance of Wang Yang Ming (quoted by Soltau, 1982, p.134); his (and others') bushido background—which has, of course, a close relationship to Confucian teachings—is well-known; and, only a few analyses of Uemura's thought relative to "traditional thought" have been done, e.g., Unuma Hiroko, "Uemura Masahisa no Sekai--Dento to Shinko o Megutte" ("The World of Uemura Masahisa--Centring around Tradition and Faith") Nihon Shiso Shigaku (Historiography of Japanese Thought) No.25, September, 1993, pp.103-113. More material on Uemura's specifically (neo-)Confucian training is thus required. Then, of course, how that training compared to Ebina's would need to be explored.

The related contrast of regional backgrounds--Ebina from Kansai in western Japan and Uemura from Kanto around Tokyo--with not only the associated intellectual differences but also denominational loyalties, comes into play here as well.
A final look at the debate can be made by considering Uemura's earlier-mentioned "concern [for] the establishment of an indigenous and unified church which would serve as a vehicle for proclaiming the truth of faith in the new Japan."255 His was not a concern for just one church among many, but for one Church: "Uemura's...determined effort [was] to proclaim the centrality of the Christian faith through the establishment of the church universal in the new Japanese society. This audacious effort is unprecedented in his time."256 This had been his and others' hope ever since joining the very first "Yokohama 'Kokai'"; and, it had been a dream which he had fervently worked to realise anew in the negotiations with the Kumiai Churches.

The debate with Ebina had begun with Uemura's questioning whether or not those not adhering to "fukuin shugi" ("evangelicalism") should belong to the Alliance. This was a church-government type of issue more than a strictly theological matter. Furthermore, as the Evangelical Alliance later evolved into the "Christian Church Alliance," his comments at the time show that "Whether formally, or in a visionary way, Uemura had not lost his zeal for a united and procedurally-pure church amalgamation of all denominations."257 Uemura's question about adherence to evangelicalism which led to the debate was not so much directed to Ebina personally, nor in the interests of instigating a theological debate per se. Rather, Uemura's underlying goal was to clear up the ambiguity of Alliance membership, in the interests of his ultimate goal of establishing one, unified Japanese Church.258

Uemura emerged from his discussions with Ebina as the single most influential!
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255Cf. above, Part II, ch.1, p.166.
257Kumano, 1968, p.245.
258Ibid., pp.243-245.
Protestant Church leader in Meiji Japan.\textsuperscript{259} His was the most listened to voice on socio-political matters; his organisational influence was unmatched; his theological viewpoint was the prevailing understanding. Despite an inevitable plurality of structures and viewpoints, Uemura Masahisa occupied the single most respected seat around the Meiji Christian Church’s decision-making table.

D. Uemura Masahisa

Concluding this examination of Meiji Christianity with a profile look at Uemura will help to provide a summary of Japan’s first-generation Protestantism. On the one hand, Meiji Japan was a volatile period of history. Also, Christianity’s newness to Japan meant that familiar categories of understanding and describing it—familiar either to the context or to Christianity—were and still are inadequate for painting a neat, clear picture.\textsuperscript{260} Thus considering a prominent figure like Uemura enables viewing one, definable embodiment of the fascinating, yet difficult to grasp, movement known as Meiji Christianity.

Uemura similarly embodied a summation of Meiji Christianity for Takakura. From the time of his baptism by Uemura in 1906 (Meiji 39) through Takakura’s initial years of training, Uemura was unquestionably both at the peak of his own influence in the Church, as well as the single most important teacher and example for Takakura. Focusing specifically on this "Great Church Leader in Japan"\textsuperscript{261} is thus essential for understanding the Christianity which was communicated to Takakura by his previous generation.

\textsuperscript{259}This was true at least of the visible, organised Protestant Church; Uchimura Kanzo’s wide influence should not be forgotten.

\textsuperscript{260}The thesis has thus resisted the temptation to present issues and movements, e.g., the "New Theology," through familiar, crisply-elucidating, definitive terms. Instead, the attempt has been made to be faithful to the complicated, and often unclear, realities being described.

1. Theological Concerns

As to the categories used here in Part II, Chapter 1 for examining Meiji Christianity, Uemura held all three--social-political, organisational, and theological--very tightly together. Uemura carried these three sets of concerns in an intertwined, or overlapping, or better yet intermingled way. As a youth he was "fired with ambition to restore the family fortunes" after the Meiji Restoration, and "devoutly worshipped at the shrine of a blacksmith who had risen to be a great soldier and patriot, praying that I might rise in rank in like manner."

A generation later, at the end of the Meiji Era, it was written of him: "In what other country, I wonder, can the man be found who has spanned the entire history of a denomination, having been a leading factor in its evangelistic, literary, educational, and administrative activities, and at sixty-six is still the most dynamic, sagacious personality in its ranks?"

In reviewing Uemura's life, one wants to say that such an admiring sketch of the sixty-six year old church statesman’s career describes how God answered the prayer of the ambitious youth. Such a claim is fraught with theological ambiguities, however. Paradoxically, it was just those kinds of ambiguities and tensions that both held together and tended to pull apart Uemura's intermingled socio-political, organisational, and theological world.

a. The Question of Clarity

The initial theological ambiguity that arises can be put into a question: How did the Christian God answer the prayers of a non-Christian young man? This problem becomes even more complicated upon taking into account the totality of Uemura's pre-conversion religion. He first of all describes his family's faith as "Shintoist." Uemura also points out that his hero Kato Kiyomasa, the blacksmith turned soldier-patriot whom he literally worshipped, was "a zealous member of the Nichiren sect of Buddhism." Furthermore, Uemura's religion of "hero-worship was laughed away" by his senior students in English school in that
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they "ridiculed Confucius." Was Uemura the young man Shintoist, Nichiren Buddhist, Confucian, or what?

The simplest--and in this case probably the most helpful--explanation is the well-known "distinctive feature of Japanese religious history" of "unity and plurality," or "unity and diversity." Historically there are separate, identifiable religious traditions in Japan. However, they cannot be treated in total distinction because people practice them, both communally and individually, in an intermingled fashion. Thus the very nature of the question seeking to classify Uemura's religion is chained to a distinguishing compartmentalisation that does not easily apply.

Even so, there remains the primary question regarding the relationship between the God of Christianity and Uemura's pre-Christian religion. In considering this question, it should be noted that the context giving rise to the question is the same Enlightenment, scientific worldview which underlies the "distinguishing compartmentalisation" just noted to be in conflict with the general Japanese religious situation. Uemura's own background, however, allowed for religious intermingling in the manner in which he himself described his pre-Christian worship. In terms of posture towards religion, then, the frameworks of the question and of Uemura's context, respectively, are different: the former discriminates, the latter amalgamates.

Viewed historically, God in Jesus Christ came to Uemura--the Christian faith was transmitted to him--via the channel of the former scientific, discriminating context. It was initially through the American Dutch Reformed James Ballagh, then through the theological tutelage of the similarly affiliated S.R. Brown, then through the American and Scottish, Reformed and Presbyterian missionaries at the newly-
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265 Ibid., pp.679-681.
266 Earhart, 1974, pp.1-4.
formed United Church Seminary\textsuperscript{268} that Uemura learned of Christianity. The faith they brought demanded the worship of the one, true God, to the exclusion of other gods, all of which were false. That faith also included the acceptance of the clear, propositional truths of God’s Word, the Scriptures. The focal truth was the good news, the gospel of salvation exclusively through faith in God’s divine Son Jesus Christ. Acceptance of this faith meant salvation and inclusion in the Christian Church; rejection meant damnation and exclusion. Furthermore, there was no middle ground.

Uemura’s own background and context, however, cultivated just the opposite posture. His "spiritual climate" was a place "where tolerance is the norm and black-and-white distinctions are discouraged...."\textsuperscript{269} Upon embracing the missionaries’ faith, then, Uemura found himself placed within an inherently ambiguous, theological squeeze between claims of religious exclusivity on the one hand, and demands for tolerance which were woven into the very fabric of his culture and personhood on the other.

This theological ambiguity into which Uemura was thrust was central to his own thought, life, work, and world. It was also vitally connected to his socio-political and organisational concerns. Insofar as others understood Uemura and his Christianity in ways that were compatible with the parameters within which he himself dealt with the ambiguity, they and he accordingly were able to cooperate and work towards similar goals. And insofar as Uemura’s theological parameters were connected with those of his socio-political and organisational objectives—Japan and the Church, respectively, along with their respective roles in the world—other people within either of those two sets of parameters were allies as well. How Uemura is perceived and judged therefore must take into account all of these

\textsuperscript{268}Yamamoto, 1929 (Shows 4), pp.74-75. Uemura was a student there for one year prior to his ordination in 1878 (Meiji 11). Fujimicho Kyokai Hyakunen Shi Shiryo Inkai, comps. and eds., 1987, "Nenpyo," p.13.

\textsuperscript{269}Takeda, 1978, p.90.
interconnections, along with the resulting clarity and lack thereof.

In continuing to look specifically at Uemura's theological concerns, considering the following excerpt from his own reflections in 1909 (Meiji 42) is revealing:

The fall of the Shogun's power pushed my family to launch out on the rough sea of a struggle for existence. When the fugitive adherents of the Tokugawa lost cause [sic] were fighting in the ill-advised battle of Funabashi, and the attack on Ueno in Tokyo was being planned, I landed with my family at Yokohama in April, 1868. To restore what was lost and to bring joy and comfort through my success in life, was my childish dream.

In these circumstances I was led to seek guidance and help in religion. Half a mile from my house there was a shrine for the worship of Kato Kiyomasa.... From childhood I had been taught, by my mother especially, to love Kato Kiyomasa. I regarded him as an incarnation of simplicity, honesty and courage. He was my hero....

At last my mother was sagacious enough to divine the future usefulness of the English language. Times were changing, and she saw that the studies I was pursuing in the Terakoya would soon be out of date.... I went, then, to the school at the age of thirteen. Ten young men much older than myself boarded there together. The spirit of the age was all for moving forward....

...my religion of hero-worship was laughed away to the winds.... Almost unconsciously my habit of worship was dropped, and yet I felt lonely without my religion....

It was in January, 1872, that I entered the English class in a school established by a missiona y [sic] in Yokohama.
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270 Pertinent to this discussion on theological clarity are Polanyi's comments on "participatory knowledge," as well as Bosch's concerning the inherent presence of a desire for understanding the present within any attempt to interpret the past. Cf. Part I, p.79(n.304), above, Part II, ch.1, p.103(n.1).

271 The quotation is from his "Retrospect by a Convert of 1872." In order adequately to demonstrate the interconnectedness for Uemura of the theological, socio-political, and organisational, the present quotation is extensive. Furthermore, it will serve as the basis for the remainder of this analysis of Uemura.

272 Kato Kiyomasa was a blacksmith turned soldier and patriot. Cf. above, Part II, ch.1, pp.132,171.
Before this a desire had been aroused in my heart to know about the God of the Western people. Once, when studying the English reader, I had found a picture of a lovely child in a praying posture, and then thirst for something gone filled my soul. The one thing needful was not yet in my possession. With me it was 'Frame-work which waits for a picture to frame'.

.... The missionary's Japanese was hard to be understood; but somehow the Christian idea of God which seemed to me so old and so new took possession of my soul.... My youthful soul was stormed by the wonderful faith in the one true God, ever and everywhere present, holy and merciful. Without discussion, and before making any inquiry, I felt myself to be already a Christian....

Fifty years of Christian work has penetrated deep into the heart of the nation. European literature, especially English, has transformed the content of many religious words. The term 'God' has been almost Christianized. Nobody nowadays will think of preaching against gross ideas of idolatry. The nation is slowly, but steadily, being permeated through and through with Christian ideas. The religion of Jesus is a sure part of the character of each Japanese, in such a way that even the worst and most ignorant of men can not wholly shake it off. The spiritual soil which is being thus prepared can not fail, during the next fifty years, to produce a rich harvest in a wide-spread revival of Christian faith.

Pentecost is not history alone. It will be found to be prophecy.

A few months after that memorable January, I was baptized. My only difficulty was in persuading my mother to give her permission. But she consented, and this good and enterprising mother embraced the same faith. This mother it was who was primarily the means of leading me to Christ, for unless she had sacrificed her own comfort for my education, I do not know where I should be.273

Once again, several questions arise concerning points of ambiguous tension:

1. Uemura credits his "good and enterprising mother" with being "primarily the means of leading me to Christ...";274 yet, it was

---


274In a portion of his "Retrospect" not cited, Uemura describes how his mother continued his vegetarian vow—which he had taken "according to the Buddhist idea of sanctity, for Kiyomasa was a zealous member of the Nichiren sect of Buddhism"--in his stead when he entered English school, since a student-servant such as he was not allowed to select his food. As such "she had sacrificed her own
through the missionary that "the Christian idea of God...took
possession of my soul." There is thus not a clear-cut answer here to
a discriminating question concerning the means of Uemura's coming
to Christ. Perhaps one could distinguish between "circumstantial"
means (the mother)—which if anything, was "primary" for Uemura--
and "conceptual" means, i.e., the missionary convening the "idea" of
the Christian God. Even so....

2. Having lost his hero-worship religion, Uemura "felt lonely." Sometime and somehow, though, "a desire had been aroused in my heart to know about the God of the Western people." Seeing the picture of a child praying caused there to be a "thirst for something gone" to fill his soul. He had the "framework [needing] a picture to frame." How was the "something gone" different from the next picture which filled the frame? How was his "loneliness" different from the "desire [which] had been aroused" concerning the Western people's God?

3. The new picture--"which seemed to me [both] so old and so new"--was the Christian idea of God; he came to "faith in the one true God." How was it that the idea seemed "so old," and in what sense was God "ever and everywhere present"?

4. The role of language, particularly its ambiguity, was crucial in the process of his "somehow" being gripped by the Christian idea of God. Language was also observed to be important in "transform[ing] the content of many religious words," e.g., "God." How had "especially English" specifically brought this about?

5. After a half-century of Christian work had "penetrated deep into the heart of the nation," Uemura observed, "The religion of Jesus is a sure part of the character of each Japanese...." Uemura's observation seems to be that the latter had resulted from the former. But was it also a claim that "The religion of Jesus is a sure part of...each Japanese..." even without explicitly "Christian work"?

The ambiguities within the comments cited give rise to the related questions. However, Uemura did not seem to feel the same ambiguities; nor did he have the need to alleviate such a feeling of tension, as would a raiser of such questions.

comfort for my education...." Ibid., pp.679-680.

Presumably Uemura would have had in mind here the Japanese term "kami."
One could say that the alleged ambiguities just were not there for Uemura. Moreover, pressing these kinds of questions any further begins to pull apart his intermingled and interconnected world in a way that he would not, and perhaps could not, allow.

For example, relative to the missionaries' claims of exclusivity for the truth of God and the Bible, as well as for salvation in Jesus Christ, Uemura noted clearly that he came to "faith in the one true God." Furthermore, as the concluding statement of a series of messages on the Cross, delivered contemporaneous to the message being considered here, Uemura quoted Peter's statement recorded in Acts 4:12 claiming that there is "No other name under heaven...by which we must be saved." Similarly, Uemura clearly and boldly proclaimed:

Unless we recognize the Christ who died for men and was raised again, and unless we sacrifice the self-seeking life, we cannot attain to the new life centered in Christ. Only after we know the Christ who died for us on the cross, shall we experience the living Christ in us.... What marks off Christianity as different from any and all other religions is the atonement of the cross.

Surely James Ballagh and his missionary colleagues would have concurred wholeheartedly with all of these claims by Uemura to Christian exclusivity.

At the same time, Uemura gives no indication of disparaging his pre-Christian religious faith. He saw both "Bushido" and traditional Japanese religions, e.g., Buddhism, "as steps towards Christianity, the true religion. God has made preparation for true religion." Therefore, Uemura stated that "I do not attack the
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276Emphasis mine.

277The messages were delivered from March through May, 1908 (Meiji 41). They have been reproduced in Uemura Zenshu, Vol.2, 1932 (Showa 7), pp.337-370.

278Ibid., p.370.

279This is from Uemura's 1907 (Meiji 40) address to a student convention, "The Christlike Life." An English translation of the message is in Aoyoshi Katsuhisa, Uemura Masahisa Den (Biography of Uemura Masahisa). Tokyo: Kyobunkan, 1935, p.514.
religions in Japan as enemies..."280 Rather, he had a sympathetic attitude towards Japan's past religious leaders, especially including Honen (1133-1212) and Shinran (1173-1262), who helped popularise the notion of Amida Buddha's free grace and compassion. God had thus worked through these two figures in preparing Japan for "true religion," the gospel of Jesus Christ.281

Uemura further believed that a "Baptised Bushido," or the infusion of Confucian values with a new, Christian spiritual core, uniquely added qualities (e.g., loyalty) to Christianity that greatly enriched it. These "Bushido" ideals had been instilled in him through his worship of Kato Kiyosama, thus preparing him better to receive the message of the Christian God. Thus "Uemura looked back to his own conversion experience in his youth and saw in it something which could be related to all Japanese conversions."282

This is not to suggest that Uemura accepted anything and everything. His debate with Ebina and his criticisms of the state, already cited, indicate otherwise. Similarly, he did not praise all of Japan's past religious leaders: Honen and Shinran were particularly outstanding, especially in their preparing the way for Protestantism's teaching of free grace and salvation by faith alone.283 Even relative to "Bushido," Uemura critically remarked: "We have to acknowledge a number of shortcomings and faults in the code of the samurai. Our prayer is that the spirit of the samurai with all its praiseworthy strong points may be grafted to that of the cross through our faith in the Lord of all creatures, the Saviour of the world."284 One could interpret these kind of remarks as indicating that one of the

280 This is from Uemura's "Nihon Shukyo no Kotetsu" ("Shift in Japanese Religion"), quoted in Ishida, 1973, p.46, as quoted in Soltau, 1982, p.128.
281 Soltau, pp.128-130.
282 Ibid., pp.125-127.
283 Ibid., p.130.
284 This was written by Uemura on 15 June 1894 (Meiji 27); it is quoted in Ibid., p.124.
effects of God’s coming in Christ to Uemura was a posture of discrimination relative to his own existing religious context.

But in saying that, it could be claimed as well that God gave Uemura a discriminating eye towards "American Fundamentalism." Uemura did not so much criticise the content of Fundamentalists’ thought as he did their "backward facing view of God" and "excessively bigoted, conservative thought."285 It was due to criticism by "some conservative missionaries" that Uemura resigned from teaching at Meiji Gakuin and started his own seminary.286 Clearly the claim that Uemura Masahisa simply acquiesced to anything cannot be substantiated, whether it be to things Western, or to things Japanese, or to theological "conservatism" or "liberalism."

Uemura’s establishing his own seminary is a clear instance of his independence from people and organisations that would seek to control him. As noted earlier, the timing of that sort of move was crucial in that it was made in the continuing wake of a decade of Japan’s conservative reaction to the West.287 This brings to the fore the other areas of Uemura’s socio-political and organisational concerns, and to these we must turn shortly. Before leaving the theological discussion, however, two further points need to be addressed.

b. The Question of Classification

One of these points concerns how Uemura might be theologically classified. As previously noted, the terms "orthodox" and "evangelical" have been used extensively about him.288 However, as should be evident by now, these terms
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285 These quotations are in Ishihara, 1935, p.98.
287 Cf. above, Part II, ch.1, pp.135-137.
mean different things to different people at different times and places.\textsuperscript{289} Indiscriminately applying them to Uemura’s thought is thus not possible. This is especially so given the foreign origin of these terms, as compared with Uemura’s (pre-)Meiji Japanese context.\textsuperscript{290}

As far as imported theological categories are concerned, Uemura’s emphases on the Bible, the divinity of Christ, and the Cross would classify him as "orthodox" or "evangelical" compared to "German Liberalism" or "Unitarianism." On the other hand, Uemura’s criticism of "Fundamentalism" was mutual, in that "conservative evangelicalism" has pointed out that Uemura did not strictly adhere either to the substitutionary theory of the atonement or the verbal inspiration of the Bible.\textsuperscript{291} Uemura did not simply absorb the evangelicalism that he was taught in an unreflecting way.\textsuperscript{292} As a thinker and writer, he took on and developed new thoughts, without ever leaving his Japanese base.\textsuperscript{293}

c. Development

Uemura thus cannot be characterised theologically in a way short of spelling out

\textsuperscript{289}For example, one writer lists twelve different usages for the term "evangelical." Uda Susumu, \textit{Fukuin Shugi Kirisutokyo to Fukuinha} (Evangelical Christianity and Evangelicalism). Tokyo: Inochi no Kotoba Sha, 1993, pp.35-38.

\textsuperscript{290}This important point of importing theological issues into foreign contexts will arise regularly throughout the rest of the thesis.

\textsuperscript{291}op.cit., pp.158-160.


in new ways, particularly descriptive of him, what and how he thought.\textsuperscript{294} There must also be allowance for the next point to be addressed, which is the developing character of "Uemura's theology." Uemura himself saw Christianity as an "unfinished product"\textsuperscript{295} that "is destined to develop and grow perpetually" as it enters new cultures, and fulfils existing religions.\textsuperscript{296} Accordingly, Uemura held that theory and doctrines cannot decisively or finally be the foundation for "constructing Christianity."\textsuperscript{297} Besides, salvation is not by any theory of atonement, but only the Cross of Christ, the fact of the atonement.\textsuperscript{298} As such, then, our (subjective) faith is in something super-theoretical, which is God's (objective) Word, or "God's Inspiration."\textsuperscript{299} This Word thus becomes our inner strength.\textsuperscript{300}

This is not to say, Uemura explains, that we are to be indifferent either to theoretical theological formulations or to scholarship. Regarding the former, since salvation is through faith in the Cross, evangelism must have Christ's death and the

\textsuperscript{294}One could call this suggested approach more \textit{historical}--as opposed to \textit{theoretical} or \textit{systematic}--while not ceasing to be \textit{theological}. This is in line with the posture of this thesis, of course, and the related approach of "translation." Cf. Introduction, pp.4-5(n.6).

\textsuperscript{295}"miseihin"

\textsuperscript{296}These comments are from Uemura's "The Christlike Life," quoted in Aoyoshi, 1935, p.511. Omura calls this view of Christianity Uemura's "extremely firm conviction." Omura, 1993, p.113. The apparent conflict between this understanding and Uemura's traditionalist Christology frustrates the desire to achieve a clarity for which Uemura apparently did not sense a need.

\textsuperscript{297}Ishihara, 1935, p.103.


\textsuperscript{299}"kami no reikan"

\textsuperscript{300}Ishihara, 1935, pp.103-104.
atonement as its central message. Accordingly, the atonement was a constant concern of Uemura’s preaching. Along with the theme of living by faith in relation to the risen Jesus, the atonement was the overriding theme of Uemura’s extant forty sermons which he preached during the years that Takakura sat under his ministry subsequent to the 1906 (Meiji 39) baptism. Thus, for Uemura that you preached the Cross was imperative. How you preached the Cross also was critically important, although any single theory of the Cross necessarily was incomplete.

As for scholarship, Uemura held that it helped to deepen our understanding of Christianity. For him knowledge and faith were compatible, and scholarship facilitated the ongoing task of interpreting, as opposed to systematising, Christian truth in each age.

As Uemura developed as an interpreter of Christian truth, one can see the following movement in his writings:

---


302Kuwada Hidenobu, "Uemura Sensei no Shingaku no Chukaku to shite no Shokuzai no Kyogi" ("The Doctrine of the Atonement as the Kernel of Rev. Uemura’s Theology") Shingaku to Kyokai 2, No.1, 1935, p.110.

Again, "conservative evangelical" criticism generally disagrees with such an assessment. Examination of Uemura’s definitive works, "Fukuin Shugi no Shinko" ("The Faith of Evangelicalism") and "Kirisuto to Sono Jigyo" ("Christ and His Work"), shows a primary interest in the person but not the work, i.e., the preoccupation is with Christ’s divinity. Okada Minoru, "Uemura-Takakura Shingaku no Yuku (Sairoku)" ("The Whereabouts of Uemura-Takakura Theology (Reprint)"), in Okada Minoru Chosakushu (Collected Works of Okada Minoru). Vol.5. Tokyo: Inochi no Kotoba Sha, 1993, pp.23-27. Similarly, while acknowledging the context of "Christ and His Work" being the debate with Ebina, as well as noting the claim that the series was never completed, Soltau’s assessment of Uemura’s evangelicalism is that, "While certain lip service was paid to the atonement, Uemura’s energies were directed primarily to the defense of the truth of the incarnation." Soltau, 1982, pp.209-211.


1. First, there is an Enlightenment, "natural theology" type of apologetic, exemplified in his 1884 (Meiji 17) *Shinri Ippan*.

2. Next, he produces a systematic organisation of sermons in his 1898 (Meiji 31) *Shinko no Tomo (Friend of Faith)* and 1901 (Meiji 34) *Reisei no Kiki (Crisis of Spirituality)*.305

3. Finally, Uemura issues a call for life change and reformation in his 1919 (Taisho 8) *Inori no Seikatsu (Life of Prayer)* and 1924 (Taisho 13) *Shinko no Seikatsu (Life of Faith)*. One can see a movement towards more practical concerns, as well as a deepening of religious faith and experience.306 What this faith turns out to be for Uemura then is "the heart’s agitating, yearning fight."307 To use perhaps his favourite term—which more than any other single word explains Uemura’s own religious nature and thought—faith is "kokorozashi" ("aspiration" or "intention").308 In Uemura’s words, "Faith is one’s ‘kokorozashi’...which is directed to Christ. The church is the gathering of those who share this same aspiration. Our immediate and most urgent task is to actualize this reality of the church and Christians

---

305 As noted in Part I, Oshio argues from entries in Takakura’s (currently unpublished) diary entries that he read the latter work while in Kanazawa, i.e., prior to moving to Tokyo and being baptised. Oshio, No.2, 1954, p.37; cf. Part I, p.89. (Inexplicably, Oshio calls the work Uemura’s "first" published sermon collection.) Ishihara characterises *Reisei no Kiki* as a summary of basic Christian salvation doctrines. Ishihara, 1935, p.93.

306 Ishihara, 1935, pp.88-101. Ishida sees a correlative "decided development toward deepened appreciation of Japanese culture within Uemura’s thought between *Fukuin Michishirube* (1884; Meiji 17) to *Inori to [sic] Seikatsu* (1917; Taisho 6), which appeared to have taken place in reference to his experience of Christian faith in encountering the Japanese religious mind...." This included the deepening of such Christian notions as worship and sin by their interaction with the Shinto-oriented terms "matsuri" and "tsumi", respectively. Ishida, 1973, p.48.

This movement was not unrelated to Uemura’s socio-political and organisational concerns, to be examined below.


Uemura’s "kokorozashi," which was always directed towards his Lord Jesus Christ—both led and joined with other fellow travellers in faith. Also, his thought was "not formed in the classroom, not confessionally derived, not systematically conceived, but slowly developed as Uemura daily and weekly went about his task of appealing to the Japanese through the written and spoken word." Uemura’s theology has thus been termed a "fighting theology." As already noted, Uemura’s and other Christian leaders’ almost primary theological intention was the establishment of a national and free church. Uemura fought—and in terms of his theology, he interpreted, but did not systematise—towards that end.

With the raising again of Uemura’s socio-political and organisational concerns, to these we must now specifically turn.

2. Socio-political Vision

Uemura’s recollections of his conversion years earlier began as follows:

The fall of the Shogun’s power pushed my family to launch out on the rough sea of a struggle for existence. When the fugitive adherents of the Tokugawa lost cause [sic] were fighting in the ill-advised battle of Funabashi, and the attack on Ueno in Tokyo was being planned, I landed with my family at Yokohama in April, 1868. To restore what was lost and to bring joy and comfort through my success in life, was my childish dream.

Towards the end of those same recollections, Uemura could say that

Fifty years of Christian work has penetrated deep into the heart of the nation.... The nation is slowly, but steadily, being permeated through and through with Christian ideas. The religion of Jesus is a sure part of the character of each Japanese, in such a way that even

---

309 This is quoted in—and translated into English by—Matsuoka, 1978, p.41.
311 Kumano, 1968, pp.216-239.
the worst and most ignorant of men can not wholly shake it off. The spiritual soil which is being thus prepared can not fail, during the next fifty years, to produce a rich harvest in a wide-spread revival of Christian faith.313

What had been "lost" was the world of the Tokugawa Shogunate, which his family had served in its "hamamato" status. Uemura's "childish dream" was to work along with other loyal subjects of the Tokugawa regime "To restore what was lost and to bring joy and comfort through my success in life...." The spirit of the age had been for moving forward, but he longed for the restoration of a stable past that had been swept away. Now, a whole generation later and with deep satisfaction, was not Uemura reflecting on how years of Christian work had prepared the "spiritual soil" to "produce a rich harvest" of "joy and comfort" for "each Japanese?" Was not this "wide-spread revival of Christian faith" the new Christian, "Baptised Bushido"-based civilisation that would be "so old and [yet] so new"?

Indications are that Uemura and other early leaders did long for the "restoration of the kingdom," just as the apostles had at the time of Jesus' ascension into heaven.314 Fluctuations in socio-political and organisational circumstances brought correlative changes in the level of ambiguity inherent in Uemura's intermingled aspirations. It is instructive to note, for example, that Uemura's "Retrospect" was written in 1909 (Meiji 42), still three years before what apparently was a turning point in Uemura's explicit involvement in socio-political affairs, as noted earlier.315 Yet even as various centrifugal forces--such as a hardening imperial ideology, changes (one could say breakup) in the Evangelical Alliance, or his own deepening experience of Christ's atonement for sin--may have heightened the ambiguous strain of holding all areas together, Uemura's vision and calling remained intact.

313Cf. above, Part II, ch.1, pp.174,175.
315Cf. above, Part II, ch.1, pp.120,124.

185
Besides earlier remarks that argue for such a view, further aspects of Uemura’s writing career, particularly in association with journals, also lend credence to viewing his self-understanding of his mission in those terms. At the outset of the 1880’s (second Meiji decade), which was a time of great openness to the West and tremendous advancement of the Church, Uemura and several other young Christian leaders founded in 1880 (Meiji 13) the *Rikugo Zasshi* (*Cosmos Magazine*). Within a decade Kumiai leaders were the prime contributors to the magazine, followed by its becoming a Unitarian periodical. Nevertheless, the *Rikugo Zasshi* was a significant comprehensive, inter-denominational Christian effort that earned the respect of the wider intellectual community.

With the consolidation of the Kumiai’s and NKK’s respective ecclesiastical organisations in 1890 (Meiji 23), and with the *Rikugo Zasshi*’s having become more

---

316 These further aspects also reveal the fluctuating, contemporary conditions and ambiguities.

317 Soltau points out that the founding group had just formed a Tokyo counterpart to the YMCA, and that the *Rikugo Zasshi* thus was essentially that group’s periodical. Soltau, 1982, p.82.

In light of the timing, the title of the magazine is intriguing. "Cosmos" is the standard English translation for "Rikugo." However, one could conjecture that the title was purposefully selected to be an alternative to the influential *Meiroku Zasshi* (the "riku" of "Rikugo" is the same character as "roku," i.e., meaning the English "six"), which had run for nearly two years between 1874-1876 (Meiji 17-19). The latter was formed by the "Meirokusha" ("Society of Meiji Six"), a group of leading specialists in things Western, whose noteworthy members included Fukuzawa Yukichi and Mori Arinori. The group was quite progressive, and it advised the Restoration government in its innovations and programs of Westernisation. Cf. Ion, *The Cross and the Rising Sun*, 1990, pp.36-37; Saba, ed., Vol.2, 1966, pp.353-356; William R. Braisted, *Meiroku Zasshi: Journal of the Japanese Enlightenment*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1976, Introduction.

As one of the *Rikugo Zasshi*’s editors, Uemura debated among others Fukuzawa, just mentioned as a pivotal member of the "Meirokusha." In light of Fukuzawa’s status of a well-known public figure, it can be argued that Uemura’s and the other founders’ intent for the *Rikugo Zasshi* to be a comprehensive Christian counterpart to the progressive *Meiroku Zasshi* is more than a far-fetched speculation. Cf. Soltau, 1982, p.82.

of a Kumiai organ, Uemura the same year simultaneously founded two new, complementary periodicals: the *Nippon Hyoron* (Japan Review) and the *Fukuin Shuho* (Evangelical Weekly). After the latter was closed by the government due to Uemura’s defence of Uchimura Kanzo following the famous lese majesty case, Uemura simply restarted his magazine under a different (and what became its well-known) title, the *Fukuin Shinpo* (Weekly Gospel).319

In the inaugural issue of the monthly *Nippon Hyoron*, Uemura declared that, in feeling constrained to add to the large number of publications already in existence, he himself had a calling "in terms of Japan. I have critical opinions about politics, literature, social issues, economics and education. Also, regarding the religion of the present and the future I have a very strong desire. I have the confidence to make my opinions regarding these things public...."320 One could say that the focus of the magazine was to be on issues outside the Church per se, i.e., matters concerning the wider society of Japan. The *Fukuin Shuho*, on the other hand, was to address matters directly involving the Church, e.g., evangelism, inter-church cooperation.321 Both aimed at a renewed, "baptised" Japan: the *Nippon Hyoron* directly, the *Fukuin Shuho* (and then the *Fukuin Shinpo*) through the Church.322

What is important to note here is that Uemura has had to resort to two complementary periodicals instead of a single publication (*Rikugo Zasshi*) begun only one decade earlier. This shows an inevitable tension within Uemura’s own "Baptised Bushido" calling. To recall the three major Christian "Bands" in Meiji

---


320Ibid., p.87; Ouchi, 1970, p.245. The English translation is Soltau’s.

321This complementary "outside-" and "inside-the-Church" distinction is made by Ouchi. Ouchi, 1970, pp.246ff.

322One can see the same complementary objectives in Uemura’s two works published six years earlier, i.e., the well-known *Shinri Ippan*, and the lesser known *Fukuin Michi Shirube* (Guide to the Way of the Gospel). The former’s apologetic nature has already been described; the latter "served as an introduction to the Christian faith." Soltau, 1982, p.85.
Japan, there was for one Uchimura's "Non-Church," "Sapporo Band" movement. There was also the Kumiai "Social," and frequently "Japanised," "Kumamoto Band" stream. In distinction from these other two, Uemura's "Church," "Yokohama Band" tradition gave him his "uniqueness...in his strong concern for the building of the church in Japan, his plan being to influence and change society through the church." This meant that Uemura's religio-political commitment to build a new Japan entailed that ecclesiastical structures--and ideally only one, unified structure--were indispensable for the realisation of the vision.

Up through the late 1880's (through the first two decades of Meiji), there was still realistic optimism for one national church, or one "kokai." Furthermore, due to the ferment and openness on the government's part to new ideas--including things Western and Christian--there was little sign of a fundamental, insurmountable cleavage between political and ecclesiastical structures. However, with the twin ecclesiastical (Kumiai and NKK) and political (Constitution and Education Rescript) consolidations of 1889-1890 (Meiji 22-23), the ambiguity between Uemura's socio-political and organisational (and theological) concerns was heightened. Although the ultimate vision was not lost, the road to its achievement had taken some unexpected turns.

Furthermore, in returning specifically to the matter of the *Nippon Hyoron* and *Fukuin Shuho/Shinpo*, limited finances, time, and energy would not allow equal support of both journals. Uemura of course had tremendous and increasing responsibilities alongside those of writing and publishing, most especially within his own congregation and the wider NKK. The *Nippon Hyoron* thus gradually dropped in publication frequency, and it was finally discontinued in 1894 (Meiji 27), only four years after its founding. The *Fukuin Shinpo*, on the other hand, continued throughout Uemura's lifetime and beyond, becoming the most widely-read and influential Christian periodical within the Meiji (and Taisho) Christian

---

Uemura’s *Fukuin Shinpo* attempted to make up for the *Nippon Hyoron*’s demise by taking up various socio-political questions. Uemura was thus able to continue, through writing and publishing, to pursue his religio-political vision. At the same time, however, Uemura was firmly committed to "aspire" after His Lord’s calling through ecclesiastical structures, and there were changing external conditions which included a "settling" of focus on the NKK and its growth. These combined realities only increased the strain on the interconnections between Uemura’s comprehensive, intermingled three areas of focus.

3. Organised Efforts

Uemura’s writing ministry, as well as of course the establishment and expansion

---


325 Ibid., pp.90-92.

326 The discontinuation of the *Nippon Hyoron*, and the continuation of the *Fukuin Shinpo*, signalling this "settling" of focus on "church formation" is Ouchi’s analysis. Ouchi, 1970, pp.245-248. One could also cite other factors contributing to Uemura’s and others’ focusing on church and denominational growth, e.g., the correlative growth of capitalism. In the West, by one author’s analysis, "Capitalism and denominations have grown hand in hand." Andrew Walker, *Enemy Territory: The Christian Struggle for the Modern World*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1987, p.137.

327 This strain explains the previously cited view of Uemura’s ministry as being both church-centred and socially-aloof, particularly after 1912 (after Meiji). This view is espoused by several analysts, including Takenaka Masao. Takenaka thus distinguishes Uemura’s attitude from the "nationalistic" Protestants. Takenaka, 1957, pp.70-71; cf. above, Part I, ch.1, p.120. This thesis’ analysis suggests that Uemura’s and the more extremely "nationalist" Protestants’ ultimate visions were similar, if not identical.

Despite the centrifugal strain, that Uemura’s vision continued to be for the nation (albeit via the Church) can be seen in such events as the annual worship service, beginning in 1909 (Meiji 42), held at Uemura’s Fujimicho Church especially for the national Diet members. Saba, ed., Vol.4, 1966, pp.819-824; *Uemura Zenshu*, Vol.2, 1932 (Showa 7), pp.573-578. Furthermore, the geographical scope of Uemura’s vision—expressed particularly in evangelistic tours—expanded along with Japanese involvement in Korea, China, and other parts of Asia. Saba, ed., Vol.3, 1966, pp.186-368.
of the NKK, would thus have been paramount in Uemura's mind as he reflected in 1909 (Meiji 42) on "fifty years of Christian work." No doubt that "work" also had included wider, non-ecclesiastical events, such as the entrance into Japanese discourse of the vocabulary and concepts of "European literature." Primarily, however, in referring to "Christian work," Uemura was thinking of the wide variety of organised efforts by Christians to spread the gospel and reform society. Besides the centrally-important church growth, as well as widespread publishing, Uemura was recalling the translation of the Bible and of Christian hymns, both of which projects saw him intimately involved.328 He was remembering the important work of foreign missions, especially the Presbyterian and Reformed men and women who had cooperated with the "Yokohama Band" tradition, including the NKK.329 Uemura would have been reflecting as well on the financially independent church he had pastored, as well as the independent seminary he had founded in Meiji 37 (1904). This particular ministry "was dearest to his own heart," becoming "widely known and highly respected in the Christian community."330 That his church, seminary, periodicals, and NKK home missions society all were independent and self-supporting at the time of the "Retrospect" must have been most gratifying to Uemura; he always exhibited and declared that

328Saba devotes over half of one his five volumes to these massive projects, which were carried out during the late 1870's and 1880's (second Meiji decade). Saba, ed., Vol.4, 1966, pp.1-452. Soltau mentions that Uemura served on the Old Testament translation committee, being primarily responsible for the translation of the Psalms, Song of Solomon, Isaiah, and Esther. The entire Old Testament translation was completed in 1887 (Meiji 20), after the New Testament had been finished in 1880 (Meiji 13). Soltau, 1982, pp.81-82.

329Saba devotes considerable attention as well to various missionaries, as well as a separate, one hundred-plus page section to the matter of church-mission cooperation. Saba, ed., Vol.4, 1966, pp.453-554.

By the time of Uemura's "Retrospect," the missionaries had ceased to have an official vote in NKK decisions. Uemura had led the discussions leading to this situation, and he encouraged the missions not to send any more personnel to Japan. Howes sees Uemura taking a reasonable position on a "most difficult subject," including the posture: "The old missionaries had served the cause of Japan well by introducing Christianity to it; they should be treated with all respect before they retired...." Howes, 1965, pp.360-361.

this was "a vital principle with me!"\textsuperscript{331}

In speaking of "fifty years of Christian work" which had "thus prepared" Japan's "spiritual soil," Uemura surely was also recalling many of the efforts that had been made towards alleviating social problems, as well as improving moral conditions. Temperance and anti-brothel movements--particularly strengthened by the Salvation Army--had had their effects;\textsuperscript{332} Uemura had led educational and other efforts on behalf of elevating the social status of women;\textsuperscript{333} schools, hospitals, and other institutions for social reform had been prominent.\textsuperscript{334} Uemura would not necessarily have approved of the social action taken by advocates of "Social Christianity." Instead was thinking of the social service and social concern that the Christian Church had rendered in its role as "the fundamental unit of social change."\textsuperscript{335}

Japan as a nation and society had of course changed a great deal during the half-century over which Uemura reflected in his "Retrospect." Uemura and the Church he led and served inevitably changed along with the society in which they lived and worked. Amidst all of those organisational changes, fluctuations in socio-political

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{331}Saba, ed., Vol.1, 1966, p.674.
\item \textsuperscript{332}Iglehart, 1959, pp.106-107; Saba, ed., Vol.2, 1966, pp.642-699. The Salvation Army had entered Japan in 1895 (Meiji 28); Yamimuro Gunpei was a particularly prominent leader. Ozawa, 1964, p.73.
\item \textsuperscript{333}Takenaka, 1954, p.186; Soltau, 1982, p.101.
\item \textsuperscript{334}Morse, 1991, p.46.
\end{itemize}
circumstances, and "fighting" his way along theologically, Uemura passionately and devotedly served his Lord in a way that at least matched his family's long-time, faithful service of the Tokugawas. His was a mission to which he sensed a holy, irrevocable, Pauline-type of calling: Uemura recollected that, at the time of his conversion, "Without discussion, and before making any inquiry, I felt myself to be already a Christian." His "youthful soul" had been "stormed" by a new lord-vassal relationship, and for the rest of his life this "dynamic, sagacious personality" was "a leading factor in...evangelistic, literary, educational, and administrative activities...." Uemura's "kokozashi" was a total effort for his nation, his church, and his faith.

That effort was the task to which Uemura Masahisa's Lord had called him. And that was the incomplete task which Uemura and his generation passed on to Takakura and his contemporaries.

336 The highlights of the period are summarised in Figure 4, ensuing page. Events in bold type are carryovers from the previous timeline (cf. Figure 2, Part 1, p.102).

337 Cf. Galatians 1:16-17.

338 Cf. above, Part II, ch.1, pp.132,171,175.
**Figure 4. Takakura and Meiji Christianity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Takakura's Life</th>
<th>Pertinent Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Protestant Missionaries Arrive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868 Meiji 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871 M 4</td>
<td>L.L. Janes to Kumamoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872 M 5</td>
<td>Yokohama Kokai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873 M 6</td>
<td>Ban on Christianity Lifted / Uemura Baptised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876 M 9</td>
<td>Oath on Hanaoka Hill (Kuma.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877 M 10</td>
<td>Itchi Kyokai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Born, Reared in Ayabe**

| 1884 M 17 | Shinri Ippan |
| 1885 M 18 | Evangelical Alliance |
| 1886 M 19 | Ayabe Church |
| 1887 M 20 | Bancho Church (Uemura) |

**Parents Divorced**

| 1889 M 22 | Meiji Constitution |
| 1890 M 23 | Education Rescript |
| 1891 M 24 | NKK Formed / Lese Majesty |

**Elementary School in Ayabe**

| 1892 M 25 | Incident / Education- |
| 1893 M 26 | Religion Confrontation |
| 1894 M 27 | Sino-Japanese War / Kumiai, NKK Indep. from Missions |
| 1895 M 28 |                      |

**Second Mother**

| 1900 M 33 | Jr. High School in Tokyo |
| 1901 M 34 |                        |
| 1902 M 35 | Stepmother Dies; 3d Mother |
|          | in Feb. / HS in Kanazawa |
| 1903 M 36 | Uemura Leaves Meiji Gakuin |
| 1904 M 37 | Russo-Japanese War |
| 1905 M 38 | Fujimicho Church |
| 1906 M 39 |                        |
| 1908 M 41 | Baptist by Uemura Masahisa/ Student at Tokyo Imp. Univ. |
| 1910 M 43 | Asst. Pastor at Fujimicho C. |
| 1911 M 44 | Military Service in Kyoto Fu |
| 1912 M 45 | Pastor in Kyoto / Sapporo |

**Parents**

| 1900 M 33 | Asst. Pastor at Fujimicho C. |
| 1901 M 34 | Military Service in Kyoto Fu |
| 1902 M 35 | Pastor in Kyoto / Sapporo |

**School in Ayabe**

| 1903 M 36 | Uemura Leaves Meiji Gakuin |
| 1904 M 37 | Russo-Japanese War |
| 1905 M 38 | Fujimicho Church |
| 1906 M 39 | Baptist by Uemura Masahisa/ |
| 1908 M 41 | Asst. Pastor at Fujimicho C. |
| 1910 M 43 | Military Service in Kyoto Fu |
| 1911 M 44 | Pastor in Kyoto / Sapporo |

**Jr. High School in Tokyo**

| 1900 M 33 | Asst. Pastor at Fujimicho C. |
| 1901 M 34 | Military Service in Kyoto Fu |
| 1902 M 35 | Pastor in Kyoto / Sapporo |

**Stepmother Dies; 3d Mother**

| 1900 M 33 | Asst. Pastor at Fujimicho C. |
| 1901 M 34 | Military Service in Kyoto Fu |
| 1902 M 35 | Pastor in Kyoto / Sapporo |

| 1903 M 36 | Uemura Leaves Meiji Gakuin |
| 1904 M 37 | Russo-Japanese War |
| 1905 M 38 | Fujimicho Church |
| 1906 M 39 | Baptist by Uemura Masahisa/ |
| 1908 M 41 | Asst. Pastor at Fujimicho C. |
| 1910 M 43 | Military Service in Kyoto Fu |
| 1911 M 44 | Pastor in Kyoto / Sapporo |

| 1900 M 33 | Asst. Pastor at Fujimicho C. |
| 1901 M 34 | Military Service in Kyoto Fu |
| 1902 M 35 | Pastor in Kyoto / Sapporo |

**Imperial Rescript**

| 1908 M 41 | Imperial Rescript |
| 1910 M 43 | Annexation of Korea |
| 1911 M 44 | Christian Church Alliance |
| 1912 M 45 | Sankyokaido |
The Christianity into which Jesus Christ brought Takakura was not confined to its expression within Meiji Japan. Just as the previous generation had lived in a period of Japan’s history when things Western were studied and adapted to indigenous needs, so did Takakura grow up and serve his church in Japan during a time of continuing interaction with the West. As described earlier, that interaction took place on a tremendous variety of often interconnected fronts, including specifically religious ones. Speaking in broad historical terms, during the period which included Takakura’s lifespan, religious influences proceeding through Western to Japanese channels were, of course, primarily Christian.

Takakura’s conversion to Christianity in 1906 (Meiji 39) came on the heels of the Russo-Japanese War, a conflict which in many ways brought Japan into the circle of "modern industrialised" nations. However, Japan was still very much on the periphery of this exclusive group due to the implied, intermingled qualifications of being "Western" and "Christian" as well. Similarly then, just as it had been throughout the Meiji period, the Christian Church in Japan continued--throughout Takakura’s lifetime and beyond--to be the younger student of its elder theological standard bearers in Western lands.¹

As was the case in the previous chapter’s examination of Meiji Christianity, the manner in which Western Christianity came to Takakura will serve as the guiding selection grid for its consideration here. One possible approach would be to take the Christian faith of the West in the various cultural and national expressions

---
¹Japan’s exclusion from full membership in the "modern, industrialised, Christian West," as well as the Japanese Church’s continued status as a younger disciple of the Western Church, were realities at least in the minds of Western peoples and Christians. That many Japanese, including Christians, had come to consider themselves as equal partners with the West has been noted earlier, and it will be explored further later. Cf. Part I, p.42.
encountered by Takakura, i.e., American, Scottish, English, and German.\(^2\) However, Takakura received Western Christianity not only in its various, culturally-distinct forms, e.g., by living in Scotland, or by reading German, but in nationally intermingled ways as well. For his part, Takakura dealt with Western Christianity by interacting simultaneously with its different cultural expressions, e.g., he read in the course of the same day both German and English works. Furthermore, Western Christianity itself had much interchange between its different national forms: the powerful German theological flow into English-speaking Christian circles in the years leading up to and during Takakura’s lifetime would be a prime example.

In order therefore to avoid examining Western Christianity in a manner which might artificially clarify it outside of the actual, historical process through which it came to Takakura, this chapter will proceed chronologically through Takakura’s own encounters with the Christian faith of the West. Because his two and one-half years in Britain were pivotal for Takakura’s dealing with Western Christianity, that period will serve as a dividing point for considering three time frames, i.e., before, during, and after Takakura’s time of study in Britain.

**A. Before Takakura’s Time in Britain**  
*(Before Mid-1921; Taisho 10)*

Compared with most of his elders, including his own mentor Uemura Masahisa, Takakura had relatively little direct contact with Western missionaries. By the time of Takakura’s baptism, the NKK was organisationally independent from its cooperating missions, and the Uemura-led Fujimicho Church, Tokyo Seminary, and *Fukuin Shinpo* all had been financially independent as well ever since establishment. Thus right from the beginning of his life in the Church, Takakura was part of a Japanese Church that stood on its own vis-à-vis the Church in the West.

\(^2\)As shall be seen below, to a limited degree Christianity also came to Takakura in French and Russian forms. (The latter’s inclusion in “Western” Christianity can be understood from a Japanese or "'Far' Eastern" perspective: "Western" and "Eastern" are both relative classifications.)
This is not to say that Takakura had no missionary acquaintances at all. During his brief pastorate in Kyoto in 1913 (Taisho 2), Takakura in fact worked under a missionary named R.P. Gorbold. Throughout the five years of his pastorate in Hokkaido, then his nearly three years in Tokyo prior to leaving for Britain, Takakura had occasion to meet amicably with missionaries in a variety of settings. These and other possible relationships with Westerners apparently were not singularly important for Takakura, however: neither he himself nor material written about him take the trouble of elaborating in the least on their significance.

Instead, then, of much direct contact with Western Christianity prior to going to Edinburgh in 1921 (Taisho 10), Takakura’s encounter was more indirect. He read Western works a great deal, something to be considered subsequently. First, though, the Western Christianity mediated to Takakura through Uemura and the Meiji Church will briefly be examined.

1. Western Christianity as Mediated through the Meiji Church

The majority of the missionaries who came to Japan immediately before and after 1868 (Meiji 1) were (English-speaking) Americans who deeply bore characteristics of English Methodism, American Revivalism, and German Pietism. Furthermore, these men and women had their roots in Puritan America, and they longed to see New England’s declining political and economic influence "spring up renewed" through increased spiritual and intellectual flowering "in the lands of the Orient."

---


4E.g., Takakura went to "Rowland’s" house in April, 1915 (Taisho 4), for a meeting with the well-known evangelist Kanamori Tsurin (Paul) during one of his tours in Hokkaido; in 1917 (Taisho 6) he had a meal in the home of the "Lake" family; Takakura heard a sermon by "Thornton" in 1919 (Taisho 8). Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.42,83-84,100.

5This is according to, e.g., Ishihara Ken, as cited by Furuya Yasuo in his "Joron" ("Preface") to Furuya, ed., 1992, p.10.
as well as in distant parts of the United States.\(^6\) As noted earlier, these missionaries' faith thus helped to cultivate evangelistic/revivalistic and ethical tendencies of Meiji Christianity.\(^7\) Furthermore, the American missionaries' Christianity "emphasized personal conversion, implicit faith in the Bible, moral rigor, and a sense of mission.... Here was a faith well suited to the conditions both of the American frontier and of the spiritual desert in which many Japanese young men felt themselves."\(^8\) In these terms, Uemura and other Meiji Christians conveyed, in contours similar to the original, the missionaries' Christianity to Takakura.

However, also as previously examined in Part II, Chapter 1, the intellectual-theological mediation was not as straightforward.\(^9\) The historical context of American Christianity coming to Japan was the former's integral relationship to the expanding nineteenth century American empire. The United States, along with the other early modern imperial power, Russia,\(^10\) had shown the initial Western interest in the commercial opening of Japan in the 1850's.\(^11\) Specifically in reference to Uemura and many others in the "Yokohama Band," the missionaries S.R. Brown and James Ballagh were the two Westerners who gave the most influential and direct theological input. The fact that they were Americans thus


\(^7\)Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.107,141.

\(^8\)Howes, 1965, pp.344-345.

\(^9\)Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.142-144.
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meant that they all the more preached and taught with a "passion and sense of mission"\textsuperscript{12} the gospel of Jesus Christ to their young samurai converts.

On the one hand, that Uemura's and others' own "passion and sense of mission" resembled that of the missionaries thus enabled their political theory within Meiji Japan to be, in many ways at least, compatible with that of their American counterparts. With the European notion of territorial Christianity or "Christendom" as their background,\textsuperscript{13} the Americans brought to Japan their distinguishing "theological virtue" of the separation of the church and state--"a formal (though far from an actual) abandonment of the Christendom principle."\textsuperscript{14} Uemura's own religious, socio-political vision for Japan\textsuperscript{15} found an echo in the Americans' Puritan vision for the Christianisation of all the earth. Furthermore, the doctrine of church-state separation was picked up by Uemura in the battles which he increasingly had to wage against the state, thus enabling his "Church-centred nationalism" to be one of the most balanced amongst Meiji Christians.\textsuperscript{16}

However, Uemura and his fellow leaders had to articulate their vision and faith \textit{in Japan}, both for themselves and their followers. Their intellectual formulations thus somehow had to possess certain degrees of fundamental compatibility with their own, Japanese context. Of great importance was that these Meiji leaders theologised in their own Japanese language. This necessarily entailed a significant difference of structure and content from the missionaries' Latin/English-based

\textsuperscript{12}Soltau, 1982, p.39.


\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p.159; Walls, 1990, pp.14-15.

\textsuperscript{15}Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.184-189.

\textsuperscript{16}Furuya Yasuo, \textit{Nihon no Shingaku (Theology of Japan)}. Co-authored by Ohki Hideo. Tokyo: Yorudansa, 1989, pp.128,133. The English translation of the title was supplied--and discussed--by the authors.
intellectual-theological world.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, that same intellectual-theological world had imposed itself by linguistic-theological conquest one millennium earlier on the peoples of Northwest Europe.\textsuperscript{18} Japanese-Western differences could hence only be widened by the latter's ingrained militancy; and, the peculiar American expansionism in the case at hand only exaggerated the several clashing contrasts which emerged.

Western theology's interaction with the Japanese context was made even more difficult by its having retained a basically closed posture relative to other cultural-intellectual frameworks ever since the Constantinian Era.\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, pre-Renaissance annexations of an emerging Western individualism, of various aspects of Germanic culture, and of a strictly logical methodology\textsuperscript{20} only accentuated the "unmistakable foreignness," the "foreign-smell," of the missionaries' message within the milieu of Meiji Japan.\textsuperscript{21} In addition, post-Renaissance characteristics


Latin was the language of the whole Western Church for 1,500 years, and has been the language of the Roman Catholic Church for another 400... [T]he theological and ecclesiastical vocabulary of the English language is saturated with Latin.... Oddly enough...German theology has a much less Latinised vocabulary than English. But there is no doubt that the "style" of our Christian life in the English-speaking world is very deeply influenced by those thousand years of Latin dominance.

\textsuperscript{18}This process has been outlined by Andrew F. Walls in "On the Origins of Old Northern and New Southern Christianity," in H. Kasdorf and K.W. Müller, eds., Bilanz und Plan. Mission an der Schwelle zum Dritte Jahrtausend. Bad Liebenzell, VLM, 1988, pp.243-255.

\textsuperscript{19}op.cit., p.355; Whaling, 1986, p.29.


\textsuperscript{21}Soltau, 1982, p.99.
such as a rational, Lockean epistemology and methodology, a basic
tactical approach of modern, "objective scientific inquiry," and the
intellectual categories of Scottish Common Sense philosophy.
All of these various historical contexts of Western (and particularly
American) theology's long formation, and then entrance into Japan,
thus combined to guarantee that Takakura did not, and could not,
receive via Uemura or via any other Japanese believer or church
either an unchanged or a totally favourable transmission of its
expression of the Christian gospel. Ethically and politically, the
Meiji Church in many ways mirrored Western Christianity.
Intellectually-theologically, however, what reflection there was passed
through a darker glass. In summary, then, one should say that the
American missionary form of Christianity which reached
Takakura came to him only indirectly, and in severely refracted form.

2. Western Christianity as Encountered Through Reading

Takakura had more direct access, by contrast, to Western
Christianity through

---

22Peter A. Schouls, "John Locke and the Rise of Western Fundamentalism: A
Hypothesis" Religious Studies and Theology 10, Nos.2/3, May/September, 1990,
pp.9-18.

23George Marsden, "The Collapse of American Evangelical Academia," in Alvin
Plantinga and Nicolas Wolterstorff, eds., Faith and Rationality: Reason and Belief
in God. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983, p.223, as
quoted in Theodore P. Letis, "B.B. Warfield, Common-Sense Philosophy and

24Mark A. Noll, comp. and ed., The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: Scripture,
Science, and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin
Breckinridge Warfield. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed,
1983, p.36. The formative context for the background of many of the
missionaries to Japan was late eighteenth and early nineteenth century American
evangelicalism, and especially presbyterianism. Noll describes in further
detail the extensive influences of Common Sense thought within that context in his
stimulating article, "Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought"
American Quarterly 37, No.2, Summer, 1985, pp.216-238.
readily available written works.\textsuperscript{25} One can surmise that sitting under Nishida Kitaro in high school would have brought Takakura in touch with writings connected with the contemporary Western religio-philosophical issues with which Nishida himself was dealing. This particularly would have meant works related to the "opposition...between...realism, positivism, and empiricism on the one hand, and ‘Lebens-Philosophie’ (philosophy of life) and existential philosophy on the other.... Between these two opposing philosophical strands emerged a new branch of philosophy based on psychology...." Nishida surely would have directed Takakura and other students to the writings of some of this new movement’s representative writers, e.g., Wilhelm Wundt, William James, Gustav Theodor Fechner, and Ernst Mach.\textsuperscript{26}

During seminary, Uemura’s guidance meant a varied cuisine, ranging from Jonathan Edwards to Alexandre Rodolthe Vinet to John Calvin.\textsuperscript{27} Interesting to note as well is Takakura’s sampling of classical and patristic writings, reflected in an essay he wrote as a student on Stoicism.\textsuperscript{28} Although he undoubtedly digested material covering the broad sweep of (Western) Christian history,\textsuperscript{29} the strongest diet upon

\textsuperscript{25}Even so, during the few years surrounding his baptism, i.e., three years of high school, then two and one-half years of seminary, Takakura’s predecessors served as mediators of the faith of the West which Takakura was studying by directing him, quite naturally, to what they judged he should read.

\textsuperscript{26}Abe, 1990, p.xiii. Although such Western religio-philosophical writers and issues obviously were not co-extensive with, and were sometimes totally distinct from, Christianity per se, they often were clearly related to the contemporary Christian faith in the West. They were thus important to the encounter Takakura had with Western Christianity, and hence they have been mentioned here.

\textsuperscript{27}Soltau, 1982, pp.179-180.

\textsuperscript{28}"Stoa Shugi ni tsuite" ("Concerning Stoicism") \textit{Fukuin Shinpo} Nos.699-702, 19,26 November, 3,10 December 1908 (Meiji 41), pp.5-6,5-6,5-7,3-4; \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.4, pp.3-21.

\textsuperscript{29}This is again reflected in an early essay which Takakura wrote for the \textit{Fukuin Shinpo}, this one in 1912 (Taisho 1), i.e., two years after finishing seminary. In this essay, Takakura deals with Tertullian, Kant, Luther and Calvin, Jansenism, deism, John Stuart Mill, Ritschlianism, and a number of other specific persons and topics. Contemporary authors to whom Takakura refers include the English (Anglican)
which Takakura and his fellow students were nourished was British, and especially Scottish, theology. This was due to the central place in the seminary of Uemura, who had been steering his students in that direction. Uemura wanted to move Christian thought in Japan away from being the strictly American product that it had been since early Meiji, as well as to provide an alternative to the strong influence of German theology. Uemura thus recommended to his students such theologians as P.T. Forsyth, James Denney, R.W. Dale.31

Takakura's German reading ability was most welcome to his teachers, given the paradoxical, combined situation in Japan of the importance of German theology and the sparsity of German readers. Takakura thus read extensively in such


Although he had studied some French in his student days at the Imperial University, one could surmise that Takakura read translated versions--perhaps English--of the French works. Sabatier’s works, for example, had been "speedily translated in America," e.g., Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit was both written in French, and then translated into English in 1904 (Meiji 37). Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," p.187-188; Claude Welch, Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century: Volume 2, 1870-1914. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, p.233.


Charles Germany notes the Meiji Church’s theological links with American scholarship due to the ongoing presence of missionaries from the United States. However, as the bulk of Japanese intellectuals turned to German thought around the turn of the century, Protestant theology increasingly lost wider influence due to being tied to "the less profound scholarship of the United States primarily." Thus, for example, William A. Brown's Christian Theology in Outline and Clarke's An Outline of Christian Theology were used extensively in seminaries. One will recall that Uemura himself used Clarke, at least up through 1903 (Meiji 36). Germany, p.6(n.11). Cf. Part II, ch.1, p.135.

representative theologians as Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Herrmann. Takakura wrote his graduation thesis on Schleiermacher’s Über die Religion, and he was supervised in that project by the two teachers at the seminary most familiar with German thought, Hatano Seiichi and Ishihara Ken.

After graduating from seminary, Takakura both followed the channels of reading travelled as a student and branched out according to his own reading interests. During the eleven years between seminary and arriving in Britain, Takakura’s reading of Western works included those authored by Forsyth (on art), Rousseau (Confessions), Dostoevsky (Crime and Punishment), Edwards (Religious Affections and A History of the Work of Redemption), Peake, Newman, Kähler,

32Germany, p.94. Germany cites these three thinkers as influential in Takakura’s early theological development. Analysis of such a claim will come later in the thesis.

33Oshio, pp.48-49,52. Takakura completed the thesis, entitled “Shuraierumaheru no Shukyo Ron ni Tsuite” (“Concerning Schleiermacher’s Theory of Religion”), in May, 1910 (Meiji 43). It has been reproduced in Zenshu, Vol.4, pp.373-510.

34As mentioned earlier, Ishihara later studied in Germany concurrent with Takakura’s years in Britain. Cf. Part I, p.94.

Hatano encountered German philosophical thought beginning in 1896 (Meiji 29) in the person of Raphael von Koeber, who was teaching at the Imperial University in Tokyo. During these years he also attended Uemura’s church and was baptised. Hatano then studied in Germany (Berlin and Heidelberg) from 1904-1906 (Meiji 37-39), before returning to teach at the Imperial University in Tokyo. It was during this time that he also helped teach at the seminary. From 1917 (Taisho 6) Hatano had a distinguished career at the University of Kyoto until his death in 1950. Twelve-Member Editorial Board, "The Life and Thought of Dr. Seiichi Hatano," in Hatano Seiichi, Time and Eternity. Translated by Suzuki Ichiro. Tokyo: Yushodo Co., Ltd., 1963, pp.I-IV; Carl Michalson, Japanese Contributions to Christian Theology. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press, 1960, pp.101-102.

35Likely this was Forsyth’s Religion in Recent Art. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1905, or possibly Christ on Parnassus: Lectures on Art, Ethics and Theology. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1911.

36This had been translated (from English) into Japanese in 1892 (Meiji 25), twenty-six years after its original publication in Russia. Irokawa, 1985, p.69.
Campbell, Denney (The Death of Christ\textsuperscript{38}), Johannes Tauler,\textsuperscript{39} Henri Bergson (Time and Free Will), Thomas À Kempis (Imitation of Christ), and Francis Thompson. Takakura read several biographies, too, for instance those of Nietzsche, Cromwell, Edwards, and Tolstoy.\textsuperscript{40} Takakura also wrote essays on such figures as Augustine, Pascal, Frederick Robertson, Catherine of Genoa,\textsuperscript{41} and Luther, thus implying a significant amount of research into these Christians' life and thought as well.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{38}Presumably this was John McLeod Campbell's The Nature of the Atonement, a work cited by Takakura in later years, e.g., in the bibliography of Takakura Tokutaro, Fukuin Kirisutokyo (Evangelical Christianity). 7th ed. Tokyo: Shinkyo Shuppansha, 1953, p.174; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.456. Charles Germany kindly lent his copy of Fukuin Kirisutokyo to the thesis writer.


\textsuperscript{40}Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.4-5,8,16,28-29,34,36,37,89,91,96; Oshio, pp.58, 72-73,92.

\textsuperscript{41}Catherine of Genoa was an Italian mystic, 1447-1516, not to be confused with the fourteenth century Catherine of Siena. One analysis remarks that it was unusual for Takakura to write such an essay on a mystic. Note, however, Takakura's reading of the German mystic Tauler. "Zenoa no Kazarin" ("Catherine of Genoa") Bummei Hyoron (Review of Civilisation) 6, Nos.6-7, 1 June, 1 July 1919 (Taisho 8), pp.21-26,21-26 (Zenshu, Vol.4, pp.554-572); Zenshu, Vol.4, "Kaisetsu," p.5.

\textsuperscript{42}Besides the essay on Catherine of Genoa, these works are in published form as follows: "Agasuchin no Shukyoteki Keiken no Hatten" ("The Development of Augustine's Religious Experience") Fukuin Shinpo Nos.927,928,930,932. 3,10,24 April, 8 May 1913 (Taisho 2), pp.4-5,4-5,4-5,4-5 (Zenshu, Vol.4, pp.511-530); "Soshiroku' ni Awaharetaru Pasukaru no Shukyo Shisho Ippan" ("Glimpses of Pascal's Religious Thought Revealed in 'Pensées'")", in Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.260-275 (Zenshu, Vol.4, pp.531-544); "Furederikku Robatoson no Shukyo Shiso" ("The Religious Thought of Frederick Robertson"), in Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.276-285 (Zenshu, Vol.4, pp.545-553); "Ruteru no Konpon Shisho" ("The Fundamental Thought of Luther"), 1917 (Taisho 6), in Chosakushu, Vol.3, pp.267-276.
Once in Britain, Takakura of course encountered much more directly, and in a much more concentrated way, certain forms of Western Christianity. However, even before that time, Takakura had encountered extensively the thought of the Christian West through the printed page. The writings that found their way to Takakura conveyed a wide range of eras, languages, and styles of thought, and not all of them were specifically theological, or even Christian. "Varied" would thus be the safest overall description of what Takakura read before travelling to the West.

It is not impossible, however, to identify certain themes of the writings of Western Christianity which came to Takakura. Negatively, it can be said that the tradition immediately connected with the American missionaries who had been cooperating with the NKK, i.e., "Princetonian Theology," did not comprise a significant portion of Takakura's readings--unless one would want to include Jonathan Edwards in that category.43 Speaking positively, a case could be made for an overall theme of "inner spirituality." This is a primary emphasis in a large portion of the readings, e.g., in Schleiermacher, Dostoevsky, Edwards' Religious Affections, Tauler, Thomas À Kempis, and Thompson (cf. Rousseau and Bergson as well). The fact that Takakura's readings included several biographies should be noted, too. Furthermore, the essays which Takakura wrote stress religious experience. For example, the work on Augustine relies greatly on the Confessions in focusing on his personal pilgrimage leading up to conversion, instead of on Augustine's thought or theology.

In addition to this overall theme of inner spirituality, soteriology is arguably the primary sub-theme. Forsyth, Denney's The Death of Christ, and Edwards' A History of the Work of Redemption, for example, strongly and clearly focus on

43 Even so, it is significant--in light of earlier comments about the background of the Meiji missionaries' Christianity--to note that Edwards, "the last of the great Puritan theologians," in the spirit of Augustinian piety "repudiated the concept of a natural moral sense." What Edwards had repudiated was then advocated by the ensuing orthodox American Presbyterianism in its embracing of Scottish Common Sense philosophy. Noll, 1985, pp.217-218; cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.200.
Christian salvation through the Cross of Jesus Christ. Takakura’s composition of the essay on Luther encapsulates both this sub-theme of soteriology, and the main theme of religious experience, of Takakura’s reading. It is based on *Freedom of the Christian*, which Takakura had read just a few days before writing the article. This famous work of course speaks of *salvation* in Christ through faith alone, thus enabling the believer to *experience* true freedom.

Thus while remembering the varied, eclectic nature of the written works which Takakura encountered, one can venture to maintain that--prior to Takakura’s personally entering part of that world in 1921 (Taisho 10)--Western Christianity had come to him in terms of Christians’ personal experiences of salvation through Jesus Christ. Those experiences had occurred within different epochs and languages; but, they also shared a general "Western" tradition. Of course, their basic commonality came from the fundamental involvement of Jesus Christ, Who was also fundamentally working in the life of the non-Western Takakura, both while he read in Japan, and as he ventured for study in the West.

**B. During Takakura’s Time in Britain**
(Mid-1921 - Early 1924; Taisho 10-13)

Takakura was thirty-six years old when he went left Japan for the first time in his life and went to Britain. By the time he returned home as a soon-to-turn thirty-nine year old church leader, Takakura had been instructed and surrounded by Westerners, primarily British, for well over two years. The first significant nine months of this immersion in "Christendom" was spent in the capital city of Calvinist Scotland, Edinburgh.

1. *Nine Months in Edinburgh - New College*

Upon his arrival in Edinburgh on 5 October 1921 (Taisho 10), Takakura faced all of the excitement and difficulties of entering a different culture, especially including

---


45 *It is helpful to note that Takakura’s exposure to "Westerners" in "Christendom" primarily meant his being in English-speaking Britain.*
the adventures of encountering a new language. Particularly at first, spoken English caused Takakura to experience times of nervousness and confusion. His struggles ranged from the simplest personal introductions to difficulty in understanding school lectures. Some private tutoring and time helped to increase Takakura’s language competency.46

The purpose of going to Edinburgh was to study at New College. The professors in Edinburgh who thus gave the most input into Takakura’s structured, "formal" educational experience were H.A.A. Kennedy, H.R. Mackintosh, and W.P. Paterson.47 Kennedy was the teacher that Takakura and many other students liked the most personally. Takakura describes him as possessing a kind, pious personality, in addition to being an astute New Testament scholar. His lectures were the "easiest to understand" for Takakura, for he spoke "slowly and clearly."48 Kennedy’s best-known work, The Theology of the Epistles,49 was foundational for Takakura’s own Pauline studies which he conducted during his later years.50

Takakura attended Mackintosh’s lectures in systematic theology,51 and presumably


47Oshio, pp.98-99. Paterson was actually in Edinburgh University’s Divinity Faculty, not New College. Regarding the relationship between the two faculties, cf. below, Part II, ch.2, p.209(n.56).


51Oshio, p.98.
read several of his writings, including the well-known *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*.\(^52\) In this work, Mackintosh analyses Christological development in the New Testament, then further throughout (Western) Church history. At the end of the third and final part of the book, which proposes "The Reconstructive Statement of the Doctrine," Mackintosh concludes:

It is in the unity of God as known in Christ that our minds come finally to rest. The triune life is apprehended by us for the sake of its redemptive expression, not for the internal analysis of its content. The problem can never be one of ontology mixed with arithmetic. Throughout, our aim is bent on history and its meaning, as we strive to apprehend the one God in His saving manifestation.

The book then closes with a trinitarian confession.\(^53\) It was this methodological and substantial blend of both modern and traditional theological style which prompted Takakura to evaluate Mackintosh as a "first-rate theologian."\(^54\) Moreover, Takakura expresses thanks for receiving through Mackintosh a "general idea of theology."\(^55\)


\(^53\)Mackintosh, 1913, p.526.

\(^54\)Takakura qualifies his praise, however, by critically noting that Mackintosh could be termed "Ritschlian."

\(^55\)"Oncho to Shinjitsu," in *Oncho to Shinjitsu*, p.4; *Chosakushu*, Vol.2, p.9. As noted in Part I (pp.94-95(n.379)), this essay describes Takakura’s time in Europe; it shall thus be used extensively in this section of the thesis. Hereafter it shall be referred to simply by the title of the book for which it serves as a preface, *Oncho to Shinjitsu*.

Takakura later listed several of Mackintosh’s works as references in his own writings and lectures. For example, Takakura included *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ* in the bibliography of his 1927 (Showa 2) *Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo*. Because Takakura listed the 1913 2nd ed., so has the thesis; cf. ns.52,53 above. *Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo*, p.174; *Chosakushu*, Vol.2, p.455. Hereafter *Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo* shall be referred to as FK.
W.P. Paterson was Professor of Divinity, and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, at Edinburgh University. Takakura was able to participate in Paterson’s seminars, as well as benefit from some private discussions. Through these encounters, as well as through reading Paterson’s The Rule of Faith, Takakura

Takakura also used both The Originality of the Christian Message (London: Duckworth & Co., 1920) and The Christian Apprehension of God (London: Student Christian Movement, 1929) as references for his "Prolegomena" dogmatics lectures delivered from 1930 (Showa 5). The last reference especially shows how Takakura must have both kept abreast of Mackintosh’s works, as well as appreciated them enough to cite something published as recently as the previous year. Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.72,181,187, "Kaisetsu," p.1.

56Edinburgh University Calendar, 1921-1922. Edinburgh: James Thin, 1921, p.414. At the time, the University’s Divinity Faculty and New College were separate entities, the latter serving as a ministerial training school for the United Free Church. There had been close cooperation between the two faculties, however, ever since the famous 1904 House of Lords decision awarding the New College properties to the continuing Free Church. The faculties especially worked together from the days of depleted students and other resources during World War I. Hugh Watt, comp., New College Edinburgh: A Centenary History. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1946, pp.96ff.


58Oshio, p.98; Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.4 (Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.10). Interestingly, Takakura’s cross-cultural experiences were accentuated through this individual interaction with Paterson. At the end of Takakura’s time in Edinburgh, the professor mistakenly introduced Takakura as being "from China." Takakura records his feeling of deflation, yet thankfulness for gained humility. Emphasis original. "Edinbara Saigo no Mikkakan" Seisho no Ksans No.74, January, 1923 (Taisho 12), pp.42-43; Zenshu, Vol.6, p.290. Reproduced in Oshio, p.108.

Besides the fact that this incident occurred after knowing Takakura for several months, Paterson’s mistake seems slightly more difficult to understand when one considers that from 1910 seven other Japanese students had preceded Takakura to New College—but there had been no Chinese! New College Edinburgh, Hand-Book. Years 1906 through 1921, housed in New College Library.

59W.P. Paterson, The Rule of Faith. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1912. Takakura similarly included this work in the bibliography of FK, p.175; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.457. He also used it as a reference for his dogmatics lectures, along with an article entitled "Sacrifice" in James Hastings, ed., A
came to have a heartfelt admiration and respect for this professor's "personality, faith, and theology." He furthermore offered the opinion that Paterson, although not well-known in Japan due to the sparsity of his writings, was at the time the "greatest theologian" in England and Scotland. Takakura noted that this high evaluation was in large part due to Paterson's piety and prophetic insight.60

It is significant that both Mackintosh and Paterson were particularly well-versed in contemporary German theology. For example, both include in their respective surveys of Christian doctrine separate sections on Schleiermacher and Ritschl.61 Mackintosh explains that a primary purpose of writing The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ was "to furnish...a competent guide to the best recent discussion, in this country and Germany."62 One writer even sees Mackintosh as having been acquainted with the movements of German theology to the extent that he serves the history student as a transitional figure between Ritschl and Barth.63 As for Paterson, among other numerous similar activities he edited a publication on German culture, himself contributing the chapter on religion.64 That both of these theologians were thus steeped in German language and thought would have struck a resonant chord in the heart and mind of the similarly well-read Takakura.65


60Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.4; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.10.

61Mackintosh, 1913, pp.250-256,278-281; Paterson, 1912, pp.344-388.


65Takakura disparaged the contemporary state of English theology, especially dogmatics. He evaluated more positively Scottish theology in terms of "having more concentration of thought and power to penetrate deeply" into matters. Even so, Takakura remarked that all contemporary theologians, including Scotsmen, must learn from German theology in terms of "contemplative and experiential power." "Katorishizumu ni kansuru Kyomi" ("Interest in Catholicism") Fukuin Shinpo
Takakura's own description of the special character of Paterson's theology was that of "Calvinistic Evangelicalism." Upon using that designation, Takakura immediately proceeds to recall Paterson's closing address to the 1919 Church of Scotland General Assembly, "Recent History and the Call to Brotherhood." Takakura remarks how that address stressed "Calvinism's social ideal," as well as Christianity's role of "ethicising" the "social order." That such emphases would have made an impression on Takakura is not surprising, for he was actually living in Scotland—the country where many, including Takakura himself, believed that "Calvinistic Christianity is being made the most of." Encountering such a society first-hand most likely made a bigger impression of "Calvinism" on Takakura than did anything else about his time in Edinburgh, including even his studies in New College.

However, at the time of Takakura's Edinburgh sojourn, Calvinist Scotland, like much of the rest of Europe, was suffering among the agonizing aftermath of the First World War. And not only did the War itself bring about widespread anguish, it also accentuated the complex, revolutionary changes that had been going on throughout nineteenth century Scotland. The rapid changes associated with the Industrial Revolution, Highland Clearances, Irish immigration, urbanisation, and

---

No.1456, 24 May 1923 (Taisho 12), p.3; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.211-212.

66W.P. Paterson, Recent History and the Call to Brotherhood. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1919. Pertinent to the ongoing question of language is Takakura's translation of the speech title, "Kindai Rekishi to Doho e no Shomei." The term "Doho" normally refers to a concrete group, i.e., "brothers," "fellow countrymen," or "fellows." The resulting meaning is thus slightly different from that conveyed by the more abstract term used by Paterson, "brotherhood"; "dohoai" might have been one possibility for an alternative translation. Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.5; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.10.

67Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.5; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.10.

68Ibid. Takakura's own words are, "Genzai, sekai ni oite karuvinisutikku na kirisutokyo ga mottomo yoku ikasarete iru tokoro ha, nan to itte mo sukoturando de aru."

69Cf., e.g., Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.460.
development of scientific knowledge proved too difficult for the Church to maintain its central role in Scotland. Both contemporary and subsequent writers evaluate the Church's place in Scottish life throughout this period as having increasingly moved to the periphery, becoming "less and less strongly connected to the things which matter most in society." 

Cheyne analyses the century's revolutionary religious changes, specifically in their biblical, confessional, liturgical, and social aspects. He makes the overall observation that "the tempo of change grew perceptibly faster, and the controversies occasioned by it infinitely more intense" in the years leading up to Great War. In terms of the Church's social roles, prior to the 1830's the Church and not the state had been in charge of "the day-to-day life of Scotland, including poor relief and moral and social welfare as well as schooling." Thomas Chalmers had led the Church's mid-century efforts to alleviate the mounting Scotland's social and economic needs, but his "anachronistic" vision, having originated in pre-industrial Scotland, proved inadequate. Biblically, the Robertson Smith trial of 1880-1881 had revealed serious divisions in both the recognition and understanding of Scripture's trustworthiness and authority. Confessionally, the Declaratory Act of 1892 and the subsequent 1900 formation of the United Free Church showed a large-scale shift towards greater latitude of creedal interpretation.

---


74 Ross, 1987, p.146.

75 Ibid., pp.2,29.
Many have interpreted these biblical and confessional changes favourably, understanding them as Scottish religion's losing "much of its old narrowness and crudeness under the influence of a broader culture."76 Most Christian writers at least have lamented the Church's social marginalisation, with varying interpretations as to the causes. Some have offered the analysis, for example, that the Western, including Scottish, Church fled into "bourgeois-capitalistic culture and milieu."77 Others have blamed "the breakdown of Christendom," with the result, "The head of Europe is still Christian, [but] its heart has been led astray."78 "Conservatives" of that day, "for whom Old Testament Israel provided the model for Church and society,"79 blamed the Church’s decreased influence on its straying away from its orthodox biblical and confessional moorings.

Takakura was well aware of these revolutionary changes in Scottish society and church life. For one thing, he had seen mind-boggling social changes back in Japan. Furthermore, soon after his time in Edinburgh, Takakura wrote an essay for readers in Japan on the Church in Scotland and its history.80 In this and other writings he makes specific mention of the Scottish people's rational thinking, strong


80 Takakura composed this in September, after he had left Edinburgh in June. "Sukoku Kyokai to Sono Rekishi" ("The Scottish Church and Its History") Fukuin Shinpo Nos.1428-1431, 1435, 9,16,23,30 November, 28 December 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.4-5,5-6,6,5-4-5; Zenshu, Vol.4, pp.227-252.
sense of duty, interest in theological matters, and love of freedom. Moreover, he largely attributes this Scottish "national character" to the nation's Calvinist heritage. Takakura saw these qualities particularly through his more "informal" education of friendships and participating in church life: this interaction especially made his stay in Edinburgh a rich and rewarding time.

A description of the importance of Takakura's time in Edinburgh would not be complete without a word about his beloved books. He found and bought many "thought-provoking" and "extremely unusual" used books that were unavailable in Japan. Undoubtedly most of these books were written in English. However, one could surmise that he also found some German materials, due to his professors' expertise in German thought. He definitely found an abundance of German

---


82Oshio, p.98.

83Takakura was not, however, always effusive in his praise and evaluation of Scottish Christians. He wrote to his wife that he had heard no "great" preachers, and even though believers had a deep knowledge of the Christian faith, they were not very passionate. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," p.273.

84Ibid., p.274.

85Oshio, p.98.

86Interesting and relevant is Takakura's only extant English paper, written at an unknown time during his stay in Edinburgh. It is entitled, "The Problem of Authority in Religion, Its Seat and Character" (the title would suggest the paper was written for Paterson), and is reproduced in Zenshu, Vol.4, pp.1-25; a Japanese translation is in Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.345-371. It is in effect an abridged translation, with a few additions of an essay written approximately nine years earlier (1912; Taisho 1), "Shukyo ni okeru Authority" ("Authority in Religion"), referred to above in reference to Takakura's pre-Britain encounter with Western Christianity. Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.201(n.29).

The relevant point about German books is that the English paper refers to a few sources not mentioned in the earlier Japanese paper, including John Oman's Grace and Personality and Vision and Authority, as well as Windelband's essay "Das Heilige" (in his collection called Präludien). Since Grace and Personality was not published until 1917 (Vision and Authority was published in 1902), and Windelband's Präludien until 1919, one could tentatively conclude that Takakura
books when he left Edinburgh in late June of 1922 (Taisho 11), and then took a trip to Germany.

2. Travels on the Continent and in England

After meeting up with Uemura Masahisa in London, Takakura and his "senpai" travelled to Heidelberg. There they met Ishihara Ken, who had invited his two friends to come and visit. During his month in and around Heidelberg, Takakura became more directly acquainted with German theology through discussions with Ishihara, reading and purchasing many books, and attending a lecture by Schubert. Together with Uemura he also visited various sites associated with World War I. Perhaps it was this type of encounter with war-stricken Germany which caused Takakura to remark in a letter first encountered these works—particularly Wildelband’s—in Edinburgh, possibly on the advice of Paterson. Cf. John Oman, Vision and Authority. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902; John Oman, Grace and Personality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917; Wilhelm Windelband, Präludien. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1919.

87Uemura was on his third, and final, trip through America and Europe. Saba, ed., Vol.4, 1966, pp.581-602.


89This is an oft-used designation for someone who in English might be termed a "senior," "superior," or "elder." This emotionally-laden term has been used here to connote what must have been some of the feelings Takakura experienced upon seeing Uemura again after almost a year away from Japan.

90It will recalled that Ishihara had helped Takakura in his thesis on Schleiermacher, and was currently studying in Heidelberg. Cf. Part I, p.94, above, Part II, ch.2, p.202(n.34).

91The majority of these books were concerned with the theme of "kingdom of God," the significance of which will be explored later. Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.461.

92Presumably this was the eminent church historian, Hans von Schubert. It was upon Uemura’s request that they attend the lecture. Takakura remarks that his teacher did not understand the lecture, confirming Uemura’s lack of German ability mentioned earlier. Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.8-9; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.13. Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, pp.202-203.

93Ibid.
to his wife that the Germans were really "struggling," and that Christianity had little influence there.\(^9^4\)

During the next month, Takakura travelled "aimlessly" by himself, visiting a number of famous places throughout Germany. He was able to see the passion play, performed only once every ten years, at Oberammergau. Takakura visited various cities, coming away with varying degrees of appreciation. He spent three days at the Wartburg Castle, where Luther had translated the Scriptures. Such historic places associated with the Reformation, along with much lovely scenery and immersion in the German language, left lasting impressions on Takakura as he returned to England to commence studies at Mansfield College in Oxford.\(^9^5\)

After getting settled in Oxford, Takakura had some time before the school term began in mid-October. An acquaintance named Sasaki had invited Takakura to visit him at the Society of the Sacred Mission in Kelham, an Anglican monastery


Furthermore, in an essay written about one year later, Takakura relates an incident of having met a German student in Berlin. Upon informing the student that he was a Christian minister, the student sneered, "Currently in Germany... Christianity does not exist." Although recognising this statement as extreme, Takakura comments on the weak state of Christians in Germany, particularly in allowing their cultural pride to supersede their faith.

Continuing within this subject of Christianity and culture, Takakura also elaborates on the relative strengths and weaknesses of British and German theologians, something he had mentioned four months earlier. While acknowledging the overall indebtedness of British to the Germans, he thinks British theologians generally have a healthier attitude towards Christianising their own culture and civilisation. "Kirisutokyo no Tokushoku to shite no Choshizen" ("The Supernatural as a Special Characteristic of Christianity") Fukuin Shinpo No.1459, 23 August 1923 (Taisho 12), pp.1-2; Chosakushu, Vol.1, 258-260. Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.210(n.65).

\(^9^5\)Normally Takakura would have been expected to be in Edinburgh for one more year, but he thought it more important to explore "aspects of England's religious world, which is at various points different" from Scotland. Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.9-10; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.13-14.
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near Newark-on-Trent.96 The Society had begun in 1890 as a training centre for Anglican curates, initially with a particular missionary focus on "Corea." Herbert Kelly had been centrally instrumental in the monastery's beginning and growth.97 Interestingly, Kelly had spent five years in Japan during the 1880's (around Meiji 20), working in connection with the Anglican Trinity Seminary in Tokyo and leaving a "strong impression."98 During those years, he was involved in the formation in 1887 (Meiji 20) of the equivalent church in Japan to the Anglican Church, the "Nippon Sei Kokai."99

Takakura was able to pay a visit for four days, experiencing life at the monastery and getting to speak with Father Kelly. Takakura notes the Society’s blending of study and Catholic piety, the communal lifestyle, and "near to Catholic" worship. Interacting with Kelly over a wide range of subjects was particularly meaningful: Takakura reports the Father as a man of "keen insight" and "extremely strong theological conviction," as well as one of the people whom he met in Britain who left a "deep impression." That Takakura wrote extensively about his time in Kelham, as well as mentioned it in his overall recollections of his time in Britain, shows the significant input which Father Kelly and the Society gave to their brief

---


The name "Sei Kokai," by Kelly's and others' descriptions, was chosen as a direct translation of "Holy Catholic Church" in the Apostles’ Creed. Recall the earlier discussion about the importance of the term "kokai" for ecclesiological practice and understanding in Meiji Japan. Cf. Part II, ch.1, p.131(n.96).
Takakura spent the ensuing year in Oxford, but before considering the ways in which Western Christianity came to him during that time, brief mention should be made of Takakura’s trip in April, 1923 (Taisho 12) to Barbizon, France. He enjoyed viewing paintings very much, and in France Takakura was able to see works by da Vinci, Rembrandt, Millet, and others. The explicit and implicit religious themes and underpinnings of such art was in Takakura’s case a much appreciated, if only relatively minor, additional channel of his encountering the Christianity of the West.

3. One Year in Oxford - Mansfield College

Before his trip to the West became a reality, Takakura’s first preference would have been to find a quiet place somewhere in the Japanese countryside, and to immerse himself for two or three years in research and speculation. The time in "quiet, refined" Oxford provided one year at least of such a "blessed life," as he later acknowledged it to have been. Living in a second floor room located above "Fujiya," a shop on Ship Street operated by a Japanese friend, Takakura spent his time "only reading, while surrounded by the books I had bought." He used the Mansfield College Library somewhat, but he attended only a few, uninspiring lectures. "Currently," he wrote soon thereafter, "there is no professor here for whom I have a sense of admiration."102

The range of Takakura’s study and reflection was wide and varied.103 One strand

---


102 Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.1,10-11,12; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.7,14-15,16.

103 One could assume, for example, that Takakura already had with him in Oxford many of the works he later used as references for his dogmatics lectures. He bought great numbers of books in Edinburgh and in Germany, and the fact that
of his interest ran through several Anglican figures, especially Charles Gore, William Inge, Hastings Rashdall, and William Temple. Takakura had actually met all of these men, and "in various meanings" had a "deep interest" in them. By contrast, "I do not have much interest in the English Nonconformists." Takakura thus held the opinion that, outside of some of the Anglican thinkers, "Generally speaking, English theologians lack contemplative and experiential power." 104

Although important, "High Anglican" thought was not the dominant subject of Takakura's study, however. Finding the Mansfield College lectures disappointing, and English theology in general wanting, Takakura oddly enough found his Oxford-

a substantial portion of the books listed as lecture references were published in Edinburgh, Germany, or London, and prior to 1923, suggests that Takakura had acquired many of them by or during his year in Oxford. As to their variety, a quick perusal of these works reveals, for instance, authors of several different nationalities (e.g., German, English, Scottish, American, French, Danish) and ecclesiastical affiliations (e.g., Anglican, various Free Churches, Lutheran, Roman Catholic). Cf. Zenshu, Vols.8,9.


Takakura notes that the Presbyterian John Oman and the Congregationalist P.T. Forsyth--both of whom interested him deeply, as we shall see--were of Scottish origin, even though they spent their adult years in England. Moreover, Takakura does not specifically mention here Alfred E. Garvie and Sydney Cave. As both the aforementioned lists of reference works and the FK bibliography show, however, Takakura did appreciate, later on at least, the importance of such contemporary English Congregationalists as Garvie and Cave. Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.185,187, Vol.9, pp.632,634. FK, p.174; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.455.

Takakura’s absence of explicit mention of these two could have been simply out of convenience. It might have been due to his current interest in Catholicism expressed in the essay being quoted, which may have caused him somewhat to overstate his lack of interest in English Nonconformists. He even may have been aware of the non-English backgrounds of both men (Garvie’s parents belonged to Scottish families who had earlier settled in Poland, where he himself was born; Cave was born in Aberdeen), thus consciously eliminating them from the English Nonconformist category. L.G. Wickenhamlegg and E.T. Williams, eds., Dictionary of National Biography, 1941-1950. London: Oxford University Press, 1959, p.289; Who Was Who 1951-1960. 2nd ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1964, p.194.
based research interests directed primarily towards the thought of four non-English writers. One was John Oman, the Scottish-born, Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics (Divinity) at Westminster College in Cambridge. But Takakura’s concentration on Oman actually waited until the following autumn, upon attending the Presbyterian Church of England minister’s lectures at Westminster. Takakura thus writes, "During the time of reading on the [second] floor of ‘Fujiya’..., the thinkers who moved my faith and theological thought were [Baron Friedrich von] Hügel, [Ernst] Troeltsch, and [P.T.] Forsyth." Takakura does not specifically say how he came into contact with the writings of von Hügel and Troeltsch. One could imagine Takakura having read von Hügel’s The Mystical Element in Religion, as Studied in St. Catherine of Genoa and Her Friends in connection with his own essay on the Italian mystic. The high quality of von Hügel’s interpretative work underlies "the common judgment that no modern work on mysticism has been more influential than this one" and, Takakura wrote his piece on Catherine eleven years after von Hügel’s book was published. However, Takakura makes no mention of The Mystical Element either in the essay, or in other contemporary documents, e.g., his diary. There is thus no conclusive evidence that Takakura was aware of von Hügel’s writings—or

---


108 Welch, 1985, p.42.
Troeltsch’s, for that matter—before travelling to Britain.109

William Inge may have introduced von Hügel to Takakura. Takakura himself points out Inge’s and others’ high praise of von Hügel as the "deepest thinker amongst contemporary theologians in England," as well as his undisputed rank as "the greatest Catholic theologian since Newman." Takakura then proceeds to recount how "led by Hügel, I came to have a liking for Troeltsch. In both men’s thought there are points that reciprocally respond to the other person's."110 Perhaps Inge, then, was the catalyst for von Hügel, and then Troeltsch, coming to Takakura.

Another possibility would be W.P. Paterson. The two examples Takakura gives of von Hügel’s and Troeltsch’s "reciprocally responding points" are "the way of thinking relative to fundamental problems of religious philosophy" and the similar manner in which the two "essentially viewed Catholicism."111 These sound strikingly similar to Paterson’s own emphases.112 And Paterson very well may

109The Mystical Element in Religion is listed as a reference for Takakura’s dogmatics lectures, but this does not help in deciding whether or not Takakura knew of the book before 1921 (Taisho 10). Zenshu, Vol.8, p.182.


111Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.13,17; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.16-17,20.

112In praising Paterson’s The Rule of Faith, Takakura remarks that in that book Paterson demonstrates that he "essentially understands Catholicism." Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.4; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.10. Although the Japanese here is clear, the English as rendered is ambiguous. By his wording "honshitsuteki ni rikai shite
have referred Takakura and others of his students to von Hügel and Troeltsch, since Paterson makes explicit mention of both of them in the additional chapter on "Movements of the Twentieth Century" included in his 1932, enlarged fourth edition of The Rule of Faith.\(^{113}\) Quite possibly, von Hügel’s and Troeltsch’s books were purchased at Paterson’s suggestion, and were thus among those "surrounding" Takakura in his room on Ship Street.\(^{114}\)

**a. Baron Friedrich von Hügel**

However the connection came about, Takakura succinctly recounts how the works of von Hügel and Troeltsch, and then Forsyth, "moved" him. Beginning with von Hügel, Takakura records how he "fervently read all of his writings. In particular, Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion edified me the most, at certain points charming my soul."\(^{115}\) Takakura goes on to describe two areas in which

\(^{113}\)W.P. Paterson, The Rule of Faith. 4th enl. ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932, pp.397,398-401. The original version was published in 1912; Takakura was in Edinburgh for the 1921-22 (Taisho 10-11) academic year.

\(^{114}\)In the continued attempt to focus on Takakura’s concrete historical context, it could be suggested that H.R. Mackintosh also may have helped introduce von Hügel and Troeltsch to Takakura. Troeltsch had been scheduled to speak in London, Oxford, and Edinburgh during a tour planned for March, 1923, a trip cancelled by his untimely death. Troeltsch, 1923, Introduction, p.xi. On the inside front cover of the copy of this book housed in New College Edinburgh Library, there is a handwritten note from von Hügel: "To the Rev. Professor H.R. Mackintosh[,] for all he had planned, for the now great dead man, in Edinburgh."

\(^{115}\)"...keihatsu suru tokoro mottomo dai de atte, aru ten de ha watashi no tamashi o miryo suru mono ga atta." Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.13; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.16. Reproduced in Oshio, p.116. As previously noted (cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.208(n.55)), Takakura wrote this essay recounting his years overseas—here serving as our guide--back in Japan in January, 1925 (Taisho 14), so he would have been referring to the said book’s first series. Baron Friedrich von Hügel, Essays & Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1921. Takakura included both the first and second 1926 series in the bibliography of his (1927; Showa 2) FK. FK, p.175; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.457-458. Essays, The Mystical Element of Religion, and von Hügel’s Eternal Life are reference works for
he found von Hügel particularly instructive: "One was the idea of grace as a fundamental problem of philosophy of religion, the other was an essential look at Catholicism."116

Regarding von Hügel’s insights into the idea of grace, Takakura writes:

According to him, the essential characteristic of religious experience itself lies in the experience of grace. Divine-consciousness is consciousness of grace. God, the object of religious consciousness, is not limited to being a simple value, but is reality. He shows this by the phrase, ‘The divine givenness’. Such things as ‘The Otherness, The Prevenience of God, The one-sided relation between God and men’ comprise fundamental elements of religious experience. Religious experience is consciousness of God working, of grace working.117

Takakura in the next sentence contrasts such religious experience with a "culture-consciousness" which emphasises "self working, human living" as opposed to "divine living." He then points out that the "god given by value recognition can never become God as the object of religion." Takakura then immediately notes the mystical element in true, gracious religious experience: "The move from rational recognition of God to religious recognition presupposes a mysterious leap."118

Takakura then describes how von Hügel instructed him on the essential nature of the Christian faith’s expression as a community, i.e., "Christianity’s supernatural side, as well as special historical, revelational, [and] incarnational characteristics." Takakura thus continues, "Next, through him, for the first time I came to have an interest in an essential look at Catholicism." The ideas of the Church as a strong guarantee of grace, as a mother disciplining the faithful, and as having a "grand

---


117Emphases original. The phrases enclosed by quotation marks are written in English by Takakura.

118Emphases original. op.cit.
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unity and universality" are valuable and instructive. That "the Catholic faith is a theocentric, supernatural thing, as well as abundant in an other-worldly atmosphere" gives modern Protestantism much cause for reflection. These aspects of Catholicism Takakura found particularly praiseworthy and helpful as he encountered them--again, "for the first time"--through von Hügel’s writings.119

Writing from the vantage point of approximately two years later, Takakura also includes certain criticisms of Catholicism. For example, in Takakura's words, Catholic piety’s special qualities, "such as the soul’s purification and purgatorial pilgrimage," are rooted in "a type of static mysticism," which in turn is based on "Catholicism’s coupling of a metaphysicalised view of God and sacramentalism." Despite this sort of idea with which he "could not at all agree with," Takakura could still claim that considering Catholicism "suitably gives light to the problems of our souls."120

As one who considered himself squarely within Protestantism, Takakura was by no means alone in learning from von Hügel, the Catholic layman: he "was very highly regarded by many Protestants as a Roman Catholic who was ecumenically open to other Christians."121 Spending most of his life in Britain, von Hügel lived and wrote through the so-called "modernist crisis" within Western European Catholicism, which spanned the two decades surrounding the turn of the twentieth century. In writing about the Catholic "modernism" for which von Hügel served as a "rallying point," one analyst describes the movement as

the more or less simultaneous awakening of a number of Roman Catholics, in different places and different circumstances, but mostly rather well educated, and all strikingly aware of the intellectual and other advances of their own era and milieu, to the serious

inadequacies of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical system of thought and practice then current.

Underlining the importance of von Hügel's role this same analyst writes, "He alone of the modernists was truly cosmopolitan."122

Baron von Hügel sought to live by the principle that "truth, not orthodoxy, [is] the real object of his life's search, and that it [is] orthodoxy's obligation to come to terms with truth."123 Many English Protestants, too, were "in search of foundations,"124 having had the orthodox teachings they had received rocked by profound changes in society and in the intellectual world. For many Christians, von Hügel was a positive example of one "who took account of the modern world of science and historical study, but was able at the same time to preserve and convey a profound religious sense of the mystery lying in the depths of human personality, and met and answered by the 'Perfect Reality' of God."125 As another writer remarks, "No other man was more eulogized by people of varied backgrounds and divergent interests."126 For both the "fervently reading" Takakura and many other English Christians, then, Friedrich von Hügel provided valuable and much appreciated guidance in their England-based quests for truth.

b. Ernst Troeltsch

As already mentioned, part of von Hügel's guidance for Takakura meant leading him to the thought of Professor Ernst Troeltsch. Takakura names two of Troeltsch's works which "especially moved" him: "Grundprobleme der Ethik" ("Fundamental Problems of Ethics"), and Protestantische Christentum und Kirche


123Ibid., p.244.


125Heron, 1980, pp.177-178.

in der Neuzeit (Protestant Christianity and the Church in Modern Times). Just as he did in recounting what he had learned through von Hügel’s writings, Takakura mentions two areas in which he was particularly enlightened by Troeltsch. First, through "Fundamental Problems of Ethics" Takakura was provoked to deal with the "relationship between Christianity and culture." In the latter work, Troeltsch’s "historical intuition" revealed much to Takakura about "various problems of modern Protestantism." Given Troeltsch’s importance in turn-of-the-twentieth-century Western Christian thought, it is not surprising that he would have spoken to Takakura concerning such broad, foundational issues of "Christianity and culture" and "modern Protestantism." As one recent summary of nineteenth century, Western Protestant thought describes Troeltsch:

More than any single figure, he stands at the end of nineteenth-century Protestant thought as the one in whom the central issues converge in sharp focus. As Albrecht Ritschl opens the period from 1870 to World War I with a concentration on the dominant concerns of the theology of the time, so Troeltsch most clearly reflects the results of the consideration of faith, history, ethics, and their interrelations at the end of the century.


129Welch, 1985, p.266.
Going further back than Ritschl, one can see Troeltsch as wrestling with fundamental longings of German philosophy—which were articulated by Leibniz, and further developed by Kant and Hegel—to be "not reducible to logic" and more "human" than pre-Leibniz, dominant Platonic "quasi-mathematical" propositions would allow.130 In grappling as such with the very nature of philosophy itself, Troeltsch furthermore reached beyond the boundaries of ecclesiastical thought into the heart of the overriding concern of "the more imaginative thinkers" in the Europe of his day. That concern was "that the former conceptions of a rational reality" were insufficient, and that...the 'activity of human consciousness' for the first time...seemed to offer the only link between man and the world of society and history."131 As for specifically Christian concerns, Troeltsch dealt critically with the massive issues in Protestant theology presented to Ritschl and others by "our great master"132 Schleiermacher: these issues focused on no less than dealing with the psychology and historicity of living religion itself.133 All of these various and converging concerns with which Ernst Troeltsch dealt were foundational in the history of Western, including Western Christian, thought. Sensing that the foundations were eroding and instable, Troeltsch once declared to a group of fellow theologians, "Gentleman, everything wobbles."134


131Hughes, 1979, pp.427-428.


That Troeltsch so pointedly felt his own, his religion’s, and his entire civilisation’s insecurity was due to the impermanency and evaporation of absolutes that had occurred with the "radical historical-cultural relativism"\textsuperscript{135} which had come to pervade contemporary Western thought. This historicisation of thought had not, of course, bypassed the hallowed disciplines of theology. Another commentator notes:

As Ernst Troeltsch remarked, the very phrase ‘purely historical’ (rein historisch) implies a complete Weltanschauung, which embraced theology as much as it did every other aspect of existence. ‘The historical method is a leaven which, once applied to biblical science and church history, alters everything until it finally explodes the entire structure of theological methods employed until the present.’\textsuperscript{136}

Amidst the confusion brought about by such an ”explosion of the entire structure of theological methodology,” and yet true to the "radical historicity" of his day, Troeltsch was throughout his life "consistent in his conviction that history is not only the source of the problems but also the source of their solutions."\textsuperscript{137} For Troeltsch, answers to the questions, "Where was one to find firm foothold, a grounding for truth and value in the flow of all things human? What defense was there against the onslaughts of skepticism and relativism?"\textsuperscript{138} could only be found on an "historical grounding based on studies of uncompromised integrity." It was this "descriptive, comparative, evaluative, and constructive task" of cooperating between dogmatics and historical studies which demanded, and received, Troeltsch’s full energies.\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{135}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{138}Hughes, 1979, p.231.

Although Troeltsch is sometimes analysed either "as the systematician or dogmatician of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule," or "as a philosopher of religion...[holding a particular] idea of the religious a priori," he is thus more properly to be seen "primarily from the standpoint of Der Historismus, as [carrying out] the attempt to deal with the problems of history and the philosophy of history on the grand scale." This is the framework in which Troeltsch’s thought came to Takakura, at least according to the manner in which Takakura describes the two areas of stimulation he received from "Grundprobleme der Ethik" and Protestantische Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit.

Takakura first describes how Troeltsch "fundamentally discusses the relationship between Christianity and culture." Cultural values such as those of family, society, state, and art are governed by an immanent ethic, which is independent in its own right as an ethic of culture. On the other hand, a supernatural ethic, rooted in religion, "as an ascetic ethic works on culture, purifying and raising it. The immanent cultural ethic and the supernatural religious ethic stand in a polaristic relationship, and while both simultaneously repel and seek the other, they mutually complement each other." Troeltsch then relatedly, according to Takakura, distinguishes between Jesus’ ethic and a "Kantian, formal, autonomous ethic": Jesus’ ethic has a "concrete, objective content and purpose," namely the "kingdom of God." Takakura goes on to remark how Troeltsch "clearly explains the meaning of the kingdom of God which the Bible teaches, correcting the modernised, humanistic view of the kingdom of God."  

His mention of things "modernised" eventually leads Takakura into describing "‘modern’ Protestantism":

In Troeltsch’s Protestantische Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit, the situation which passes from the Golden Age (in the

---

140Welch, 1985, pp.268-275.

relational sense) of Luther's and Calvin's Reformation time, through the Enlightenment thought of the eighteenth century, and then changes to modern, liberal Protestantism is described with exceedingly acute historical intuition. His historical view in particular is a thing of discernment which penetrates between the lines.\(^{142}\)

Troeltsch's analysis of "old Protestantism" through the seventeenth century is that it should be viewed at various points as an extension of the Catholicism of the Middle Ages; "true, modern Protestantism" then appeared from the time of eighteenth century Enlightenment thought. Takakura then comments that even though there are alternative theories to this particular interpretation, nevertheless "Enlightenment thought and rationalism of recent times are tremendous dangers as far as Protestantism is concerned.... Rationalism, naturalism, agnosticism, atheism, materialism: modern Protestantism has been successively threatened by these things."\(^{143}\)

Upon reiterating how various problems of modern Protestantism were clarified for him by Troeltsch's writings, Takakura singles out the "degeneration of the idea of grace"\(^{144}\) as the problem which "especially stimulated\(^{145}\) my heart." As Takakura explains, "If you take away the idea of grace from Christianity, its religious life as such becomes nothing."\(^{146}\) This personalised reading of Troeltsch begins to show the depth of stimulation Takakura received. And Takakura considers that stimulation significant enough to remark, "I think it necessary that anyone dealing with the problem of Christianity and culture by all means [at least]

\[^{142}\]"Exceedingly acute historical intuition" renders "shinkoku sugiru hodo na rekishiteki chokkan." The final sentence is, "Kare no shikan koso ha gANKO shihai ni tessuru mono de aro."


\[^{144}\]"oncho kannen no taika"

\[^{145}\]"shigeki shita"

once touch the thought of Troeltsch.\textsuperscript{147}

c. Peter Taylor Forsyth

Takakura continues his recollections of his year in Oxford as follows:

On the [second] floor of 'Fujiya', I also was engrossed in the writings of Forsyth. I read everything of his I could get my hands on, even articles of his published in magazines. As far as the recent English-American theological world is concerned, I cannot find any other theologian filled with insight that has conviction, and burning with evangelical faith, as much as he. He is certainly a great theologian.

The distinctive qualities of Forsyth's writings, "filled with positive faith behind the words," could quickly be recognised by any reader, writes Takakura. His works are not "dry like most theological writing," but "each doctrine oozes out of his central conviction."\textsuperscript{148} Perhaps the spring of life which Takakura sensed coming through Forsyth's writing was what had been deepened through Forsyth's bereavement after losing his wife of fifteen years, as well as through a constant digestive ailment suffered throughout life, similar to Takakura himself.\textsuperscript{149} Takakura eventually concludes his section on Forsyth by expressing, "I recognise and am thankful for the many matters of faith and of theology in which I was enlightened through Forsyth."\textsuperscript{150} Forsyth obviously meant a great deal to Takakura both personally and intellectually.

"The first" of (again) two areas of instruction Takakura selects to describe "was that


231
the essence of evangelicalism was forcefully clarified through him..."151 Ever since his conversion to Christianity through Uemura Masahisa, Takakura had learned of the evangelical faith.152 Moreover, Takakura had known of Forsyth’s evangelicalism from seminary days, i.e., since about fifteen years earlier. But Takakura had experienced a decade-and-a-half of living and thinking since sitting under Uemura’s ministry in Tokyo, and Forsyth had in the meantime written several more books and articles. In this sense, then, the time was ripe for Takakura to have evangelicalism "clarified" through Forsyth.

That it was the matter of evangelical faith which was singled out by Takakura is not at all surprising in light of Forsyth’s writings and career. Only two books are mentioned here in Takakura’s comments on this first point concerning evangelicalism: Faith, Freedom and the Future and Principle of Authority.153 But Takakura in various other places refers to a sizeable portion of the Forsythian corpus.154 Although it is difficult to classify Forsyth’s thought,155 much less

---


152One should recall here what was pointed out earlier, though, namely that "evangelical" has a variety of meanings. Cf. Part II, ch.1, p.180(n.289).


154Takakura’s dogmatics lecture reference lists and FK bibliography alone include the following works by Forsyth, in addition to the two already mentioned (unless otherwise noted, the works are books published by London: Hodder and Stoughton):

* "Revelation of the Bible" Hibbert Journal 10, Oct., 1911, pp.235-252;
* Theology in Church and State, 1914;
* Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind, 1907;
* The Person and Place of Jesus Christ. London: Independent Press, 1909;
* The Work of Christ, 1910;
reduce it to a single theme, it is fair to say that "Forsyth devoted most of his interest to the Work of Christ.... [T]he objective Atonement is the controlling idea of his theological perspective." 156 As the single most extensive examination of Forsyth's theology concludes, "It is our conviction that he was evangelical. He was not evangelical in the sense of adopting some system of theology which might go by that name, but rather in the sense of seeking before all else to hear and serve the evangel of Christ, the apostolic preaching. He sought to give it clear and fresh exposition for his generation." 157

Takakura begins to explain the meaning of Forsyth's evangelicalism by pointing out that it sought to "give life to...the evangelicalism that bloomed with the Reformers," which moreover was "rooted in the faith of the New Testament, particularly the faith of Paul." 158 Other commentators on Forsyth concur, 159 including what this

---

* The Cruciality of the Cross, 1909;
* Lectures on the Church and the Sacraments. London: Longman, Green, 1917;
* This Life and the Next: The Effect on This Life of Faith in Another. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1918.


155 As one relatively early analyst of Forsyth puts it, "Forsyth cannot be placed in a convenient theological niche, and such characterizations of him as 'a forerunner of neo-orthodoxy' or 'a Barthian before Barth' are likely to confuse as well as to clarify. He is a member of no 'school'." Robert McAfee Brown, P.T. Forsyth: Prophet for Today. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952, p.12.


meant for what has been termed an "evangelical mystical" experience of grace:

Forsyth takes his stand with 'the true mystic', by which he means the evangelical mystic. Adolf Deissmann draws the distinction between... 'acting' and 'reacting' mysticism.... The 'reacting' mystic... like Paul and Augustine and the great spiritual geniuses of the Church, does not search for God, but responds or 'reacts' to a God who has initiated the search, and made himself known through revelation. The moral and not the metaphysical is therefore the motive of this type of mysticism. To this latter category Forsyth belongs.¹⁶⁰

Hence Takakura continues by pointing out that Forsyth "thoroughly seeks to emphasise that Christianity is a religion of grace." In contrast to Catholicism, which teaches salvation by the cooperation of faith and good works, Forsyth "never tires" of stressing that only by faith in God’s grace in Christ alone will sinners be saved.¹⁶¹

Forsyth himself intertwines these various themes—in his easily recognisable style—in the following comments on certainty:

In the Roman view salvation, grace, is something comparatively external. It is a donum superadditum to the native power of man. It is attached to the rest of his life by the supernatural agency of the Church; and he might become isolated from the Church, and put out of reach of the addition required. His security cannot become an inward, direct, and permanent certainty. But in the Protestant faith man was made for Christ and His salvation. That is human destiny. And his faith is to trust and act Christianly in the occasions and vocations of life as thus created. It is in that medium that the experience comes home. And especially in the moral life and its


experiences.\textsuperscript{162}

Such terms as "Christ," "grace," "salvation," "moral," and "experience" are prominent words in Forsyth's vocabulary.

As Takakura continues, he notes that for Forsyth, "Our faith should not be thought of as having freedom and human desire as the cardinal points, but should be established on authority and grace as central emphases." The life of faith is not to put freedom first, but authority--obedience to which gives true faith-rooted freedom for the Christian.\textsuperscript{163} The historical context helps to explain why Forsyth would have stressed authority and certainty, for his were days of "profound disturbance" in late nineteenth and early twentieth century England. There were large-scale domestic shifts toward philosophic idealism, as well as changes in social mores, morality, and the arts. Combined with international, economic, and political challenges associated with Britain's reduced status from world trade monopoliser to world trade competitor, all of the turbulence served as causal factors for the unease of the times.\textsuperscript{164} So acute was the sense of upheaval that Forsyth could write in 1912, "In this unprecedented social revolution, so indicative of a spiritual, the question that naturally becomes imperative is the question of an authority."\textsuperscript{165}

Forsyth focuses his introductory comments of this work on "the question of an authority" by pointing towards a religious answer:

\begin{quote}
The conviction in these pages is that the principle of authority is ultimately the whole religious question, that an authority of any practical kind draws its meaning and its right only from the soul's relation to God, that this is so not only for religion strictly so called, nor for a Church, but for public life, social life, and the whole history and career of Humanity."\textsuperscript{166}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{162}Forsyth, \textit{Principle of Authority}, 1912, p.396.


\textsuperscript{165}Forsyth, \textit{Principle of Authority}, 1912, Prologue, p.2.

\textsuperscript{166}Ibid., p.3.
A major part of the background for Forsyth's concern was the theological storm which raged within Protestantism, corresponding somewhat to the Catholic "modernist crisis" mentioned earlier, in association with the so-called "New Theology" represented by R.J. Campbell. Campbell had deliberately adopted this label,\textsuperscript{167} publishing a book in 1907 bearing the same title.\textsuperscript{168} Based on the conviction of the immanence of God in man's religiosity, Campbell advocated the constructive expressions of the Christian spirit in the movement toward socialist government and corporate understandings of society at large.\textsuperscript{169}

While this was possibly just a "peripheral venture" amongst "the late-nineteenth-century efforts to relate Christianity to modern culture,"\textsuperscript{170} P.T. Forsyth certainly did not see the movement as an innocent, passing trend. For Forsyth, the "New Theology" was the most serious threat to Christianity since the second century, and indeed was a reappearance of gnosticism.\textsuperscript{171} His swift rejoinder to Campbell's book was an article in the \textit{British Weekly},\textsuperscript{172} deftly entitled "The Newest Theology." Forsyth begins by claiming that the central issue involves "the point I am always pressing but cannot easily get people to face--the point of our central and final authority." He commends the past generation's search for freedom "from a stiff and thin orthodoxy,"\textsuperscript{173} but laments the current stress on protecting the general, vague notion of "freedom" birthed by the earlier, noble

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{167}{Welch, 1985, p.221.}
\footnote{169}{Langford, 1969, p.33.}
\footnote{170}{Welch, 1985, pp.223,225-227.}
\footnote{171}{op.cit., 1969, pp.38-40; Rodgers, 1965, p.30.}
\footnote{172}{This was soon followed by another article in \textit{The Old Faith and the New Theology}, collected by E.H. Vine. Langsford, 1969, p.38.}
\footnote{173}{Forsyth singles out "the great [F.D.] MAURICE...[who] at his core provided the continuous evangelical centre to which we returned from all the excursions and alarms which attracted eager spirits in such an age." Caps original.}
\end{footnotes}
quest for truth: "We must transfer the emphasis from the freedom which truth breathes to the truth which breathes freedom." This truth is the gospel, God's holy love in Christ, Forsyth asserts. He then summarily concludes:

The first thing needful is not an extension of our freedom, but an interrogation of it. We go back—back to KANT, back to LUTHER, back to the Church, back to the Bible, back to CHRIST. And the question we ask them all is, 'What is your Gospel?' It is the historic, the positive, instead of the speculative way. And only one of them says, 'I am your Gospel, Who, from My Cross, am your absolute Lord.'

To Forsyth, just as gnosticism's "speculative" longing for a "romantic-idealistic" redemption ran counter to Christianity's "moral-historic" salvation, so did Campbell's "New Theology," with its idealistic philosophy, challenge "the whole historical character of Christianity." Campbell's search to find the proper replacement for the Scriptures as an infallible authority in itself was not wrong: the emergence of modern thought had correctly discarded an innerrant Bible as no longer acceptable. The tragic and fundamental error was a misconstruing of

---


177 Ibid., p.39; Forsyth, "The Newest Theology," 1907, pp.1-2. Welch points out how Forsyth was in favour of using the tools of biblical criticism, "provided we do not allow criticism to become our master but let it be our friend and servant." He further elaborates on Forsyth's posture toward "modern principles":

The modern principles that Forsyth heartily approved (he liked the term 'modern' much better than 'liberal') included the freedom of the individual from external authority, the social idea of organic salvation and the socialized conception of personality, the distinction between theoretical and practical knowledge (stressing the ethical dimension), the idea of historic evolution, and the passion for reality.... But against liberalism's misuse of these principles, Forsyth wanted to insist on the objectivity and authority of the gospel.

Welch, 1985, pp.150,237-237, with references to Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind.
the Cross, a denial of God's grace and holiness as well as man's guilt and sin, a misplacement of authority in man instead of God.\textsuperscript{178}

Reminiscent of his comments on Paterson, Takakura considers Forsyth's faith and theology, with their stress on authority, properly to be designated as "Calvinistic Evangelicalism." Takakura notes Forsyth's use of the term "New Calvinism," as well as Forsyth's praise of Calvinism's emphasis on the freedom of God. To Takakura, these comments "deeply touch the essence of religion and faith themselves."\textsuperscript{179}

Takakura next moves to the second area in which Forsyth instructed him, which involves the Church. In particular, Takakura mentions Forsyth's ideas on the meaning of the Church for Protestantism, as well as the important connection between the Church and theology.\textsuperscript{180} As to the former, the Church's meaning becomes clearer by first mentioning false examples of the Church, namely "simply a Christian, philanthropy society" and "a club attempting to give a fulfilling cultural consciousness." By contrast, the Church's special characteristic is that it is a "(collective) body of grace."\textsuperscript{181} The Church must be a religious body which stands on the basis of positive and historic faith." Apart from presupposing the "historic, objective faith which originates out of the New Testament, and has created the Christian Church down through the generations," the Church has no meaning. "In other words, when the Protestant Church stands on the orthodox, evangelical faith, its meaning can begin to be fully discovered."\textsuperscript{182}


\textsuperscript{180}Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.21; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.23. Reproduced in Oshio, pp.123.

\textsuperscript{181}"oncho no dantai"

\textsuperscript{182}Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.23; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.25. Reproduced in Oshio, pp.125.
By the "positive," "historic," "objective," "orthodox," "evangelical" faith, Takakura is referring to what Forsyth additionally describes as the Church's "dogma," or "primary theology." It is "a stateable something fontal, fundamental and final, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." The Church's dogma is not to be a set of the lowest common denominators of faith: "It is not reduction I suggest but rather compression." That is, "it is a truth not simply held by the Church but held as constitutive for it. It holds the Church rather than is held by it."183 This is the gospel, the evangel; and, if the word "dogma" cannot be used, the word "Kerygma" would be an acceptable alternative. For Forsyth, "It is the thing preached that matters; the word for it is secondary."184

What thus becomes for Forsyth "secondary theology" is the Church's "doctrine," i.e., "experience which has passed into the Church's reflection." What is usually termed "theology" is even more "tentative" than "doctrine," and theology's "chief object" is "to prepare material for the doctrine by which the collective Church preaches its dogma to the intelligent world, 'placarded' and writ large." Always, though, the driving force for doctrine and theology must the gospel or dogma: "Both the doctrine and the theology of a Church will be what its germinal dogma make them under varying conditions."185

Whether "Theology" be broken down into "dogma," "doctrine," and "theology," or into "primary" and "secondary," whenever and wherever the Church is, so should theology be. This notion is what Forsyth instilled in Takakura; hence Takakura cites Forsyth's statement, "No theology, no Church."186 Takakura further remarks that the "weak sentimentalism and shallow utilitarianism within the current Christian Church in Japan" is very much related to the absence of a recognition of

---


184 Ibid., p.62.

185 Ibid., pp.51,54.

"the true meaning of theology." For as he notes directly before his final statement of thanksgiving for all that he has learned through Forsyth, "Where there is no true theology, in fact there is neither strong, deep faith." 187

Having reviewed what Forsyth had given to him, Takakura thus closes his recollections of his time spent in Oxford. As we emerge with Takakura out of his second-floor room, we can sense the importance of the year spent here wrestling with the writings of some the most incisive thinkers of contemporary Western Europe. There have been intermittent strolls through some of Oxford’s lovely parks, as well as reflective considerations of the portraits of Gladstone, Locke, and Pusey in the Christ Church Assembly Hall. 188 But above all it has been the books, those lovely mounds of books that have made this year special. Amidst them all, the writings of three men have stood out: von Hügel, Troeltsch, and Forsyth. Each in his own way has given much stimulus, as well as shed new light on foundational issues with which Takakura had already been dealing. 189 But if one of the men had to be chosen—not only out of this year, but from the entire time spent in Britain—as the thinker who had given the most lasting and fundamental insights, he could be selected without much hesitation: "Forsyth." 190

4. One Term in Cambridge - Westminster College

As mentioned earlier, for several years before he ended up travelling to Britain for
his period of study, Takakura had thought of going to the United States.191 Even until towards the end of his year in Oxford, he had hoped to attend Union Theological Seminary in New York.192 Then news of the devastating 1 September 1923 (Taisho 12) earthquake in Tokyo made Takakura want to return to Japan "to suffer together with my countrymen." But in the end he changed his mind, and decided to spend the fall term enrolled in Westminster College in Cambridge, "because I wanted to attend the lectures of Principal Oman." In retrospect, Takakura was thus "not in the least disappointed that I was unable to study in America."193

Upon initial consideration of Takakura’s school term in Cambridge spent learning from John Oman, and indeed within Takakura’s own recounting of that experience, there is somewhat of an anticlimactic feeling.194 Perhaps this is due to the relative shortness of the time (three months), the intensity of the previous year in Oxford, and/or the anticipation of returning to Japan. Nevertheless, Oman served as a significant stimulus in both new and old areas, such that Takakura could affirm

191Cf. Part I, pp.92,94.

192There is no clear indication as to why Takakura developed and sustained the desire to study in the United States, and in particular at Union. Generally speaking, the American missionary connection with the NKK was the strongest amongst other nationalities, and Uemura had various ties with American churches and people. More specifically, Union Seminary must have had a strong reputation in Japan: there was a steady stream (twenty) of Japanese students attending from 1892 through 1910 (Meiji 25-43). Thus perhaps either through the recommendation of those who had studied at Union, or through the writings of some of Union’s professors (works of Philip Schaff, C.A. Briggs, and W.A. Brown are all listed as references for Takakura’s dogmatics lectures), Takakura repeatedly, albeit unsuccessfully, attempted to fulfil his desire to go and study there. Charles Rigsley Gillett, comp., Union Theological Seminary Bulletin, General Catalogue, 1836-1918 2, No.4, May, 1919, pp.xii-xv,337-429; Zenshu, Vol.8, p.109,185, (and possibly) Vol.9, p.704.


194One senses this with Oshio as well. He does not reproduce Takakura’s account of his interaction with Oman as he does for the time in Oxford, and Oshio offers only the briefest of comments about the benefit Takakura gained from attending Oman’s lectures. Oshio, p.102.
Mackintosh's high evaluation of the Westminster Principal as "the most weighty theologian in contemporary Britain" with his own: "Certainly Oman is one of a handful of great theologians throughout England and Scotland."\(^{195}\)

In expanding on Oman's theological importance, Takakura writes, "He is a scholar rich in philosophical elementals, abundant in thoughtful insight, a strong person of theological conviction."\(^ {196}\) That Oman had "theological conviction"\(^ {197}\) did not mean strict adherence to any conceptual, articulated theological form: for him there was "not an inerrant scripture, not a revered tradition, not a normative creed."\(^ {198}\)

Fitting the description given earlier of von Hügel, Oman valued truth over inherited orthodoxy, and reality over ecclesiastical conformity.\(^ {199}\) This passionate bent became pointedly clear to Oman himself when he was a student at Edinburgh University,\(^ {200}\) during which time the "Robertson Smith Case" was raging. Over forty years later, Oman recounted some of his own impressions of Smith when he was amidst his trial:

> When I went to the university..., the Robertson Smith case was shaking the whole land.... I read his speeches, and, on one occasion, heard him. I seemed to find the same kind of knowledge as was making the world a place for me of incessant discovery and the same passion for reality as seemed at the moment life's supreme concern.

Moreover, it was striking to Oman that many were saying of Robertson Smith,

\(^{195}\)Emphasis original. *Oncho to Shinjitsu*, p.25; *Chosakushu*, Vol.2, p.26-27. Takakura had read Oman in earlier years. As to how he became acquainted with Oman's newer works, Mackintosh's praise is one clue. Takakura's likely addition of Oman's book(s) to reference works for his only extant English paper, written in Edinburgh, is another. Quite possibly, then, Takakura began to see afresh the value in Oman's thought through the input of his professors in Edinburgh. Oshio, p.60; cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.214(n.86).


\(^{197}\)"shingakujo no kakushin"

\(^{198}\)Bevans, 1992, p.48.

\(^{199}\)Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.225.

\(^{200}\)Oman graduated in 1882 with first class honors in philosophy." op.cit., p.7.
"Even if all he said were true, regard for useful tradition and the ecclesiastical amenities should have kept him from saying it."  

Takakura's comments about Oman's "theological conviction" thus point toward his view of the role of traditional theological sources, especially including the Bible, as "inspiring rather than being inspired, as enabling and persuadeing rather than coercing, and as facilitating theological insight rather than substituting for it." Oman must have fulfilled this sort of role as a teacher, for Takakura the student did not feel coerced to agree with what he saw as Oman's "Ritschlian tendencies," or with Oman's "ethical idealism," or with Oman's wish to "exclude to the extreme mystical elements from Christianity." With these points I cannot possibly agree. At the same time, however, Takakura mentions two specific areas in which he was enlightened by Oman as a person and thinker.

First was Oman's "piety." Takakura initially terms it "Calvinistic," which is not surprising in light of Oman's upbringing on a remote Orkney farmstead in the 1860's and 1870's. As Oman himself later was to write, "Extreme Calvinism I

---


203 Presumably Takakura saw Oman's desire to exclude mysticism from Christian faith and practice at least partly in connection with Oman's understanding of religious experience. On the one hand experience is the ground of religion and theology for Oman, but "experience" is not "gushy, emotional moments of 'mysticism'. Rather, [true experience comes from being] faithful and reflective in living one's life...." For Oman, experience "in the profound sense...[is] an experience of the graciousness and challenge of one's life which is the result of authentic human living." Ibid., pp.60,61. Healey also offers some comments on what he terms "Oman's important but controversial treatment of 'mysticism'." Healey, 1965, p.120.

204 Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.26; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.27.
never came across, for I [already] knew it...."\(^{205}\) No wonder, then, that Takakura continues his description of Oman as one who "respects ethical discipline."\(^{206}\)

Takakura then goes on to remark how Oman "pays a great amount of respect to the piety of the Old Testament prophets." It was through Oman, Takakura continues, that "I had my eyes opened in a new way relative to the religion of the prophets."\(^{207}\) Again, for Oman this did not mean a blind obedience to the supposed infallible teaching of the (apostles and) prophets. Nor did it mean

that, because they knew God immediately, we may only know Him at second-hand--that, because they recognized God’s rule directly, we may only do it indirectly. It means, on the contrary, that through them we also are helped to be apostles and prophets, to hear the Spirit of God’s Son in our own hearts and see for our own lives the Divine rule working good through all things.\(^{208}\)

Prophetic religion--and for Oman this meant prophetic religious experience--is thus "apprehension of and response to man’s supernatural environment," seeing God’s personal rule beyond yet manifested through all that happens. Thus neither good nor bad, neither pleasant nor unpleasant events are seen as "outside God’s gracious personal purpose." Moreover, those who share this prophetic faith "are delivered from the dominion of evil, calamity and transiency...by responding to the divine initiative and by committing themselves to the redemptive purposes of God."\(^{209}\)

Prophetic theology, in turn, becomes a "striving for insight in order to be able to see through experience to its deepest meaning," which is "what God is doing in his or her own personal, communal, and historical, experience."\(^{210}\) This piety of the

---


\(^{206}\) op.cit.

\(^{207}\) Ibid.


\(^{209}\) Healey, 1965, pp.121-122.

Old Testament prophets, this prophetic religion, is what Takakura saw in new ways through Oman.

Takakura then simply mentions the second area of Oman's thought which "pulled my interest," which is how Oman "interprets the essence of religion through the idea of 'sacred reality' as religious a priori." Because Takakura offers no further explanation, what he (or Oman) means is not immediately clear. Also, no specific work of Oman's is mentioned here by Takakura, so it very well could be that this area impressed him primarily through Oman's lectures. One could assume, however, that Oman's writings quite naturally contain this idea which particularly interested Takakura. And these works would of course include *Grace and Personality*, which Takakura cites often elsewhere, and which "gives the key to the theological centre of [Oman's] thought."

---


213 This could have been case with the matter of prophetic religion as well.

A copy of Oman's "Philosophy of Religion" lecture notes taken by D.M. Niccol, a student at Westminster College from 1919-1922, has frequent mention of "the sacred." Of interest as well is to note that section eight (out of sixteen) is entitled, "Prophetic-Personal view of God and the Purpose of the World." An explanatory letter attached to the notes, written by Niccol to the College, wonders if the lectures were not given as part of a limited (one- or two-year appointment) university lecturership in approximately 1920, i.e., three years before Takakura heard what likely were very similar lectures. Viewed in Westminster College Library, May, 1993.

The entry point to, as well as axiomatic notion underlying, Oman's religious a priori seems to be his commitment to "the fundamental significance of the person.... In the person, aspects of reality that seem on the surface to be opposite and contradictory are combined in a unique way.... For Oman, only the person...held the secret to reality's meaning." indeed, "Oman raised the personal to the level of an irreducible metaphysical category." In placing such a strong emphasis on the person within an entire philosophical outlook, Oman clearly bore the marks of the Personal Idealism of his day, represented by "[A.S.] Pringle-Pattison, [Hastings] Rashdall, C.C.J. Webb, James Ward, [and] W.R. Sorley." For these Personal Idealists, the general thesis was that "personality is the supremely good thing, that a person is the only truly real thing, that man must be conceived as a person, and that only in God is personality realized in its highest form." 

One should take care not to classify too hastily Oman as a Personal Idealist, but the similarities and mutual influences were strong. This was the case, for example, with Oman's notion in Grace and Personality of the personal interplay between the grace of God and the freedom of man. In a related way, there are also significant epistemological connections: "Like the personal idealists, Oman's theory of knowledge is an appeal to common experience. It is a combination of idealism and empiricism. The person does not create reality, but reality is only known in the measure that it is personally appropriated by the knower." Oman should not be "pigeon-holed," but he clearly bears striking resemblances to Pringle-

---

216 op.cit.
217 op.cit., p.36. It is tantalising to note here that Takakura includes all of these writers in his lecture references, as well as John Baillie, who tended "to interpret the traditional concepts of doctrine in the light of personal values." Galloway, 1986, p.301; Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.18,71,72,186,199, Vol.9, p.701.
220 Bevans, 1992, pp.36-37.
Pattison, Rashdall, and others of like mind.

Having travelled a brief side road, we can now begin to piece together Oman’s idea of "sacred reality" as religious a priori. As already hinted, common experience for Oman is neither purely passive nor purely active. Rather, it consists ideally of "personal authenticity in the way one faces life." And for the one who lives authentically, "all of one’s life, simple things...or awesome things...are occasions when one experiences the reality of life. It is in this kind of experience that theology needs to be rooted." Thus, recalling the idea of prophetic religion:

The Prophets did not arrive at their doctrine of monotheism, says Oman, ‘by meditating on the ideas of unity and omnipotence and their reflection in their souls’. Rather, monotheism emerged ‘from learning in the face of the disasters that God has a purpose no evil can defeat, and that for themselves He was greater than all that could be against them’. Life’s "sacred reality" is thus apprehended in the "religious a priori" of experience—otherwise known as authentic living—by which people see behind the surface of life to God’s dealings within this world. Hence the matter has come full circle, back to the entry point, to "the fundamental significance of the person." For it is here that "aspects of reality that seem on the surface to be opposite and contradictory [e.g., holy and profane, sacred and mundane, supernatural and natural] are combined in a unique way." Thus it is, for Oman, that the person—"the only truly real thing"—holds "the secret to [sacred] reality’s meaning." 

---

221 Emphasis original. Ibid., p.58.

222 Ibid., pp.60-61. The quotations are from Oman’s Concerning the Ministry. London: Student Christian Movement, 1936, p.147.

223 Throughout the discussion there has been an interplay between the notion of "sacred" and what for Oman are other distinguishable, although inseparable, aspects of religious experience, namely "holy," "supernatural," and "theology." Healey, 1965, pp.63-66.

224 Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.246.
In finishing his recollections about Cambridge, Takakura notes that "using the library, [I] studied Calvinism a little." He also enjoyed "daily life with English students for the first time." In this kind of way, then, Takakura’s direct encounter with Western Christianity came to a stimulating, if slightly abrupt, conclusion.

5. Summary

Before returning to Japan with Takakura, how might we summarise the Christianity which God brought to him during his stay in Britain, and through his brief travels nearby? Again the initial answer is "varied," for there were different nationalities, confessional and ecclesiastical affiliations, types of piety, theological issues, specific historical contexts, and philosophical assumptions involved. Yet at the risk of oversimplifying, an attempt at least to give some sort of overall description is needed. This is especially so in light of the thesis’ purpose of bringing together and sorting out the complex process whereby Takakura translated Christianity into his own expression of it. That process necessarily involved using the different forms in which the Christian faith came to him—including what he encountered while in the West.

The initial overall quality involves the obvious, yet fundamentally important, role of language. Excluding the brief periods he spent on the continent, and excepting some of his reading, Takakura was living and learning in English. Part III of the thesis will begin to consider what this meant for Takakura. Here it is important briefly to note what this meant for the Christian faith which came to him, given that it was lived and conceived in the English language.

Takakura encountered living expressions of Christianity in London, Edinburgh, Kelham (ever so briefly), Oxford (somewhat), and Cambridge (at least Westminster

---

225 Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.26; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.27.

College. Each of these examples included their own unique histories and cultures, yet histories and cultures which possessed the commonalities of the same language with which they were so intimately intertwined. This combination of uniqueness and commonality meant particular and yet shared systems of education, government, social life, and the arts, as well as English-language Christianity’s interrelated roles therein. The lectures, discussions, and the myriad of writings that came to Takakura in English carried even more baldly their conceptual heritages, which included among other elements a Latin-based intellectual and theological tradition. The simple yet profound fact that Christianity was conveyed in English thus implies a major part of the first general characteristic of the Christian faith Takakura encountered in Britain.

Having said that, however, we must also take note of what might be called the "German factor." Again the place of language is critical here, especially in relation to Takakura’s two months in Germany and his reading of German materials. But in addition there is that which Takakura himself recognised in noting the need for Scottish as well as English theologians to continue to learn from German theology’s "contemplative and experiential power." And as it turns out, all of the men Takakura singles out as important to his learning in Britain (with the possible exception of the Anglicans) carried out their thinking relative to the significant, if

---

227 The peculiar English-Scottish demarcations and commonalities are worthy of particular mention here.

228 Takakura even read two of Troeltsch’s works in English: Christian Thought and Protestantism and Progress. Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.226(n.127).

229 This point was noted earlier in connection with the American missionaries in Japan. Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.199(n.17).

230 Furthermore, alongside the living expressions of Christianity which came to Takakura, the English-language writings were contemporary, modern works. Hence the commonality of history and culture embedded in the same language was reinforced and focused by a common time frame.

231 Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, pp.210(n.65),219(n.104).
not primary, stimulus of German theology.232

The significance of German thought is obvious with Troeltsch, and with von Hügel as well.233 Mackintosh’s and Paterson’s indebtedness to and involvement with German thought has already been noted.234 As for Forsyth and Oman, particularly from the times of their respective periods of study in Göttingen235 and Erlangen/Heidelberg,236 their interest in German theology was consistent and substantial.237

---

232 In other words, a significant part of these men’s own "translations" and articulations of the Christian faith involved incorporating German thought.

233 The two men’s close friendship and reciprocating thought was described earlier. Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, pp.221(n.110),222(n.114).


236 Oman spent two different summers in Germany, at Erlangen in 1883 and Heidelberg in 1885. Bevans, 1992, p.10.

237 As for Forsyth, “Since he read German well...he managed to keep in close touch with Continental thought. Schlatter, Kaftan, Kähler, Wendt, and Wernle were particularly influential in his writings....” Brown, 1952, p.31. Also,

His daughter tells us that about one-third of the books in his library were in German and that he kept abreast with thought in that country by the regular reading of its periodic literature. This information, along with Forsyth’s own admission of indebtedness to the Germans, has most probably fostered the idea that his chief affiliations as a theological thinker must be looked for in that direction. There can be no doubt that he owed a great deal to Hegel, Ritschl, Kähler, and Zahn, and something to Ihmels, Schaeder, and Schlatter.

Emphasis original. Escott, 1970, p.9. An example of Forsyth’s open acknowledgement of help received from German thought includes what he writes in the preface of Principle of Authority, 1912, p.v: "My largest creditors among many are these...Ihmels...Pfennigsdorf...Schaeder...."

Bevans, after elucidating the important place of Personal Idealism in Oman’s thought, writes, "Oman’s most important influences, however, are German." Bevans, 1992, p.37.
More particularly, the thought of Ritschl and Ritschlianism was noticeably important for most if not all of these men. John Rodgers, for example, in his important analysis of Forsyth's theology asserts, "One could, with reasonable accuracy, describe Forsyth's whole theological pilgrimage as an inner critique of Ritschlian theology." That Ritschl played an important role in the thought of most Western Protestant thinkers who came to maturity during Takakura's day has of course been almost universally asserted. One commonly finds such unequivocal claims as, "Ritschl's dominance in theology during the latter part of the nineteenth century was virtually complete." We can thus come to an initial general description of the Western Christianity being considered here by realising the important place of the English-culture matrix. We are helped as well by Takakura's telling comments about the "Ritschlian" qualities of some of the men who inspired him, and especially by his remarks about the crucial importance of German theology as a whole. Hence while the Christian faith came to Takakura wrapped primarily in the English language, the contents of

238E.g., Mackintosh was involved in translating Ritschl at the turn of the century. Troeltsch and the Ritschlian Herrmann had a running discussion in connection with the different directions each of them took with respect to Ritschl. Oman reflected such Ritschlian themes as "man's capacity for valuation is interdependent with God's gracious offering" and the "insistence on the personal nature of God." Welch, 1985, p.236(n.32); Berkhof, 1989, pp.143-162; Langford, 1969, pp.222-223; Bevans, 1992, p.39.

239The continuation of the quotation should be noted: "One should add immediately, however, that the critique was so radical and basic as to create a position which can only in the most qualified manner be referred to as Ritschlian." Rodgers also points out that Forsyth initially went to Göttingen "in order to sit at the feet of that great, almost overwhelming figure Albrecht Ritschl." Rodgers, 1965, Introduction, p.3. Cf. the discussion on Forsyth and Ritschlianism in Bradley, 1952, pp.103-106.


241As mentioned earlier, Takakura comments specifically about Mackintosh and Oman in this way. Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, pp.208(n.54),243.

242This American writer should like to note the Scottish and English dialects of that "English language."
the package were not therefore only British, they were also, in sizeable measure at least, German.

This German, and particularly Ritschlian, aspect helps lead to a second type of overall characteristic involving philosophical categories. Insofar as the men from whom Takakura learned had cut their theological teeth during a period of Ritschlian ascendancy, they also subsequently had to digest the related, Ritschlian philosophical assumptions of the day. These assumptions were by no means uniformly embraced throughout the Western Protestant world, but Albrecht Ritschl found an echoing affirmation in the minds of many in his own attempts to free theology to be the uniquely religious enterprise he believed it should be.

At the beginning of his monumental Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, Ritschl is clear about his posture towards the working philosophical assumptions of "traditional theology." By Ritschl's interpretation, rather than following Paul, traditional theology follows the lines of Augustine and Anselm in conceiving of the nature of redemption rationally. Thus, in regards to redemption, its three aspects of original sin, the necessity of a redemption, and Christ's person and work with its individual-corporate application are successively "deduced" by traditional theology. But, objects Ritschl, "A method which is so predominantly inspired by purely rational ideas of God and sin and redemption is not the positive theology which we need, and which can be defended against the

243 Considering here philosophical issues in distinction from religious matters should not forget the earlier discussion about the interrelatedness of philosophy and religion. Since, however, a Western context is under discussion, it perhaps lends itself better to analysis using what might be considered a Western construct. Cf. Part I, pp.76-79.

objections of general rationalism."\[245\\]

Furthermore, regarding the relationship between the concept of the divine and philosophy, Ritschl explains how

the thought of God, when by the word is understood conscious personality, lies beyond the horizon of metaphysic... And both these proofs [teleological and cosmological] for God's existence, whose construction is purely metaphysical, lead not to the Being the idea of which Scholastic theology receives as a datum from Christianity, but merely to conceptions of the world-unity which have nothing to do with any religion. This use of metaphysic, consequently, must be forbidden in theology, if the latter's positive and proper character is to be maintained.\[246\\]

Ritschl continues by pointing out, "Within the domain of European thought...we have to do with three forms of the theory of knowledge." The first two are to be rejected: [1] the Scholastic notion, received from Plato, of a static, "permanently self-equivalent unity of attributes" existing behind them, and [2] Kantian epistemology, which self-contradicts its own "principle that real things are knowable." The third and only viable option, according to Ritschl, [3] "is due to Lotze," which he explains and defends elsewhere.\[247\\] Having explained what to avoid, Ritschl sets about the task of defining the "positive theology which we need," which is both historical and set within the faith of the believing community.\[248\\]

\[245\\]\textit{Ritschl, 1900, pp.4-5.}\\
\[246\\]\textit{Ibid., p.17.}\\
\[247\\]\textit{Ibid., pp.18-20.} Ritschl thus directs the reader to his 1881 \textit{Theologie und Metaphysik}, "a pamphlet in which he attempted to set out the philosophical system of his theology," but which turned out to be "his poorest publication" and "a mistake of his old age." Galloway, 1986, pp.268-269.\\
\[248\\]\textit{Ritschl, 1900, pp.2-3.} Ritschl's rejection of a portion of Kantian epistemology did not mean a disavowal of Kant's foundational emphases on the moral or ethical. As one writer states, "Clearly, what attracted Ritschl to Kant was the latter's focus on morality as the divinely appointed field of human activity." Moreover, Ritschl in his latter days recognised "that only Kant's moral proof for the existence of God can do justice to 'the Christian conception of God'," as
Rudolf Hermann Lotze was the most influential philosopher and representative thinker of the decade leading up to the first publication of Ritschl's *Justification and Reconciliation* in 1870. It is enough here to point out his "theory of the personality of God and the infinite value of the personal minds created by him." Combined with the romantic-pietistic impulse against scholastic-Cartesian rationalism and against Hegelian idealism—an impulse so influentially expressed by Schleiermacher—Lotze "created the appropriate model in which the experiences of the time found a place." Thus it was that Ritschl in turn came to articulate the philosophical sentiments of his own generation of theologians, and to draw the map from which the following generation would navigate. This he did with his epistemological-metaphysical rejection of "rationalism," along with the more "positive" attempt to theologise concerning "conscious personality, [i.e.,] the Being the idea of which...theology receives as a datum from Christianity." opposed to the cosmological and teleological proofs. The place of Kantian morality in Ritschl's famous but often misunderstood "relational and functional" (not "anthropocentric" or "functionalistic") "value judgments" is more problematic.


There are many analyses, often critical, of the development of post-Reformation Protestant theology. For a helpful summary of the intellectual currents mentioned here in their relation to the rise of seventeenth century Protestant Orthodoxy, cf. Alister E. McGrath, "Protestant Orthodoxy," in Evans, McGrath, and Galloway, 1986, pp.150-178.


Cf. quotation, preceding page. Such overgeneralising summaries of individuals' and their periods' philosophical makeups necessarily fail to do full justice to the actual situations of the real, living people involved. However, Ritschl's own stated intentions are so clear, and his thought so dominant, that one is perhaps on more stable ground than usual in offering generalisations from Ritschl's case than from those of many other thinkers.
A quick review of the Christianity which Takakura encountered shows that it was couched in these same, or at least strikingly similar and often in combination with other, categories. Mackintosh appeals for the apprehension of the triune God as encountered in redemption, not through "ontology mixed with arithmetic." Paterson’s *The Rule of Faith*, after marking Roman Catholicism as the first "pathological" type of Christianity, points to Rationalism as the second. Von Hügel, while maintaining a proper Catholic respect for Aquinas and Scholasticism, stresses the fundamental gracious and mystical aspects of religious experience. As for Troeltsch, despite breaking from Ritschlianism as shown, for example, in his ongoing discussions with Wilhelm Herrmann, he does share the effort to free theology from its illusory, impregnable conceptualisations by placing it within its proper historical domain. While accepting reason’s responsible role, Oman’s theological methodology is one based on his own particular notion of experience, which is to be dealt with personally and authentically.

Forsyth is important to note singularly in this regard, both for his special significance for Takakura and because, as one analyst has put it, "The unity of Forsyth’s thought lies in his method." In giving primacy to "the moral" over "the metaphysical," Forsyth recognises the "new order of things" that came with Kant: "The ethical took the place that had been held by the intellectual." Forsyth not only acknowledges Kant’s fundamental significance, he concurs with


255Paterson also concludes, "The gospel...is on an altogether different footing from the speculative utterances made by theology in the outlying provinces of religious thought." Paterson, 1912, pp.390,395.

256Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.223.


258Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, pp.228-229.


261Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.234.
his ultimate direction: "As Kant handled the principle it was much hampered by the circumstances of his day, but his route was right."262 However, "In the opinion of Forsyth there is a difference between the philosophic and religious approach which is inevitable." Moreover, "That method proper to religious interpretation is that of valuation.... The valuation method, which Forsyth derives from Ritschl..., is primarily a repudiation of metaphysics...."263 Forsyth can thus state, "It is true that religion belongs neither to the rational, the aesthetic, nor the ethical side of the soul exclusively. It draws on the whole soul's being and energy. But the Christian religion at least involves if not the solitude at least the primacy of the ethical. If Reality is to reach us it must be thus."264 Forsyth's concentrated use of Kant and of Ritschl is gives clear evidence that he himself thought within the "new order of things."

Thus it was that Forsyth and the other Westerners who inspired Takakura, each in his own unique way, shared a distrust of the ultimate viability of the rational for theology, as well as an emphasis on the ethical-personal. This is not blindly to classify the Christianity which came to Takakura in Britain as Ritschlian.265 Nor is there any suggestion that it was irrational. What can be said is that the general philosophical context in which Ritschl sought to avoid the perceived ills of an excessive rationalism, and in which the value of the person was emphasised, had nourished the same trunk out of which the branches of the early twentieth century Western Christianity confronting Takakura were still growing. As Takakura nested there in Britain, he quite naturally sensed those branches' common philosophical scents and colours.

___________________________

262 Forsyth, Principle of Authority, 1912, p.5.


264 op.cit.

265 However, some of it was at least in some ways "Ritschlian," as Takakura himself points out.
A third and final general description that will be offered here is one closely related to the contemporary overall historical context, that of searching for authority. Very little needs to be added here to what has already been said regarding the rapid changes Western Europe had undergone throughout the generation leading up to Takakura’s arrival there, all of which changes had culminated, of course, in the First World War. English- and German-speaking Europe had been fundamentally shaken at practically every level of society, and the theological world had correspondingly groped for solid ground. Inheriting the stormy seas of pre-Ritschlian, German theology as well, the Christian Church living through the volatile half-century of Western European history beginning in 1870 (Meiji 3) thus had a multitude of complex issues on its hands.

Both in terms of content and intensity, the Western Church experienced many situations having parallels to the corresponding Meiji Era in Japan. Alongside those parallels, however, were significant differences, not the least of which was the Church’s and theology’s relationship to authority. As seen earlier in Part II, Chapter 1, the Meiji Christian Church sought to follow its Lord while facing the seemingly all-powerful authority of the state. In Western Europe, the Christian Church was searching for its Lord via an often unknown personal and collective authority, the very nature of which lacked a consensus of understanding.

While there were differences in relation to authority, both Meiji and Western Christianity were wrestling with the issue of authority. It is no wonder then, that Takakura would be struck by Forsyth’s making "authority" a "central emphasis" of the Christian faith. As Forsyth himself remarked, "The point I am always pressing but cannot easily get people to face [is] the point of our central and final

authority. Ernst Troeltsch agonized to find some sort of absolute authority in the midst of the volatile history in which he and his contemporaries were living. Troeltsch and Forsyth perhaps stand at opposite ends of a spectrum representing degrees of certainty relative to an understood authority. But wherever on such a continuum they and others fell, the issue of authority was paramount.

It was with particular regards to this third characteristic of wrestling with authority, in conjunction with the other two aspects of English-German language-culture and philosophical issues, that various "theological topics" were being discussed during the years leading up to Western Christianity's personally encountering Takakura. The "Calvinism" or "Calvinistic Evangelicalism" that struck Takakura, for instance, came to him as [1] an authority for Scottish society through Paterson personally and Takakura's Edinburgh experience generally, [2] the authoritative gospel of personal, moral grace through Forsyth, and [3] the "prophetic religion," or authentic personal insight into "sacred reality," through Oman. "Grace" came as [1] the authoritative, essential aspect of religious experience through von Hügel, [2] the primary missing element in weak, modern Protestantism through Troeltsch, [3] the only basis for Christian faith and certainty through Forsyth, and [4] an aspect of the reality which confronts, and then enables, true human freedom through Oman. The same could also be said for the areas of "kingdom of God," "predestination," the "Church," and "Christianity and culture," which were important issues of the day and which therefore especially confronted Takakura.

Saying that these specifically theological matters were connected to--or put more strongly, driven by--other types of struggles is not to deny their validity as issues in their own right. Rather, it helps to contextualise them within late nineteenth and

267Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.236.

268Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.228.

269Oshio, for example, discusses how Takakura dealt with these four areas in particular during his time in Britain. Oshio, pp.102-115,128-142. Oshio’s and others’ analyses of Takakura’s own theological development will more actively enter into the thesis’ discussion at appropriate places in Parts III and IV.
early twentieth century Britain and Germany. That context was the historical moment at which Western Christianity directly encountered Takakura, i.e., that was the particular route through which the substance and varied facets of Western theological subjects came to Takakura. In such a process, the different points of theology inevitably were intertwined with and even subsumed within the languages and cultures, philosophical issues, and authority crises of pre- and post-Great War Britain and Germany.

While we cannot discount the complexities of an intense time spent in Britain, we can encapsulate it within the three summarising categories just outlined. Having noted that, we can now climb aboard ship and sail back to Japan with Takakura. Although the direct encounter with Western Christianity is now only a memory, it is a living memory to be incorporated throughout Takakura's remaining years. All of the upcoming ten years will be spent in his home country. Nevertheless, the two and one-half years spent on European soil will never cease to have their impact wherever Takakura, or his thought, will live in Japan.

C. After Takakura’s Time in Britain
(After Early 1924; Taisho 13)

Despite leaving Britain, Takakura by no means left Western Christianity. He still had much material from his earlier days of reading and indirect contact with primarily American Christianity with which to continue grappling. Moreover, on top of what he had just experienced overseas, Takakura continued to follow developments in Europe and otherwise indirectly interact with various aspects of Western Christian life and thought. This took place particularly, not surprisingly, through reading.270

1. Reading

With over a month between London and Kobe on board ship, Takakura had ample time for "book reading, prayer, and conversation." Among the works he read were

270Some of that reading would have been of the books he had already purchased: he shipped back sixteen parcels of books just before he himself returned to Japan. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," p.283.
those by Philip Snowden (If Labour Rules), Charles A. Ellwood (An Introduction to Social Psychology), Benjamin Kidd (The Science of Power), von Hügel (Essays on the Philosophy of Religion), Peake (Christianity, its Nature and its Truth), Schweitzer (The Philosophy of Civilization),271 and Henri Barbusse (Hell).272 Takakura also did some "Calvinism research."273

Over the course of the next several years, some familiar names appear on Takakura's reading list: Denney, von Hügel, Mackintosh (Immortality and the Future), Dostoevsky (The Brothers Karamozov), Forsyth (Cruciality of the Cross).274 But several new names appear as well: Holl, Stange, Mozley, Hirsch, Luther, Althaus, Barth, Warfield (on Calvin), Adam (Das Wesen des Katholizismus), Bultmann, Kuyper (on Calvinism), Brunner.275 Additionally, Takakura makes several references in his diary to reading, writing, studying, and lecturing on Calvin or Calvinism.276

The emphasis on Calvin in Takakura's reading is unmistakeable. Ever since his time in Edinburgh, Takakura seems to be dealing with the subject of Calvinism at an increasing rate. There were different aspects of what Takakura describes as "Calvinism" in Britain, as well as different emphases in the works he mentions encountering back in Japan. But amidst these varieties of Calvinism coming his


274 Ibid., pp.234,236-237,239,260,395,396.


way, the important place of the *Institutes* in particular should be noted. That classic work arises frequently for Takakura's own study, as well for his teaching Calvin to others.277

Another trend is one towards German materials. A mere glance at the representative list of Takakura's readings shows a clearly increased presence of contemporary German authors.278 Takakura makes occasional, interesting remarks in his diary in connection with his German books, such as how encouraging it is to acquire a new batch, or wondering if Forsyth has much to say about modern German theology.279 What all this meant for Takakura will be examined more closely later. The relevant point here is the noticeably increased—not total, but definitely increased—German reading material insofar as Western Christianity continued to come to Takakura.

Once again it should be noted that Takakura's reading as a whole covered a wide range of subjects, styles, and authors. Dostoevsky, the British Socialists, and Barbusse add their own particular spices of variety, for example. Moreover, within the German readings themselves there is an interesting mixture, too: Karl Adam gives a continuing Catholic input, and writers such as Holl and Althaus accompany Luther himself as representatives of the contemporary "Luther Renaissance" in Germany.280 One group has stood out from the others, however, to many who have considered Takakura's dealings with Western theology.281 Because of this


278There are many more not in that list. Just within the *FK* bibliography, additional names include W. Vollrath, H.E. Weber, Gogarten, Girgensohn, Thurneysen, Behm, Riggenbash, Mandel, Schlatter, Schaeder, Heim, and Ihmels. *FK*, pp.173-176; *Chosakushu*, Vol.2, pp.454-458.


281Charles Germany, for example, writes at the end of a short overview section entitled "Takakura's Theological Development," "One final influence significant in the developing thought of Takakura must be recognized as the crisis theology
attention which the so-called dialectical or crisis theologists have thus received, they merit their own consideration here as well.

2. Crisis Theology

It is unclear as to how and when Takakura first encountered dialectical theology. Perhaps it was as early as his time in Edinburgh, or maybe during his visit with Ishihara Ken in Germany during the summer of 1922 (Taisho 11). One close development in Europe." Germany also concludes his chapter on Takakura with a separate consideration of "Takakura and Barth." Germany, pp.88,96,121-122.

While realising the differences in meaning, here the two terms will be used interchangeably as designations.

In keeping with the attempt made throughout this entire Part II of the thesis to postpone examining Takakura's reception and use of Western (and Meiji) Christianity--all the while using contact with Takakura as the guiding criterion of selecting what to consider--dialectical theology will be considered here only insofar as it came to Takakura.

Cf. above, Part II, ch.2, p.215. One could speculate further as to when Takakura may have first read something about crisis theology. As for other Japanese thinkers, Charles Germany notes that Kuwada Hidenobu writes that he himself "first heard of Karl Barth through reading an article by H.R. MacIntosh [sic] in the Expository Times around 1923 [Taisho 12]." Germany, p.128. There he cites Kuwada Hidenobu, "Baruto Shingaku no Seimeiryoku" ("The Life-Power of Barth's Theology") Fukuin to Sekai No.5, 1956, p.62.

Three decades had elapsed by the time Kuwada was recollecting in 1956 (Showa 31) about when he first read of Barth via Mackintosh. In the vagueness of memory, either "around 1923" was likely about five years too early, or the source of his hearing of Barth was different. Mackintosh wrote a major article introducing Barth and his theology for the Expository Times in the fall of 1928 (Showa 3). Most likely this is the article that Kuwada and many others read.

In the November, 1924 (Taisho 13) and June, 1927 (Showa 2) issues, Mackintosh contributed articles--as he did frequently--under the section "Recent Foreign Theology," both of which only mention Barth's name in passing. The 1924 article is entitled "The Swiss Group," and it features Emil Brunner. In the introduction Mackintosh writes, "Professor Brunner...is probably the ablest of the Swiss group, including Kutter, Barth, and Gogarten." In the 1927 review of a new book by Friedrich Traub, Mackintosh again mentions Barth's name only once, in the introduction: "Opening with some relevant pages on the paradox and perversity of Barth's theological estimate of history as the medium of revelation, Traub proceeds to...." Other than these two obscure places, Mackintosh, and apparently noone else either, writes of Barth in the Expository Times before the September 1928 (Showa 3) essay, written under the section "Leaders of Theological Thought";
friend notes that Takakura's contact with crisis theology did not begin until 1925 (Taisho 14). In any case, one could guess that it should not have taken too very long before Takakura and others in Japan started hearing of (Karl) Barth's theological bombshells which he began dropping on the inherited "German liberal theology" following World War I, or of (Emil) Brunner's pitting his "theology of the Word" against the position of the "consciousness theologians" with the writing of his *Die Mystik und Das Wort* in 1924 (Taisho 13).

The first explicit mention of crisis theology Takakura makes in his diary is on 18 May 1927 (Showa 2). This was after someone else's lecture at the seminary, a talk termed by Takakura as an "introduction to the theology of Barth." Diary entries clearly referring to relevant reading do not appear until 7 May 1929 (Showa 4), with mention of Peter Brunner's *Vom Glauben bei Calvin*; (Karl) Barth is not entered until January of 1931 (Showa 6).

cf. the three articles by H.R. Mackintosh in *Expository Times*: "The Swiss Group" 36, No.2, November, 1924, pp.73-75; "German Theology" 38, No.9, June, 1927, pp.369-371; "Karl Barth" 39, No.12, September, 1928, pp.536-540.


288This is the first mention in his published diaries, at least.


291Takakura writes that he had been reading Barth's "sermons." In his 4 May 1933 (Showa 8) entry, Takakura mentions reading Barth's "Justification and Sanctification." *Zenshu*, Vol.10, pp.309,351,396.
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However, from the reading materials Takakura lists elsewhere, one could gather that works by dialectical thinkers came to him somewhat before 1927 (Showa 2). Included in his earlier (from 1924; Taisho 13) dogmatics lecture references are Thurneysen’s *Das Wort Gottes und die Kirche*, Gogarten’s *Die Schuld der Kirche gegen die Welt* and *Die religiöse Entscheidung*, as well as Barth’s *Zur Lehre vom Heiligen Geist*. The 1927 (Showa 2) FK bibliography lists eight works—half of them published in 1924 (Taisho 13)—by Barth, Emil Brunner, Peter Brunner, Girgenson, Gogarten, and Thurneysen. Several of these eleven writings reappear as references for Takakura’s later (from 1930, Showa 5) “Prolegomena” lectures; there are also seven additional works, by Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Girgensohn, and Gogarten. The publication dates and number of writings that Takakura read would thus indicate that he was consistently being confronted by

---


293These works are, in alphabetical order by author (and including only the date of publication, which is the way Takakura listed them):

* K. Barth, *Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie*. 1924.
* E. Brunner, *Die Mystik und Das Wort*. 1924.
* .........., *Religionsphilosophie evangelischer Theologie*. 1927.
* .........., *Von Glauben und Offenbarung*. 2nd ed. 1924.


294They are, in alphabetical order by author (and as listed in the Zenshu):

* K. Barth, *Dogmatik I*.
* .........., *Die christliche Dogmatik*.
* E. Brunner, *Der Mittler*.
* .........., *Erlebnis, Erkenntnis und Glaube*.
* .........., *Grundrisz der evangelischen Dogmatik*.
* F. Gogarten, *Ich glaube an den dreieinigen Gott*.

op.cit., Vol.8, pp.71,72,100,145,162,181,182,184,185.
crisis theology at least from a time soon after he returned to Japan from Britain in 1924 (Taisho 13).

Because dialectical theology became so prominent as quickly as it did amongst European Continental Protestant thinkers, then among English-speaking theologians, it is not surprising that Takakura would have become aware of and interested in the movement from its early stages. The flow of reading materials from the West to Japan was fast and full, and students like Ishihara and Takakura were returning from their studies in Europe and America with the latest progress reports. Takakura's illness from mid-1932 (Showa 7) perhaps kept him from having to decipher thoroughly, at least from that time, the puzzling fissures that were appearing amongst the various dialectical thinkers. Even so, as early as 1927 (Showa 2) Takakura knew of distinctives which differentiated Brunner from Barth. Indeed, Brunner is the one whose thought seemed to come with more force and appeal. Takakura did however recognise Barth as the "prime mover" amongst the crisis theologians, and he thus recommend that his students read him due to his importance.

295 Charles Germany, citing a number of Japanese sources, notes the attention given to dialectical theology in 1927 (Showa 2) at Doshisha in Kyoto following one of the professors' return from studying abroad, including six months in Germany. Germany also mentions "a crucial event in the introduction and development of dialectical theology in Japan," the translation into Japanese of Brunner's Theology of Crisis in 1931. Earlier in his book Germany summarises these various movements when he writes within a different context, "Dialectical theology, introduced through interpretations of Brunner, Barth, and Gogarten, had entered in the late 1920's and early 1930's." Germany, pp.48,127-128.

296 Ibid., p.121.

297 "Sato Shigehiko Kun ni Kotau" ("Reply to Shigehiko Sato") Fukuin Shinpo No.1685, 1 December 1927 (Showa 2), p.5; Zenshu, Vol.5, p.203. Both Sato Toshio and Charles Germany point out Takakura's early preference for Brunner. Sato, 1992, p.79; Germany, p.121. Germany goes on to state, "One can certainly take for granted that this larger debt to Brunner did not preclude Takakura's reading Barth's early books, particularly his commentary on the Book of Romans." Although this claim would appear to rest on fairly safe ground, the only concrete evidence that Takakura did in fact read Barth's Romans commentary is his inclusion of it amongst his list of reference works for his own commentary on
From all of this evidence, one can be sure that Takakura was aware from a fairly early time of the various movements of dialectical theology in Europe, America, and his own country. Certainly he was more familiar with crisis thought, and with Barth in particular, than a well-known Scottish churchman who confessed in late 1930 (Showa 5), "I cannot claim to have struggled through the whole of Barth's difficult and elusive Prolegomena, or to have been able to discover and surely grasp his meaning even on all the central points." However he may have articulated Barth's and Brunner's thought, Takakura knew about the former's own strict starting point at the Word of God, versus Brunner's attempt to find a point of contact for the Word of God in his doctrine of man. Likewise, Takakura knew of Barth's priority of the object of faith over the act of faith, as well as Brunner's stress on "the encounter between revelation and faith" which overcomes the distinction between the subject and object of faith. Regardless, then, of the role European crisis theology played in Takakura's own thought, without question it was quite significant in the last years of Western Christianity's coming to him.

3. Personal Contacts

As a summary of the current Part II, Chapter 2, and as a transition into Part III, it turns out to be remarkably appropriate to consider two direct encounters with Western Christians which Takakura notes that he had back in Japan. One was with a Canadian missionary named Caroline MacDonald. Having begun her time in Japan with the YWCA, MacDonald had become very active in social work and prison relief in Tokyo. She also served as an elder in Uemura's Fujimicho Romans. However, Takakura never refers to Barth in his comments, despite constantly using the remarks of numerous other commentaries. Chosakushu, Vol.5, p.56.

298 D.M. Baillie, untitled article under the section "Recent Foreign Theology" Expository Times 42, No.2, November, 1930, p.44.


300 Iglehart, 1959, p.121.
Church, then in Takakura's Toyama Church. Takakura mentions MacDonald in his diary on numerous occasions, e.g., in connection with a meeting about the proposed new Shinanomachi Church building, about his feeling badly over not being able to go and see her off (presumably when she was leaving for furlough), concerning a different meeting about a lecture MacDonald gave on international labour, noting his calling on her in hospital when she sick.

The other Western Christian Takakura notes meeting was David Cairns, the Scottish, United Presbyterian Church minister and professor/principal at the United Free Church College in Aberdeen. Cairns was in Japan for a few weeks as part of a wider lecture tour he was taking in China and Manchuria in 1927 (Showa 2). Interestingly, Caroline MacDonald knew Cairns from having studied under him in Aberdeen on one of her furloughs. She not only helped to escort him and his daughter around Tokyo, but she also had instigated the invitation from the National Christian Council of Japan for Cairns to come to Japan in the first place.

---

301 Fujimicho Kyokai Kyokai Hyakunen Shi Shiryo Inkai, comps. and eds., 1987, "Nenpyo," pp.40-41,44; Nihon Kirisuto Kyokai Taikai Kiroku (Minutes of the NKK General Assembly) No.41, 1927 (Showa 2), p.9. MacDonald left Fujimicho Church with the other almost one hundred members (including, e.g., Ishihara Ken) who joined with Takakura's Toyama Church, eventually forming the Shinanomachi Church. Cf. Part I, pp.95-96(n.384).


305 The National Christian Council was the eventual successor to the "Evangelical Alliance" within which Uemura and Ebina debated before the latter had to leave. Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.140-141(n.141).
Cairns, who with his daughter had spent a week with MacDonald in Tokyo en route to China, returned to Japan in June for a fortnight; that left "a clear month in Manchuria," Cairns reported back home. During these two weeks he whisked through "a tour across the Island Empire, visiting Nagasaki, Fukuoka, Shimonoseki, Osaka, Kyoto, Nara, and Tokyo, lecturing in schools, universities, and public halls all the way." Amidst recording all sorts of "general impressions" to which he necessarily confined himself, Cairns notes speaking a number of times to groups of students. Cairns remarks, too, that "I had the privilege several times of meeting large groups of Japanese ministers at a Presbytery meeting in Kamakura [on the southwest side of Tokyo]..., and in the house of another old friend and student in Aberdeen College, Miss Caroline MacDonald." Likely Takakura met Cairns both in Kamakura and at MacDonald's; he notes in his diary on 28 June having had lunch with "Dr. Cairns."

What is remarkable at this point in terms of a summary of this Part II, Chapter 2 of the thesis is that Cairns, about as much as any single person conceivably could, displayed most of the features of the Christianity of the West that came to Takakura throughout his lifetime. Cairns had undergone "that desolating experience of complete and comprehensive doubt about the whole truth of religion" in the

306Ibid., pp.255,256; Baillie, 1950, p.28; Cairns, 1950, p.194.

307Cairns spoke with the translation help of a friend and former student at New College, a Mr. Goster. Cairns notes that although "what their reaction to [what I said] was, I hardly know, for there was no time either for 'heckling' or much personal talk," the students "came to the meetings arranged, and listened well."


310Baillie, 1950, p.10.
midst of the rise of humanist and scientific thought. He also shared the wide sense of the unprecedented importance of "the 'activity of human consciousness'"311 which accompanied "modern" thinking. As did Forsyth, Cairns traversed the valley of lifelong poor health and the loss of his wife.312 Cairns also similarly studied in Germany under Ritschlian influence, and German theology hence had a lasting place in his thought and life.313

As his faith began to blossom Cairns the churchman314 turned what for him had been a dead seed of stern, childhood Calvinism into a flowering, "Calvinistic Evangelicalism" that actively encouraged overseas missionary activity.315 Linked with Cairns’ missionary fervour was his grave concern for "the fortunes of one half of the human race" in the Far East. He believed that the scientific spirit upon which Western industrial civilisation and militarism were based was sweeping away the East’s "ancestral faiths," so "the real alternative that lies before China and Japan...must be Christianity and Socialism."316 Scotland in particular had a valuable role to play in this regard, but not by carrying an archaic message of Calvin’s "Institutes as the last word of Christian thinking on God and the World and the Soul." Instead, there had to be a message fuelled by Calvinism’s "great thoughts of God" in the form of "a reasoned account of God and the World and the Soul, of Christ and His Kingdom."317

312op.cit., pp.11,24.
313Ibid., p.11.
314As an example of his churchmanship, Cairns was elected Moderator of the General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland in 1923. Ibid., p.22.
315Cf., e.g., Cairns' address at the 1911 Scottish Students' Conference in Edinburgh, reproduced as David S. Cairns, The Vocation of Scotland in view of her religious heritage. London: Student Christian Movement, 1911.
316Ibid., pp.8-11.
317Ibid., pp.34,39,42.
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But for Cairns and his era, how to give such "a reasoned account" in the face of the acute "problem of certainty [which] presses itself to-day upon every inquiring and religious mind" was the overriding challenge.\(^{318}\) Neither the "Traditional" nor "Modernist" positions provided "solid intellectual standing-ground" for faith, particularly in regard to the miracles of Jesus.\(^{319}\) What was needed was insight into "what the 'miracles' of Jesus and His teaching about Faith mean," and a resulting faith that sees through the external, transient mystery of evil so as to rest assured of God’s power, love and freedom to help men.\(^{320}\)

In coming to such a faith personally, Cairns developed an apologetic theology that emerged out of both his era’s strong historical sense and his own, wide reading.\(^{321}\) He was thus able to help restore religious faith to many, particularly to those who had lost it due to the lack of "the conception of divine purpose and activity in the scientific picture of the universe."\(^{322}\) Having their anguish multiplied by the Great War, many heard his advice to carry through to completion their search for truth which leads to certainty: "If you wish to have a faith that you will not need to carry, because it carries you, you must not seek certainty, you must seek truth."\(^{323}\) Moreover, that truth must not be sought with the intellect alone: more important is the will in verifying man’s highest, spiritual intuitions. For, as Cairns himself puts it:

Faith, in fact, is an act of the whole nature, it is the whole man, intellect, affections, imagination, conscience, and will, seeking the whole truth, and throwing everything into the hazard. If we would increase our faith we must give the Eternal World the opportunity to verify itself in our experience. We must gamble with our lives on

\(^{318}\)Cairns, 1918, pp.3-4.
\(^{319}\)Cairns, The Faith that Rebels, 1929, p.11.
\(^{320}\)Ibid., p.243-244,247.
\(^{322}\)Ibid., pp.13,29.
\(^{323}\)Cairns, 1918, p.5.
In David Cairns, then, one can see most of the themes which Takakura encountered in Western Christianity. Besides intellectual themes, Cairns also exhibited the fervent, one-way, evangelistic "Visit to the Far East" which the Western Church had been carrying out since before the Meiji Era. Takakura’s meeting Cairns in Tokyo in 1927 (Showa 2)—just a few months before he wrote his own definitive work, *Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo*—can in hindsight be seen as representative of the meeting Takakura had with the Christianity of the West over the course of his entire life. When he met Takakura in Tokyo, Cairns said and did what Takakura already had been hearing, seeing, and reading for years.

Cairns’ time in Japan also serves amazingly well as a transition to Part III of the thesis, and thus to directly considering Takakura’s own thought. It does so by showing how desperately the Church in the West needs to do all it can to understand first-hand Christianity in Japan, including such an important figure as Takakura. In his articles about his visit to Japan, despite reporting extensively on Japan’s geography, history, social and political problems, as well as religious situation, Cairns graciously acknowledges, "My information on the whole situation is, of course, only second-hand." Cairns also correctly points out that, amidst all

---


325Relative to dialectical theology, Baillie comments that "Cairns had little sympathy with the type of Biblicism which in his later years was sometimes associated with the claim to be ‘the theology of the Word’...." Baillie, 1950, p.32.

Forsyth’s evangelical emphasis on the atonement, to which the sub-theme of Takakura’s pre-Britain reading was similar, is also noticeably absent. However, insofar as the atoning Cross as preached by Forsyth is viewed in relation to philosophical issues with which it was inextricably linked—as well as to the crucial concern for authority—Cairns’ similarity even at this point becomes easier to acknowledge.

326Emphasis mine. This play on the title of Cairn’s trip reports is to emphasise what has been described earlier as the "militancy" of the "Western Christendom" which was part of the Christianity brought to Japan, and thus to Takakura. The continuing description of Cairns’ "visit" will help support such a claim. Cf. Introduction, pp.4,5, above, Part II, ch.2, pp.196-199.
of his observing and listening while in Japan, relative to the students whom he did not know but to whom he spoke, there was no time for "personal talk." One can sympathise with Cairns not having enough time, for there was only a fortnight free for Japan due to the lengthier times required for ministry in China and Manchuria. As for this thesis, the time for "personal talk" with Takakura is coming up in Part III.

As for Takakura, he likely listened to some remarks by Cairns at the presbytery meeting, as well as heard over lunch about just completed travels throughout China and other parts of Japan. There may have been time briefly to converse about Takakura’s own period of study spent in Edinburgh, and maybe even opportunity to discuss, within limits of time and language, problems facing the Church and how to proceed with the Christianisation of Japan. Throughout, Takakura would have been observing carefully, comparing what he heard with his own reading of Cairns’ *The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith*, as well as with many other of his own ideas.

All in all, being able to meet Dr. Cairns must have been nice enough. As Takakura’s diary entry puts it, "Lunch with Dr. Cairns. He really is a likeable Scotsman." But as Takakura continues in his diary, he notes what he particularly gained from being able to converse with Cairns: "I’m thankful to have discussed together Forsyth and the modern German theological world." As it had been since his youth, what was happening in the Western intellectual world was a continuing concern for Takakura. That the Christian faith came to him through the West is undoubtedly a fundamentally important factor in Takakura’s overall thought.

---

327 Cairns, "A Visit to the Far East," 1928, pp.256,257. Even so, most any personal conversation which more time may have allowed necessarily would have become "second-hand" through a translator, anyway.

Having surveyed in Part II the types of Christianity which came to Takakura, it is now time to consider Takakura’s articulation of the Christian faith within his own life context. However, as was pointed out at the beginning of our study of that life context in Part I, it is not therefore the case that we are finally getting to the "meat" of the thesis, having worked our way through the obligatory appetizers. To continue the analogy, this thesis’ consideration of Takakura’s thought is better understood as a prepared, served, and consumed single meal: the writer has led the reader into the kitchen as well as set the table; the reader is both watching the food’s preparation, as well as partaking of the resulting meal; Takakura’s own expression of Christianity presented here in Part III could be seen as the cook’s preparation and presentation of the ingredients provided him in Parts I and II. Part IV will then seek to examine elements of the chef’s so-called "secret recipe," including seasonings contributing to the meal’s own particular, sometimes subtle flavours. The appeal, and the taste, of both the meal’s preparation and consumption are very much related to the reader’s own constitution and interests.

In other words, this examination of the thought of Takakura Tokutaro has been proceeding from the beginning of the thesis, and the current Part III is only one section of the whole. Moreover, besides Takakura himself, his historical context, Meiji Christianity, Western Christianity, as well as thesis writer and thesis reader all are vitally involved in the current consideration of Takakura’s thought.

The complexity of Takakura’s life context, as well as that of the Christianity which came to him, are at least matched by his own understanding of the Christian faith. Similar to the consideration of matters thus far, then, the current challenge is to allow Takakura to speak for himself, and yet to hear him intelligibly within the current medium of an English thesis. In attempting to meet this challenge, Part III will closely examine what uniformly has been considered to be the most comprehensive and representative example of Takakura’s thought, his 1927 (Showa
Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo. Of course, this monumental work was not produced apart from his historical context; thus, the wider connections between Takakura’s circumstances and his own thinking will need to be considered as well. Initially, however, in order fairly to think here and now about Takakura’s thought, we must consider the fundamentally important factors of language and context.

A. Japanese Language and Context

Takakura Tokutaro was born and raised, and then lived practically all of his adult life, in Japan. His mother tongue was the Japanese language, which like any other language embodies much of its speakers’ culture and heritage. Moreover, culture and language are never static entities, and the period leading up to and including Takakura’s day saw an acute acceleration of the adaptation of Western concepts and vocabulary. To facilitate such an incorporation of foreign ideas, as well as Japan’s incorporation into the "modern world," there were even suggestions that Japan adopt English as the best language for modern usage. Such a radical measure was never taken, though, so the Japanese citizenry somehow had to stretch their own language to adjust to the stream of changes into which they had been thrust.

Like many of his contemporaries, then, Takakura faced the dual challenge of mastering Japanese written in Chinese characters and of articulating in that language new, foreign meanings. The latter task was attempted either through using Chinese characters—sometimes in new combinations—to represent near-as-possible equivalent meanings, or through phonetically creating brand new words. For biblically- and theologically-trained Christians such as Takakura, the situation was further complicated by having to incorporate Hebrew, Greek, and Latin terminology. No matter how complex the process, however, the Japanese


2This helps to explain the extensive allowance in the curriculum through which Takakura passed, from "elementary" through "higher" school, to the study of the Japanese language. Cf. Part I, p.33.

3Examples of Takakura’s own attempts at expressing, in Japanese, biblical and Western terms are extensive. Similar to the problem of deciding which of the
language was the primary mode of expression with which Takakura had to work.4

many transliterations to include, considering them in this thesis will necessarily be limited to those particularly important for Takakura's thought. To mention one example here, there is the title of his second major publication, Oncho to Shinjitsu. As noted earlier, the preface to this work bears the same title. Takakura selected this title from the wording in John 1:14, "grace and truth." Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.28; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.29. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.208(n.55).

For the English "truth," or better for the Greek "aleitheias," the Japanese "shinjitsu" was the existing term in the translation of the Bible used by Takakura and other Protestants. Takakura wanted to use the term to express something of the English "reality," however. He thus occasionally placed the phoneticised "riariti" or "riaru" alongside the characters ordinarily pronounced "shinjitsu." At other times, though, in order to convey the equivalent of the English "truth," he placed the phoneticised "tsurusu" or "honto" (another Japanese word for "true") at the side. Usually, he wrote the word normally, i.e., only in characters. Cf. Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.27 (Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.28); "Kirisutokyo no Tokushoku to shite no Choshizen" Fukuin Shinpo No.1470, 30 August 1923 (Taisho 12), p.6 (Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.264); "Kirisuto no Heiwa naru Toji" ("The Peaceful Rule of Christ"), in Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.77 (Zenshu, Vol.1, p.373); "Sei no Mondai to sono Kaiketsu" ("The Problem of Life and its Solution"), 1926 (Taisho 15), in Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.140.

More of the issues associated with this particular expression "shinjitsu" will be addressed in Part IV.

4This is not to suggest that Takakura was thus hindered from conceiving "rational truth," but rather that his mother tongue and culture provided the framework and tools for conceiving and expressing "truth." Relative to this matter is the fact that much has been made of the alleged inability of the Japanese language to enable clear, logical, abstract thinking. It is argued that Japanese emphasises "aesthetic and emotional states of mind," with the original language containing primarily "concrete and intuitive" words. Cf., e.g., Nakamura Hajime, "Consciousness of the Individual and the Universal Among the Japanese," in Charles A. Moore, ed., The Japanese Mind: Essentials of Japanese Philosophy and Culture. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967, p.183; Soltau, 1982, p.10.

Edwin O. Reischauer agrees with the point that Japanese people show a preference for "a loose structure of argument, rather than careful logical reasoning, as well as suggestion or illustration, rather than sharp, clear statements." However, he calls the claim that the language lacks the clarity and logic required for modern, scientific thinking "balderdash." Reischauer instead points to the uniqueness of the Japanese language--i.e., its being "very different from almost all other languages"--as the primary reason underlying the difficulty of expressing in Japanese "modern technological or scientific" ideas. Thus, for example, "Though first Chinese and later English have been the two most important foreign languages for Japanese, it would be hard to imagine languages that differ more from Japanese in both structure and phonetics." In this sense, then, Takakura faced the common challenge of his day of translating into Japanese--the language to which he was "restricted"--
Besides it having been the case that Takakura was born and raised into using the Japanese language—apart from his own choice so to speak—Takakura’s ongoing concerns and involvements were with his native Japan and fellow Japanese speakers. Takakura’s hometown of Ayabe always had a special place in his heart, and he considered himself basically to be a "country person." As for his ministerial and teaching career, Takakura served primarily in Tokyo, and he had early pastoral positions in Kyoto and Sapporo. He preached and published in Japanese, most especially in connection with his service in the NKK and the seminary. Throughout his lifetime, then, Takakura maintained strong ties with his Japanese homeland, both locally and nationally; and, he accordingly continued to function within his first language.

The extensive attention given in Part II, Chapter 2 to Western Christianity as Takakura encountered it should not therefore lead to the conclusion that Takakura somehow left his Japanese context, including his mother tongue, in incorporating Western thought. Not only did he always remain attached to Japanese concerns as ideas already entangled within foreign languages. Reischauer, 1981, pp.385-388.

5In expression of his running loyalty to Ayabe, Takakura would travel to Ayabe in connection with other trips, including when he departed for and returned from Britain. Furthermore, Takakura was buried in Ayabe after his funeral was held at the Shinanomachi Church in Tokyo. As to his basic love and preference for open, natural, and non-urban settings, as well as his self-perception as being a "country boy," his descriptions of Edinburgh and of his travels to the English Lake District serve as two of several clear examples. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.148-149,216; Oshio, pp.145-146,322. Cf. Part I, p.98, plus references below (Part III, pp.279-280(ns.28,29)) to Takakura’s articles on "Edinburgh’s Nature" and on his travels.

6Cf. Part I, pp.92-93,95-98.


8Takakura himself notes the joy at being with fellow Japanese for the first time in over two months after the fall term in Edinburgh, particularly in being "able freely to say your own thoughts in your mother tongue." "Ingurando he no Koryoko" ("A Short Trip to England") Seisho no Kensan No.66, May, 1922 (Taisho 11), p.23; Zenshu, Vol.6, p.184.
just outlined, but Takakura was actively interacting with Japanese thought concurrent with his encounter with the West. Thus while reading Western works before arriving in Britain, Takakura was also busily reading Japanese writings. His readings included works by Uchimura Kanzo, Tominaga Tokuma, Natsume Soseki, Kagawa Toyohiko, Nishida Tenko, Nishida Kitaro, Kurata Hyakuzo, Watsuji Tetsuro, Arishima Takeo, and Hatano Seiichi. Takakura

9Uchimura was the well-known member of the Sapporo Christian "Band" and founder of "Mukyokai," or "Non-Church" Christianity. Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.113-114,116,124,125,128,147,170(n.259),187.

10Tominaga pastored in Kanazawa when Takakura was there during his high school years. Cf. Part I, p.35.

11Natsume was perhaps Meiji and Taisho Japan’s most beloved writer. Cf. Part I, pp.66-68,72-73.

12Kagawa was the well-known Christian social reformer. Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.135(n.120),138.


14Nishida Kitaro was Takakura’s high school teacher, and he went on to become Japan’s greatest modern philosopher. Cf. Part I, pp.36-37,66-67.

15Kurata was a playwright and essayist; he particularly appreciated the writings of Shinran and Nishida Kitaro. Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan, Vol.4, 1983, p.312. Cf. Part I, p.82.

16Watsuji Tetsuro was a well-known novelist and cultural historian who wrote about Buddhism, Confucianism, and Christianity. Nihon Dai Hyakka Zensho, Vol.24, 1988, p.809.

17Arishima was involved with Non-Church Christianity; he was also associated with the White Birch School of literature. Nihon Kirisutokyo Rekishi Daijiten, 1987, p.67; Nihon Dai Hyakka Zensho, Vol.1, 1984, pp.729-730. Cf. Part I, p.75.

Takakura read, with mixed evaluations, two of Arishima’s works in 1919 (Taisho 8). He also read, this time with much appreciation, Arishima’s writings while in Britain. For Takakura’s references to Arishima and these other writers, c.f., e.g., Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.27,31,39,71,98,104,120,144,147,153,154, 155,158,162,202,207; Oshio, pp.92-93.

18Along with Ishihara, Hatano aided Takakura in writing his seminary thesis on Schleiermacher. One of Hatano’s many publications was his 1920 (Taisho 9) Shukyo Tetsugaku no Honshitsu to Konpon Mondai (The Nature and Basic
also continued to read Japanese works after returning home from Britain, e.g., Uchimura, Natsume, Hatano, Mori Akira,\(^{19}\) Tsukamoto Toraji,\(^{20}\) and Maeda Togama.\(^{21}\) In addition, then, to living and working in Japan as a Japanese—and thus functioning in the Japanese language—Takakura read Japanese works extensively in addition to his wide reading of Western materials.

Even while he was away in Britain, Takakura made efforts to stay abreast of contemporary thinking in Japan. For instance, he received the new periodical \textit{Shiso (Thought)},\(^{22}\) as well as the \textit{Fukuin Shinpo} and other writings.\(^{23}\) Furthermore, Takakura maintained close relationships with several old and new Japanese friends while he was in the West.\(^{24}\) The actual contact Takakura had with fellow

\textit{Problems of the Philosophy of Religion}. Twelve-Member Editorial Board, "The Life and Thought of Dr. Seiichi Hatano," in Hatano, 1963, p.V. Takakura cites this work amongst other references for his English paper written in Edinburgh, mentioning it as one of the three to which he was particularly indebted. It is unclear as to whether Takakura read Hatano’s work before or after leaving Japan. "The Authority in Matters of Faith, its Seat, and its Character," in \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.4, p.25; cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.203,214(n.86).

\(^{19}\)Mori was Takakura’s close friend, as well as Mori Arinori’s son. Cf. Part I, p.93(n.368).

\(^{20}\)Tsukamoto was another Non-Church writer; Takakura notes reading his \textit{Gendai Kyokai no Fushin (The Unfaithfulness of the Present-day Church)} in February of 1927 (Showa 2), six months before he wrote \textit{Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo}. \textit{Nihon Kirisutokyo Rekishi Daijiten}, 1987, p.880; \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.10, "Nikki," p.329.

\(^{21}\)Maeda was a Zen Buddhist writer. Takakura read and then wrote a review of Maeda’s book, \textit{Shukyoteki Ningen (Religious Man)}, in \textit{Fukuin to Gendai} No.18, September, 1932 (Showa 7), p.1; \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.6, pp.443-445.


\(^{22}\)Cf. Part I, p.76(n.292).


\(^{24}\)Contrary to his own father’s example set years earlier (cf. Part I, p.17), Takakura remained in close communication with his family as well. Of course, much of this contact with family and friends was maintained and developed through correspondence. Amongst his diary entries for the time away from Japan, Takakura mentions receiving letters and packages from family and friends. \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.10,
Japanese in his summer travels to Germany, his visit to the Kelham monastery, and securing housing in Oxford have already been mentioned. In addition, Takakura not only travelled with Japanese acquaintances on ship to and from Britain, but he also was met by a friend upon his initial arrival in London (and seen off by several on his departure); he travelled to France with two Japanese friends; he preached regularly to a Japanese church in London while he lived in Oxford; and, he managed to make several other Japanese acquaintances in various places. Thus at least for most of Takakura’s time in Europe, being away from Japan by no means meant being removed from interaction either with fellow Japanese people, or with current issues and thought in Japan.

Takakura’s continuing involvement with Japan, especially including the Japanese Church, during his two and one-half years away can perhaps best be seen in the extensive writing he sent back for publication. From the time he was on board ship sailing for Britain until several months after arriving back in Japan, Takakura wrote pieces which appeared in thirty issues of the monthly Seisho no Kensan, and twenty-four of the weekly Fukuin Shinpo. These writings ranged from travelogues to personal impressions to more didactic essays. Most were

"Nikki," pp.149-216. Takakura’s general correspondence is reproduced in Zenshu, Vol.10, "Shokan," pp.3-167, arranged according to the recipient; letters he sent from Europe are sprinkled throughout. Letters Takakura sent to his family are on pp.267-284.


27The Seisho no Kensan was established and edited by the influential layman--and Takakura’s close friend--Masutomi Yasuzaemon, and the Fukuin Shinpo by Uemura Masahisa. Cf. Part I, p.95(n.383), Part II, ch.1, p.187.
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Takakura also wrote back about a trip, taken during his Edinburgh stay, to London and Oxford for Christmas: "Ingurando he no Koryoko" ("A Short Trip to England"), in Nos.66,67, May and June, 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.21-26,36-42, and "Okusuforudo Homon Ki" ("Oxford Visit Report"), in No.68, July, 1922, pp.27-31; a two-day excursion through the Trossachs, around Loch Lomond, and to Glasgow: "Sukoku no Kosui Meguri" ("Touring Scotland’s Lakes"), in No.71, October, 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.12-17; and, a week-long venture to the English Lake District towards the end of his year in Oxford: "Kanbarando Yuki" ("Trip to Cumberland"), in Nos.92-93, August and September, 1924 (Taisho 13), pp.35-37,26-32.

"Keramu no Shudoin Homon" has been reproduced in Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.63-81; this account (of his visit to the Kelham Monastery) and the other articles are all in Zenshu, Vol.6, pp.147-209,247-259,283-300,309-351.

29In addition to impressions intermingled with his travelogues, these include three, two-part essays published in the Seisho no Kensan: "Sukoku Ninkishitsu" ("The Character of Scottish People," which includes a focus on one particular family), in Nos.69-70, August and September, 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.31-38,24-28; "Edinbaro no Shizen" (Edinburgh’s Nature"), in Nos.72-73, November and December, 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.37-40,35-42; and, "Eikoku Kyokai Meishi no Insho" ("Impressions of Noteworthy Teachers in England"), in Nos.94-95, October and November, 1924 (Taisho 13), pp.34-38,31-38. These all have been reproduced in Zenshu, Vol.6, pp.210-246,260-282,352-370.

30These consist of his six essays published in the Fukuin Shinpo, as well as four for the Seisho no Kensan. The Fukuin Shinpo works are "Omoidazuru Mama" (written while Takakura was en route to Britain; focuses on the needs of Christianity in Japan), in Nos.1368-1370, 15,22,29 September 1921 (Taisho 10), pp.2-3,4-5,5; "Kami no Kuni ni kansuru Kosatsu sono Ta" ("Considerations concerning the Kingdom of God and Other Matters"), in Nos.1389-1391, 9,16,23 February 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.5-6,6-7,3; "Sukoku Kyokai to sono Rekishi," in Nos.1428-1431,1435, 9,16,23,30 November, 28 December 1922, pp.4-5,4-5,5-6,5-4-5; Katorishizumu ni kansuru Kyomi," in Nos.1456-1458,1460-1461,1463-1465,24,31 May, 7,21,28 June, 12,19,26 July 1923 (Taisho 12), pp.3-4,3-4,5-4,6-7,5-6,5-5-6; "Kirisutokyo no Tokushoku to shite no Choshizen," in Nos.1469-1470,1473,1475-1476,23,30 August, 25 October, 26 November, and 5 December 1923, pp.1-2,3-6,3-4,2-3,3; and, "Eikoku Kirisutokyoakai no Mondai" ("Problems Facing Christianity in England"), in No.1477, 14 December 1923, p.10.

Those published in the Seisho on Kensan are "Kami no Erabitamaeru Mono" ("The Person God Chooses"), in No.69, August, 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.1-10; "Kyokai no Kannen no Enkaku to sono Igi" ("The History of the Idea of the Church and its Meaning"), in Nos.75-77, February through April 1923 (Taisho 12), pp.15-17,16-24,25-30; "Junreiisha" ("Pilgrim"), in No.79, June 1923, pp.27-39; and, a three-part series on "grace": "Oncho ni Katararu Made" ("Until Overcome by Grace"), "Oncho to Kito" ("Grace and Prayer"), and "Oncho to Shimei" ("Grace and Mission"), in Nos.82,84,86, September and December, 1923, February 1924
published in multiple parts, usually in successive issues. Takakura's recollections
of, comparisons to, and specific applications for Japan are sprinkled throughout the
essays, and he affectionately notes at the heading of two of the more theologically-
oriented pieces that they were written specifically for "Friends in My Native
Land."31 Takakura even wrote a very vulnerable piece on friendship, baring his
soul's loneliness as it were at the news that a dear friend was moving away from
Tokyo (and Japan), and thus would not be there when Takakura himself
returned.32

The depth of Takakura's love and devotion towards his native Japan welled up in
his reaction of absolute shock upon hearing the news of the 1 September 1923
Tokyo Earthquake.33 Noting that it was a time to "seek sympathy in people
related to Japanese," Takakura fervently joined in the process of raising disaster
funds, as well as in praying "for the sake of the kingdom of God, for the sake of
Japan."34 Under more normal circumstances, the fact that Takakura was Japanese
also quite possibly helps to explain his deep feelings of attachment to deceased
Christians and their families during his frequent visits to cemeteries in Britain, as

---

31"Kokoku ni aru Tomo ni...." This subtitle is included in the respective Fukuin
Shinpo articles on Catholicism and the supernatural.

32"Tomo o Omou Kokoro" ("A Heart Thinking of a Friend") Seisho no Kensan
No.76, March, 1923 (Taisho 12), pp.36-39; Zenshu, Vol.6, pp.301-308. Takakura
introduces what he was to write as "sentimental," advising—even requesting--those
who do not like such things not to read it.


34Ibid., pp.204,205.
well as his aversion to seeing dead animals hanging in Edinburgh's meat shops.\footnote{282}

Takakura's nationality also quite naturally shows in his qualified defence of the Japanese government--including the participation of the military--in the face of criticism by a Canadian acquaintance of Japanese militarism,\footnote{282} or, in his artistic preference for old, Japanese armour as opposed to what he saw displayed in Edinburgh Castle.\footnote{282}

In summation, it can and should be said that both unconsciously and consciously,\footnote{282} as well as by custom, language, and wilful effort, Takakura Tokutaro was Japanese. This basic, foundational cultural and national identity was a fundamental aspect of his personhood, and the fact that he was Japanese undoubtedly cast a long shadow over all of his thought. Realising the importance of this influential "shadow" of Takakura's Japanese identity should (to switch to a

\footnote{282}{"Edinbar ano Shoinsho" Seisho no Kensan No.63, February, 1922 (Taisho 11), p.27 (Zenshu, Vol.6, pp.168-169); "Edinbar no Shizen" Seisho no Kensan No.72, November, 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.38-39,40 (Zenshu, Vol.6, pp.263-265,266-267). How Takakura's being Japanese influenced his attraction to cemeteries or his revulsion at seeing dead animals could be the subject of much longer discussions than are possible to conduct here. The relevant point is that Takakura reacted to, felt towards, and thought within various situations as a Japanese.

\footnote{282}{"Sukoku no Kosui Mawari" Seisho no Kensan No.71, October, 1922 (Taisho 11), p.28; Zenshu, Vol.6, p.256.

\footnote{282}{"Edinbar no Shizen" Seisho no Kensan No.73, December, 1922 (Taisho 11), p.36; Zenshu, Vol.6, p.270.

38Especially while away from Japan, Takakura was self-conscious of being Japanese. Also, throughout his life Takakura was peculiarly aware of his own thought and motives. While noting his personal struggle with the problem of the "self" (a struggle noted by all analysts of Takakura; cf. Part I, pp.25-26), Takakura wrote in retrospect that attempting to solve that problem was his primary motive for converting to Christianity, and for pursuing theological studies. Takakura, "Shukufukuseraruru Made," in Oncho to Okoku, pp.1-2; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.18-19.

While in Britain, Takakura specifically noted in his diary how his thought was developing, how he was going about selecting a "plan" for his research, as well as how his teachers' thinking compared to his own "method of thinking." (Relevant to the issue of language is the fact that Takakura often wrote such terms as "plan" and "method of thinking" in English.) Zenshu, Vol.10, pp.178,187,208.
more appropriate, "illuminating" analogy) shed much light on the current thesis’ attempt at understanding him.39

Another of the many examples of Takakura’s expressed desire to serve his country was the publication of his influential work, Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo. As he states in the Introduction, this work is part of the Church’s prayer and struggle to establish the gospel of the Cross of Jesus Christ at "the centre of the fatherland."40 Through the truth of the gospel, believers are to love others, "especially when thinking of the fatherland and our fellow countrymen."41 Upon concluding by appealing to "the present day Christian world" to heed the "Evangelical Christianity"42 which he has just presented, Takakura further asks his readers to heed "this truth of Christianity out of anxious concern for the fatherland, and love for our fellow countrymen. This is our lifelong, fervent plea."43 Takakura’s desire that his book be beneficial to and within Japan should not unfavourably be prejudged as some sort of blind nationalism, something that subsumed within itself all other aspirations, including in this case devotion to the gospel in its own right.44 It rather should serve simply as a further illustration of Takakura’s Japanese identity.

Remembering then that it was written in Japanese in order to advance the gospel


40"sokoku no chushin"

41"koto ni sokoku o omoi, doho o omou toki"; *FK*, p.2; *Chosakushu*, Vol.2, pp.283,284.


44Takakura himself criticised German theology in this regard. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.216(n.94).
in Japan, we must now proceed to examine Takakura's best-known and highly valued book, as well as "the most fully developed and responsible statement of his thought,"45 Fukuin teki Kirisutokyo.

B. Fukuin teki Kirisutokyo

In July of 1927 (Showa 2), Takakura spoke both to a student gathering and to a church retreat in the mountains of central Japan, northwest of Tokyo. These talks served as the basis for his Fukuin teki Kirisutokyo (FK), which he furiously wrote back in his house in Tokyo during the last ten days of August.46 Produced at the peak of Takakura's theological development and of his influence in the NKK,47 FK gave a "surprisingly large" number of people a "clear understanding of Christianity."48 It was reprinted several times both before and after World War II, a "remarkable" number of copies having been sold.49 Both for its content and its influence, then, the book has been termed both "epoch-making" and a "theological classic."50

1. Preliminary Observations

Before proceeding into an overview of each chapter, three general remarks should help keep in perspective the book's role within Takakura's translation of the gospel into his own contemporary situation. The first overall point is about the book's

45Germany, p.98.

46FK, p.3 (Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.284); Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.251-253. In this last reference, which is to Takakura's diary entries, one can see his fervency: having begun by prayerfully seeking a pure heart, Takakura often notes that writing the book is a "huge responsibility" and a "holy work."

47He was pastoring the then Toyama Church, which had just received about one hundred members from the Fujimicho Church; Takakura was also serving as seminary president and professor. Cf. Part I, p.95-96(n.384); Oshio, pp.183-184.


49Germany, p.98; Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.471.
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title, *Fukuin teki Kirisutokyo (Evangelical Christianity)*. In terms of Meiji Christianity, this "evangelicalism" was the tradition inherited from Uemura Masahisa, the theology of which Uemura had articulated in a particularly clear way through his much-publicised debate with Ebina Danjo.\(^51\) As an "evangelical," Uemura has thus been viewed as having adopted the evangelical faith of the missionaries under whom he studied. Speaking more broadly, this faith has been understood to have been expressed in equivalent forms by the respective Western and Japanese organisations, the World Evangelical Alliance and Fukuin Domeikai.\(^52\)

Similarly, Takakura has been characterised as having been a faithful transmitter of Uemura’s evangelical theological tradition, following the latter’s death in 1925 (Taisho 14).\(^53\) Indeed the large block of members of Fujimicho Church who transferred over to Takakura’s church did so precisely because they saw Takakura as the true theological successor to their beloved, deceased Pastor Uemura.\(^54\) Thus both amongst his contemporaries and later analysts, Takakura has been understood as bearing the same, evangelical theological standard as his mentor.

At the same time, his analysts have noted that Takakura bore that standard in his own way, including adding various new emphases.\(^55\) Furthermore, earlier cautions concerning attempts to classify Uemura Masahisa theologically should be recalled


\(^{52}\) Sato, 1991, pp.13-14; Sato, 1992, p.72; Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.140-141(n.141), 142. The Fukuin Domeikai was restructured and renamed twice during the first quarter of the twentieth century (late Meiji and Taisho).


\(^{54}\) Oshio, pp.200-218 (especially p.213); Mori Hirata, "Nihon Kirisuto Kyokai Fujimicho Kyokai no Bunretsu—Uemura kara Takakura he no Keisho no Mondai to shite" ("The Division of the NKK Fujimicho Church--Viewed as a Problem of the Succession from Uemura to Takakura") *Fukuin to Sekai* No.5, 1985, p.75-76.

here, particularly insofar as those attempts employ "imported theological categories." While thus giving due attention to previous analyses and initial impressions based on Takakura’s commitment to "Evangelical Christianity," we must also be careful to consider Takakura’s *FK* on its own terms, and within its own context. There can be no adequate substitute for a thorough, direct examination of a person’s thought, given of course the restrictions within which any such analysis must work.

This leads us to a second general remark, which concerns the ever-present matter of language and culture. A glance at the Bibliography reveals that all of the works listed are Western. Except for works by Anselm, Athanasius, and Calvin, those included are books originally written in either English and German. And except for four late nineteenth century works, all of the English and German books were written in the twentieth century, and a majority of those in the 1920’s (latter half of Taisho and early Showa).

Furthermore, throughout *FK* every specific reference to an individual (usually an author), including quotations, is either to a biblical or to a Western figure. On the other hand, there are—at first glance at least—only indirect, general references to

---

57As discussed earlier, this particular thesis is having to deal with the restrictions of significant historical and cultural gaps, for example. Cf. Introduction, p.3.  
58The Alexandrian Athanasius has been classified as "Western" here due to his long standing place of high importance in Western theological traditions, even though he is also claimed by other, "non-Western" traditions, e.g., that of the various Orthodox Churches.  
59The list is divided almost evenly between English and German works. The other works are Anselm’s *Cur Deus Homo*, Athanasius’ *On the Incarnation*, and Calvin’s *Institutes*. There are also Japanese translations of Luther’s *Commentary on Galatians* and *Freedom of the Christian*.  
movements or trends taking place within Japan.\textsuperscript{61} This should not, of course, lead us to conclude that Takakura’s explicit concern for the book’s usefulness within Japan should therefore be disregarded. The apparently exclusive drawing upon Western writings rather serves here to magnify the challenge Takakura faced in adapting the gospel both for himself and for his Japanese audience.

Relative to terminology, Takakura occasionally writes words with phoneticised, Western pronunciation alongside Chinese characters, or newly-created phoneticised forms, methods referred to above.\textsuperscript{62} How these and other attempts to meet the overall challenge of linguistic and cultural translation will be examined at appropriate places in the ensuing analysis.

The third general observation is simply to note the brief summaries of \textit{FK} provided by Takakura himself in the Introduction, as well as in his concluding remarks at the end of the book’s fifth and final chapter. After commencing with a quotation from Brunner, Takakura joins him in lamenting, "Whatever you say, modern Christianity is not giving life to the purity and depth of the religion of the Bible." This weakened condition is due in large part to the "rushing stream of modern culture," which "is sweeping away and oppressing Christianity, making its reality shallow and emasculated."\textsuperscript{63}

It is within this desperate state of affairs that Takakura issues his clarion call to the Christian Church:

\begin{quote}
I believe that now, by all means, we must once more freshly understand, and experience in a corrected way, Christianity as the religion of the Bible. To clever, refined modern people, the religion of the Cross may appear foolish, a stumbling block. But ‘the Word of the Cross’ itself is ‘God’s power, and God’s wisdom’. Moreover,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{61}There is a specific reference to "Mukyokai" or "Non-Church" ecclesiology. \textit{FK}, p.143; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.2, 424.

\textsuperscript{62}Cf. above, Part III, p.274(n.3).

the Reformers of the sixteenth century are the ones who grasped well
the purity and depth of the Bible’s religion.... We must return to the
Reformers’ ‘religion of the Word’, ‘religion of grace’, ‘religion of
conscience’.... That is, through [the Reformers we must] thoroughly
return to the religion of the Bible.

Takakura then proceeds to point out that "Evangelical Christianity" is not some
special form of Christianity or "-ism," but simply the religion of the New
Testament, as understood by the Reformers.  

At the conclusion of the fifth and final chapter, Takakura reiterates this plea to the
Christian Church to come to grips with "Evangelical Christianity," which he has
just elucidated. Following a quotation from Karl Holl, Takakura then points to the
One Whom Paul and the Reformers followed, the only One Who can truly be
called "Christianity’s founder," or "Christianity’s foundational centre," the "Lord
Jesus Christ":

We want, through Paul, through Luther and Calvin, more deeply to
understand and believe the Lord Christ. The motto of Luther’s
religion was ‘only through faith alone’ (sola fide), and Calvin’s was
‘glory to the one and only God’ (sola Deo gloria). Through the
two large, central figures of the Reformation, the truth of Evangelical
Christianity is marvellously declared. Only faith alone, grace alone.
What we seek is that those saved through faith alone will live solely
for the sake of the glory of the Lord alone.

Thus it is that Takakura concludes his summons to the Christian world of his day.
And it is the various facets of this call to the Church that Takakura seeks to address
throughout the book’s five chapters, the successive examinations of which we must
now commence.

---

64This is written as the phoneticised "izumu."

65FK, pp.1-2; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.282-283.

66"kirisutokyo no sosetsusha,’ or ‘kirisutokyo no sosetsuteki chushin”

67The enclosed Latin phrases are in fact written in Latin.

In so doing, we must enter Takakura's Tokyo home, as it were, and think with him as he writes over the course of the next ten days. This is a special period that he has set aside for consolidating on paper what he believes with all his heart that which God would have him say to the Church of his day. If we are to understand Takakura, we must labour with him in thought, moving along carefully through times of fatigue, periods of intensity, run-on phrases, unexplained ideas, unclear progressions of thought, and (for us here) cumbersome translations. Apart from tracing Takakura's thought as he presents it, we very well might miss important subtleties of his main concerns, as well as of his manner of thinking. We will therefore need to be with him in his house for a good while. When Takakura is finished writing, we shall emerge with him in order to reflect and to get our contextual bearings, and then to analyse his thought more deeply in Part IV of the thesis.

2. Chapter-by-Chapter Examination

The book has five chapters, entitled as follows:

I. The Bible and its View of God
II. View of Christ
III. View of the Atonement
IV. View of the Life of Faith
V. Special Characteristics of Evangelical Christianity

Each chapter is then divided into anywhere from five to ten sections. A brief

---

69 Especially in light of Sato Toshio's recognised status as the single most authoritative interpreter of Takakura's theology, his own chapter-by-chapter outline of FK, while being quite concise, helpfully served as a confirming and clarifying reference in the articulation--although only in the final stages--of this present summary. Sato, 1983, pp.105-114.

70 Takakura actually labels the chapters as "lectures," i.e., "dai ikko," "dai niko," etc.


72 These sections are numbered, yet untitled.
introduction\textsuperscript{73} and bibliography respectively open and close the book.\textsuperscript{74}

\textbf{a. Chapter I: The Bible and its View of God}

Chapter I sets the tone for the entire book. Throughout this chapter’s nine sections, Takakura wrestles with many of the central issues which regularly reappear, and he does so in ways representative of his overall thought. Along with Chapter IV on the "Life of Faith," Chapter I has been described as "a masterpiece, depicting well the special characteristics of ‘Takakura Theology’, filled with originality and passion.\textsuperscript{75} All of these factors justify giving this chapter a slightly more detailed and thorough treatment than the others will receive.\textsuperscript{76}

Takakura takes the first two sections to explain and stress the urgent need to deal with the correlative subjects of the Bible and God. In "fundamental" contrast to Roman Catholicism, which places "absolute authority" for "perfectly guaranteeing religious truth" in the "Church as a visible institution," Protestantism has recognised such authority to rest in the "Bible as God’s Word":

\begin{quote}
The sixteenth century Reformers, such as Luther and Calvin, through matchless, keen prophetic insight and thorough faith, achieved the purification of Christianity--as the religion of the Bible--which since early Christianity had been compromised and made impure through other cultures and religions. I think that it is not at all too much to say that, in the history of Christianity, the time of the Reformers was Christianity’s Golden Age as ‘the religion of the Bible’, ‘the religion of the Word’.\textsuperscript{77}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{73}This was composed after the body of the text was completed. \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.10, "Nikki," p.253. Takakura added some further introductory comments to the third edition, which was unrevised except for "correction of terms" and produced within only a year after the original publication. \textit{FK}, p.4; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.2, pp.285-286.


\textsuperscript{76}This weighted attention to Chapter I is true of Sato’s outline as well. Sato, 1983, pp.105-108.

However, in the wake of the Renaissance, the eighteenth century saw the "sudden rise to power" of Enlightenment thought. Rationalism, naturalism, and humanism came to "dominate," and Protestantism as the religion of the Word thus became severely "diluted." Hence, "Even such Christianity as that which the one called the great pioneer of modern theologians, Schleiermacher, emphasised does not at all purely impart the religion of the Bible." Rather, that particular Christianity has adopted "contemporary romanticism and pantheistic-mystical elements." In the twentieth century, and in contemporary, post-World War I Europe and America ("excepting the German theological world"), "It must be said that the tendency to seek to enliven Christianity as the religion of the Bible is meagre."78

Takakura offers four reasons why contemporary Christianity came to its present, weak condition. The first is that "Those who advocate a so-called liberal Christianity have fallen into religious subjectivism. Having received the influences of rationalism, naturalism, [and] humanism, the transcendental, objective side79 of

78FK, pp.8-9; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.288-289. At the end of a similar summary of Protestantism which he gives at the beginning of Chapter V, Takakura elaborates on the current state of European and American theology. There he notes "the religious movement attempting freshly to enliven Christianity as 'the religion of the Bible'--like the Christianity which the Reformers emphasised--occurring among, and possibly through, relatively young German and Swiss theologians and Christians." Takakura then lists parenthetically some of these theologians' names: Barth, Gogarten, Brunner, Schaedler, Heim, Althaus, Stange, Girgensohn. (All of these, along with other contemporaries, appear in the Bibliography. FK, pp.173-176; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.454-458.)

Takakura then offers his analysis that, having "suffered most acutely" in the war, they "took one large leap forward as the crow flies in their deadlocked faith and collided with the religion of the Reformers, and through this their eyes were freshly opened relative to the religion of the Bible." Takakura also states his belief that this theological and religious movement is "not at all a temporary reaction," but that it is "correctly putting back on track Christianity, which until now has been derailed, dragged away by culture."

Regarding British and American Christianity, Takakura laments the current lack of "awakening of evangelical faith, such as in Germany." He singles out, however, Forsyth as "occupying an isolated, great position in the modern British-American theological world," having "firmly grasped the core of biblical, evangelical Christianity." FK, p.150; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.431-432.

79"choetsuteki na, kyakkanteki na homen"
the Christian faith has been neglected, and God's immanent side has been emphasised." This subjective Christianity has taught people to find God in the "depths of the soul," to "penetrate the soul's life," and thus to seek a "fusion" or "identity of the soul and God." This thinking neglects objective grace, however, and it blurs the fundamental, biblical line between Creator and creature. It has thus resulted in a loss of "true prayer"80 as well as of any "certainty of salvation."81

The other three reasons flow out of the first. Modern, subjective Christianity views humanity optimistically. The biblical understanding is that of a sinful creature having a fundamental, tragic inner dualism who stands in need of divine "grace."82 The contemporary, optimistic interpretation on the other hand sees humanity as weak, yet ever progressing towards its ideal through education and enlightenment. The third reason for modern Christianity's ineptitude thus follows in turn, namely its having become a human-centred, experience-oriented religion which sees God as a means to fulfilling humanity's religious desires. This so-called cultural and philosophical Christianity turns out simply to be utilitarian, e.g., only providing service for the state, and is exemplified by the imported American Social Gospel. It offers no manifestation of the biblical religion of conscience, of calling, of living for God's glory. Hence it is only natural that the fourth cause of the present condition of Christianity, its secular, this-worldliness, should have nullified the healthy other-worldly, eschatological spirit of the Christianity of the Bible.83

---

80I.e., "Prayer becomes the soul's monologue instead of the soul's dialogue, and Brunner's so-called dramatic prayer is replaced by lyrical prayer." Takakura devotes a portion of Chapter IV to elaborate on these and other points about prayer. Cf. below, Part III, pp.329-330.

81The equivalent phrase is "skui no tashikasa." Emphasis original. FK, pp.9-10; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.289-290.

82Emphasis original.

83Takakura expressly distinguishes between a "Buddhist, [world-] evading sentimental other-worldly heart" and a "God-centred, healthy other-worldly heart coming from the awakened, religious conscience." FK, pp.10-12; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.290-293.
Having thus demonstrated the urgency of considering the Bible's message, Takakura proceeds in the third section to point out something concerning which he says Protestants should be in full agreement: God is the central subject about which the Bible speaks. Amongst other Christian groups who offer such alleged central biblical emphases as morality, fulfilment of religious emotions, doctrine, and prophecies concerning Christ's Second Coming, the "so-called 'History of Religions School'" is singled out by Takakura for its "historical, critical, scientific research" of "the religion of the Bible." This school had arisen out of the milieu which had seen Protestantism not only "lose faith in God's objective certainty," but also replace that faith with a focus on the psychological development of the soul's religious desires. In seeking to explain religious experience of the past, the history of religions scholars had thus applied to "objective, historical facts" the same developmental, mechanistic methodology used by religious psychology. While "perhaps satisfying academic interest" as well as "making the contributions of making more precise the Bible's grammatical interpretation and of clarifying its cultural background," the scientific methodology employed by the history of religions school "kills the living religion of the Bible." The school's contribution relative to "the most important point" of "clarifying the truth of the religion of the Bible" is therefore doubtful.

As to how God is presented to us in the Bible, Takakura makes the following, crucial remarks which, while directly concerned with the Bible, could be seen at the same time as giving a concise presentation of the rest of the book:

The Bible is not a book which teaches us about God, but a book placing us face to face with God Himself, actually putting us into contact with that reality. The God of the Bible is not a simple truth, nor only an ideal value; that god is a dead god. The God pressing upon us in the Bible is the living God, the absolute Other, the holy

---

84Takakura offers the illustrative example, "just as Confucian people look to the Analects."

85*kami no kyakkanteki tashikasa no shinko o ushinai"; emphasis original.

Father Who forgives our sin through *judging* it. Rather than something which brings about the contemplation of truth about God, the Bible causes us who are sinful to experience the living God of atonement. Truly to know the God of the Bible is none other than being forgiven of sin, and being brought into fellowship with God. According to this meaning, the Bible is the Word of God. Only in the Bible are we sinners able to hear the matchless, living Word of God, because for the faith of us Protestants, the living, true God gives nothing besides the Bible as something able to be the ultimate authority.

In describing the Bible in this way, Takakura packs the remainder of *FK* into this one set of statements. The Bible’s authority, God, Christ (implicitly), the atonement, and the experience of saving faith all are contained in the above paragraph. Insofar as the book is a single, self-contained presentation which seeks to develop and preserve its own inner harmony, each part of the book suggests the whole. Thus while progressing through the particular themes which comprise *FK*, Takakura will continually return—as if turning round and round a multi-faceted diamond—to the same subjects. For him these topics all interconnect to make up his total theological package.

Takakura next proceeds in sections four through seven of Chapter I to address various aspects of the Bible’s authority. For Takakura this matter is crucial: "I am convinced that the biggest problem for the contemporary Protestant faith is in the establishment of religious authority." This is because modern theologians such as Auguste Sabatier show a "fundamental misunderstanding" of "faith-consciousness" in placing freedom and self before authority and grace. This error of neglecting the highest religious authority "is not at all something producing a disciplined, strong faith."

---


88"shinkoishiki"

89Takakura notes parenthetically that this mistake is not just a "problem of psychological process," but a "truth problem."

90*FK*, pp.16-17; *Chosakushu*, Vol.2, pp.296-298.
In searching for the meaning of the Bible's absolute authority, neither the "so-called Bible's verbal inspiration" nor its "opposite extreme," the "attitude of the Bible's historical, critical research," is adequate. As to the former, having "appeared after the earnest, powerful faith of the time of the Reformers had declined and become seventeenth century Scholastic Protestantism, this theory, this faith" was based on an understandable "religious motive" to seek "absolute authority for the life of faith." But this "totally mechanistic" theory has "many contradictions," including the concurrent recognition yet neglect of the Bible's human and personal elements, affirming yet denying the Bible's progressive development in faith and morals, as well as preaching yet forgetting biblical truth as "salvific" and "redemptive truth." The latter "attitude" of historical criticism, having arisen in the nineteenth century and represented by such scholars as Bousset and Gunkel, "is naturalising and rationalising the Bible's view of God.... It is replacing the God of the Bible with an idea or value, or a vague large life." No more than the theory of verbal inspiration, then, can historical, critical research be reckoned to "clarify the Bible's ultimate, religious truth." Not surprisingly, "In order to receive the Bible according to the true meaning of its being the Word of God," Takakura urges a return to the Reformers' view. Luther exemplifies "the Reformers' famous circle" of the Word of God and of the Holy Spirit" in his argument for the necessity of God's giving His Spirit together with His Word in order for there to be right understanding of the Bible. Takakura quotes Calvin twice in pointing out the Reformers' emphasis on the "internal witness through the Holy Spirit," such that "the Word of God rouses complete

---

91 Takakura's Japanese rendition of "verbal inspiration" is "mubyusetsu" in characters—which has the literal English equivalent of "no-mistake-theory," i.e., "inerrancy"—accompanied by the phoneticised reading, "vabaru-insupireshon."

92 "...bakuzen taru daiseimei."

93 "seisho no shukyo no kyukyoku no shinri o araka ni suru"; FK, pp.17-21; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.298-301.

94 The equivalent of "circle" is written in the characters "junkan ronho," accompanied by the phoneticised "sakuru."
faith in people's hearts... [T]hus we have complete certainty...''95 relative to God's Word. In returning to Luther, Takakura notes the importance he gave to "the Bible's historical, literal meaning," while emphasising the Holy Spirit's interpretation as "something which raises"96 the literal interpretation upon which it is based. Moreover, as Holl explains in reference to Luther, "The Holy Spirit's interpretation, while confirming the Bible's correct literal meaning, plunges into it, and reaches all the way to the living God."97 Hence we see, Takakura argues, the Reformers' distinction between the Bible and the Word of God contained within it, even while holding the two inseparably together.98

In this manner, the Word of God in the Bible is inspired and has absolute authority, the certainty concerning which is given not by reason, but by the "insight of the Holy Spirit." Moreover, in that "The Bible is the record of supernatural, superhistorical reality coming into historical, human reality,"99 it has both divine and human elements. In terms of what these things mean for interpreting the Bible, full recognition must be given to the Holy Spirit's freedom. Moreover, there are examples of the fact that "the living, eternal Word of God actually, firmly pressed upon" people such as Augustine, Francis of Assisi, and Luther in giving them spiritual insight into certain Bible texts, such that the "historical gap between the reader and the Bible was completely abolished." However, instead of the resulting conclusion being a free interpretation of the Scriptures according to whatever the

95 The word "tashikasa" is emphasised both times by Takakura within the two quotations from Calvin.

96 The equivalent expression here is "shiyo suru mono." The unusual character combination "shiyo" is accompanied by the phoneticised "aufuheben" (aufheben).

97 "Seirei kaishaku to ha seisho no tadashi bunjiteki igi o tashikametsutsu, sore ni tsukiitte, ikeru kami ni made tasseshimeru mono de aru."

98 Some analysts see in this sort of discussion a Barthian influence. As to Takakura's encounter with the early Barth and other writers of crisis theology, cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.263-266. What sort of "influence" there might or might not have been will be addressed later in Part III, as well as in Part IV.

99 "Seisho ha choshizenteki chorekishiteki jitsuzai ga, rekishiteki jinteki na jitsuzai no naka ni irikonda kiroku de aru."
reader might think, what must be realised for a proper, Holy Spirit interpretation are the necessary prerequisites of reading the Bible with prayer, with an earnest conscience instead of just intellectually, and in light of the entire, historic Church’s corporate interpretation of the Bible.\textsuperscript{100}

Takakura proceeds to state that God’s authoritative Word in the Bible is, "if stated in one word, the gospel, the living God’s atoning grace in His only Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. The kernel of God’s Word is the crucified and risen, historic Christ."\textsuperscript{101} Here Takakura warns against separating the "living Christ" from the Bible, which would lead to subjective pietism and "religious emotionalism."\textsuperscript{102} Instead of separating Himself from the Bible,

\begin{quote}
Christ as the Word of God works on us within and through the Bible. The historic Christ of the Bible, rending the grave of the Bible through the Holy Spirit, is experienced in the present as the eternally living Christ. Here is where Forsyth’s so-called \textit{Historical Mysticism}, through the Word of God and the Holy Spirit, is established.\textsuperscript{103}
\end{quote}

Takakura thus goes on to summarise the matter of the absolute authority of the Word of God by stating, "The Bible has authority because it drives us sinners to Christ, and in Him brings us into fellowship with the living God." In its revelation of this truth content, and in this gospel as the organically unified message of Christ as it is accompanied by the Holy Spirit, lies the unique biblical authority.\textsuperscript{104} Even though it is unreasonable to think that every problem of contemporary culture can be solved by the Bible,

\begin{quote}
Nevertheless God, Who spoke through every prophet and through the Lord Christ, speaks in the Bible to us alive even now. For both
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{100}FK, pp.21-25; Chosakushu, Vol.2, 301-305.


\textsuperscript{102}This phrase is written in the characters "shukyoteki kanjo shugi," accompanied by the phoneticised "rerijasu-emoshonarizumu."

\textsuperscript{103}Emphasis original. FK, p.27; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.307.

\textsuperscript{104}FK, pp.27-28; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.307-308.
ancient people and current people, the problem fundamentally lying across human nature and the world is not something that eternally changes. The dualism of human nature and of the world, the battle between spirit and flesh and between the kingdom of God and this world, is an eternal problem. The living God in the Bible, in the Bible’s central focus of the Lord Christ and His Cross, has gathered up this fundamental problem, and has thoroughly solved it. For this reason the Bible, together with being a book of the past, is also eternally a book of the present. Together with the Bible’s central problem being something eternal, its solution is also eternal. The Lord Jesus’ words, ‘Though heaven and earth pass away, my Word shall never pass away’, are to us eternally ‘Amen’.105

Once again, and even more explicitly here, Takakura sets forth a summary of his entire thought concerning man and sin, Christ and the Cross in order justifiably to set forth the just-summarised portion of his thought on the Bible’s authority.

Before closing Chapter I by describing the Bible’s view of God in sections eight and nine, Takakura feels it important first to say a few words about the relationship between revelation and reason. He describes three alternative relationships. First is the view represented by Hegel and Schleiermacher in the Enlightenment-humanist tradition, a view which claims that reason can interpret all of the content of revelation. In the end this dual commitment to reason and religious romanticism fails, for "without the miracle of pardon, without God’s grace, we who are sinful cannot stand in the certainty of fellowship with God."106 Second is the understanding that revelation both surpasses reason and gives it a new foundation. This view alone can confirm "the unity of fact and value, the unity of sein and sollen."107 Moreover, only this view can bridge the gap between God and sinful humanity. Being the view of Paul, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Pascal and others, it understands the movement of solving the broken, divine-human personal relationship to initiate with the Creator in revelation, and to be received by the

105FK, p.29; Chosakushu, p.309.

106Emphases original. FK, pp.30-31; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.310-311.

107"Sein and sollen" are written simply in phoneticised forms, i.e., "zain to zoruren."
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gracious enablement of the Holy Spirit given through the Bible.\textsuperscript{108} The third alternative--simply stated by Takakura to be unacceptable--is that of extreme mysticism, in which revelation and reason are viewed as mutually exclusive and contradictory.\textsuperscript{109}

Takakura next lists some special characteristics of biblical revelation. He points out initially that these characteristics are "paradoxical.... Both extremities, while thought to be incompatible, at a deep place are unified." Takakura then issues the following descriptive qualities of the revelation of the Bible: first, it is both an unrepeatable, historical revelation as well as superhistorical. A quotation from Brunner helps to substantiate Takakura's point that a "historical fact, through the Holy Spirit, works in the present, and is experienced as eternal reality." Thus unlike mysticism's alleged unmediated, direct experience of the divine, biblical divine-experience is mediated through history. Second, biblical revelation is both peculiar and universal. The former is seen in the choosing of Israel, as well as in the "deep meaning of election"; revelation's universal application is in the salvation of the whole world and of the entire human race, and in the "historico-philosophical meaning of Christ's Second Coming." The third characteristic of revelation is that it is something miraculous and atoning. Per Takakura's description, "God alone works, people completely receive." In coming to people in this way, "Revelation is not something irrational, but something antirational." Moreover, "Revelation, through judging the other, saves it." Finally, the revelation of the Bible has a "miraculous, organic unity." The Old Testament prepares for and prophesies the coming of Jesus Christ, Who completes and fulfils the Old Testament as recorded in the New. Thus it is that revelation "is completely unified in God's Son, Jesus Christ."\textsuperscript{110}

Insofar as other religions have as the purpose of their revelational contents either

\textsuperscript{108}FK, pp.31-32; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.312-313.

\textsuperscript{109}FK, pp.30,31; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.310,312.

\textsuperscript{110}Emphases original. FK, pp.33-35; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.313-315.
to fulfil natural, human desires or to attempt to explain the world, their idea of god is in the end either a "postulate of the self" or a "first cause of a worldview." However, in the revelation of the Bible, the living God presses upon us as the absolute Other. Thus instead of being a "postulate of the self," He works on us as the "certain Thou." Since the "matchless historical fact of the Lord Jesus Christ stands in the centre of the revelation of the Bible," it is therefore the case that "This fact of Christ effects in us sinners the matchless God-consciousness." Hence Takakura closes this section, which leads into sections eight and nine on the biblical view of God, by noting the "deep meaning" in Martin Kähler’s words: "'We believe Christ because of the Bible, we believe the Bible because of discovering Christ in the Bible'."

Having wrestled through the articulation of what might be termed his epistemological approach, Takakura proceeds to describe four "special characteristics of the idea of the living God in the Bible." First is that "the God of the Bible is 'Creator of Heaven and Earth'.... [This is] the most neglected side of the idea of God in contemporary Christianity." That God is the Creator itself means four things: the certainty of God's reality, that God is the almighty source of all things, that he is absolute ruler over the entire universe, and that "the meaning of the reality of creatures relative to God is to display His glory." As to this fourth aspect of the meaning of God's being the Creator, Takakura states, "God the Lord of heaven and earth is a jealous God." However, in direct contrast to its proper posture towards its Creator--one expressed by Calvin's "sola Deo

111The equivalent phrase is "tashika na du." The "du" is written in the character which is normally pronounced "nanji," with the phoneticised "du" (for the German "du," or English "Thou") written alongside.

112FK, pp.35-36; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.315-316.

113Christian objectivism arises from this truth." That is, we must not have the narrow, mystical view of God as ruling only over our souls, but over all the world, including family, school, government, economy, and nation.
gloria"—"The fundamental spirit of modern civilisation is idol worship, the adoration of humanity." Because of being "very strongly possessed by this sickness," modern Christianity unwittingly has slipped into various sorts of "mystical-pantheistic piety." To avert this "crisis of the truth of the Bible," we must "worship God only, the Lord of heaven and earth."115

The second quality of the God of the Bible is that He is the living God. This means that He is "completely personal," and that He thus can become the object of prayer. Third is that God works in history. While standing above history, God enters, judges, and saves history. "Eternal meaning" is thus given "for the first time to human history," in contrast to the lack of any "deep meaning" given to history by either Greco-Roman or Buddhist thought. Moreover, in that the Lord of history has "intended to realise the kingdom of God in history," such a process is not progressive or evolutionary, but atoning and creative. "Here is the fight between the kingdom of God and history, and through the kingdom of God the salvation of history is made certain."116

Takakura then fourthly describes the "culmination of the Bible’s idea of God," namely that God is the "holy Father." It is in this truth that Jesus’ "teaching, person, and work are thoroughly revealed." When Jesus addressed God as "Father," He did not mean that God "only has a gentle, sentimental love," but that He is the "‘righteous Father’" who saves sinners "through holy judgement." Moreover, God the Father’s giving of Jesus in the Incarnation and Crucifixion both solves the "destiny of us sinners" and demonstrates God’s "immeasurably deep love." Thus only in God’s holy love do we have a basis for "Christian, prophetic optimism."117

114The phrase for "sola Deo gloria" is written in the characters "yuitsu no kami ni eiko are," with the phoneticised "sori-deo-guroria" alongside.

115Emphases original. FK, pp.36-38; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.316-319.


Takakura concludes Chapter I of *FK* by summarising the Bible's view of God, which so urgently needs to be heard and obeyed: "In the Bible, the *living* God is the Creator of heaven and earth, and the atoning God in the Lord Christ. He is the God Whom we should fear and worship, as well as adore and lovingly serve. The meaning of our having been placed in this world is, through body and soul, to display the glory of this God."\(^{118}\) In Takakura's mind, the Christianity of his day was so captivated by the contemporary culture so as to be pursuing happily its own satisfaction. In direct, stark contrast to this tendency, Takakura sets forth the holy, living, active Creator as the Judge and Saviour to be embraced and followed. Thus it is in Chapter I that he begins his prophetic summons to the Church to awaken to its plight, be forgiven through judgement, and thus obtain the certainty, strength and life which the early Church and the Reformers experienced, but which in the present day was so clearly lacking.

b. Chapter II: View of Christ

Having carefully examined in Chapter I Takakura's primary concerns and emphases, as well as his way of dealing with those matters, we can now at least attempt to move somewhat more briskly through the remaining four chapters of *FK*. Generally speaking, Takakura's chapters on Christology, soteriology, Christian living, and his summary rearticulation in Chapter V all are interconnected with, and in some sense based upon, what he has already laid out in Chapter I. Nevertheless, as we continue to gaze at the diamond of his thought, there are some fascinating and often surprising facets that will appear, for Takakura seems continually to revolve his thought at different angles. Different facets will thus require special attention in order for us to grasp (or be grasped by) Takakura's thinking. Even though we will be able to bypass some things, or give them no more than a brief glance, we must still take adequate care while continuing our examination of the remainder of this most crucial and representative example of Takakura's thought.

Takakura begins his second chapter, on (the Bible's) "View of Christ," by again citing Pascal and Paul to emphasise the absolute and central importance of Jesus Christ not only for our knowledge of God, but for our having life itself. As "Christianity's central fact," and as God's "solution to the fundamental problem of the universe and human life," Jesus commanded His followers to "follow 'Me'," not just learn from His teachings. This held a "completely different meaning" from the ways in which Gautama and Confucius instructed their disciples. What we must therefore realise is that,

When we recognise that Jesus Christ is God's only Son, that He is the Lord and Saviour, for the first time the conviction of Christianity's being the absolute religion, [of its being] the perfect, atoning religion is established. 'What do you think of Jesus Christ?' is the test of our faith. Blessed is the person who does not stumble over this question.

To deal with this central question, Takakura thus sets forth a three-part outline for the chapter's remaining nine sections: the Christology of the New Testament, the Christology of the "Christian Church of the past," and a suggested Christology for the present.

---

119To help keep ourselves in Takakura's concrete, everyday world, it is good to note that he began writing this chapter on Tuesday afternoon, 23 August, and--despite battling ill health--finished it Thursday night the 25th. Writing Chapter I had taken all day Monday and Tuesday morning. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.251-252.

120Takakura includes Pascal in the list of those having the preferred understanding of the relationship between faith and revelation; cf. above, Part III, p.298. Also, Takakura begins his section eight of Chapter I, in describing the God of the Bible, by citing Pascal's well-known statement made at the time of his conversion of having come to know the God of the Patriarchs as opposed to the god of the philosophers and scientists. FK, p.36; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.316-317.

121"kirisutokyo no chushin jijitsu"; Takakura uses this exact phrase twice here.

122FK, pp.45-47; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.325-327.


124Ibid.
Takakura points out that in approaching the New Testament's view of Christ, we must proceed with the Old Testament prophets' view of human history as the "stage for the working of God's will and administration." Thus unlike either the Greco-Roman view of static reality or Buddhism's fatalistic theory of transmigration, "For the Hebrew prophets reality is something dynamic, it is holy will." It was against this background of seeing God work redemptively in history, of interpreting God's "act of establishing the kingdom of God" through His sending the Messiah for His chosen people Israel's salvation, that the writers of the New Testament understood "the truth of Jesus of Nazareth as the Incarnation of God's Son become human." We too, by implication, must therefore remember the "marvellous Providence of God" in considering New Testament Christology.125

Takakura then proceeds to consider, in turn, the Christologies of the Synoptic Gospels, the early Church as recorded in Acts, then Paul and John.126 As for the Jesus of the Synoptics, He truly was a man who was natural and who grew. His "musical" personality was able to combine different elements such as gentleness and strength, joy and sorrow, idealism and realism.127 But as Peter recognised in begging Jesus to "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man," Jesus was also holy, something especially shown in His hatred of hypocrisy.128 Moreover, Jesus was "actually aware of a superhuman authority to grant the forgiveness of sins," a right that no sinner, and indeed only God the Father, can exercise. Also, "From beginning to end, His life was one of absolute loyalty and obedience to God the Father," and thus in this positive way Jesus demonstrated His sinlessness.129


126Takakura projects considering as well the Christologies of the letter to the Hebrews and of other New Testament books, but he ends up omitting these. FK, pp.49,65; Chosakusu, Vol.2, pp.329,345.

127FK, pp.50-51; Chosakusu, Vol.2, pp.330-331.

128Takakura also remarks here that "Otto's so-called Numinous thing was in His personality."

129The Synoptics thus do not portray Jesus' sinlessness "only negatively as having no sin or impurity in His person."
Thus in terms of the impression which the first apostles had of Jesus, their "spiritual intuition was able to recognise that Jesus Christ certainly was sinless." That "the Lord Jesus was sinless" moves Takakura to declare, "Here a surprising, matchless miracle has occurred within history."\(^{130}\)

The Jesus of the Synoptics furthermore was aware of His own unique position and authority, having a Self-identity of God’s Son, and thus a deep Messianic Self-consciousness and sense of calling.\(^{131}\) In seeking to "dig more deeply" behind Jesus’ "Self-awareness"\(^{132}\) of being the Son of God—something which enabled Him to have such great authority relative to His disciples to the point of becoming the object of their faith—we can say that "God’s enterprise of atonement is based on this Self-awareness of Jesus."\(^{133}\) Indeed, "God’s great administration of human redemption in history was something going upstream until Jesus’ matchless Self-awareness of being the Son." We cannot really answer the question as to when Jesus became aware of His unique Sonship, however. Takakura’s suggestion is that perhaps better than asking that question is to say that His was a "supertemporal, metaphysical Self-awareness."\(^{134}\)

As for the Christology recorded in the book of Acts, it tells us of the early Church’s understanding which developed out of Jesus’ Resurrection and the descent

\(^{130}\)FK, pp.51-54; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.331-334.

\(^{131}\)FK, pp.54-58; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.334-338.

\(^{132}\)"jikaku"

\(^{133}\)"Iesu no kono jikaku no ue ni, kami no shokuzai no jigyo ha kisozukerarete iru."

\(^{134}\)Takakura’s wording here is "chojikanteki na metafijikaru na jikaku." FK, p.55; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.335. Charles Germany notes here in the margin of his own copy of FK, "What does this mean?" Whatever Takakura does mean, he apparently thinks this way of considering Jesus’ Self-awareness of being God’s Son is more satisfactory than trying to ask about the timing of His coming to that realisation, for he offers no further explanation. At least for now we shall leave the matter, but Takakura’s struggle to formulate certain philosophical ideas must be part of the thesis’ eventual analysis and evaluation.
of the Holy Spirit: "The first disciples were seized by the power received from the resurrected Jesus, and they had to call Him Lord."135 While we today "cannot precisely know the form of Jesus’ Resurrection," we "must recognise His Resurrection as an objective fact."136 If we do not, we fail to do justice not only to the early Church’s "looking up to the eternal Christ" as the "historic Jesus Who had risen to the right [hand] of God," but also to their understanding the resurrected Jesus to be the "author of Christians’ fellowship/the Christian Church."137 Moreover, the disciples moved from an ethical relationship with the earthly Jesus to a "religious attitude"138 towards Jesus, culminating in their distinguishing confession of His divinity.139

As for Paul’s Christology, Takakura stresses first and foremost that it "is based on his intense experience of atonement." Takakura explains Paul’s experience as that of having been "fundamentally converted" on the road to Damascus, where he was "seized by the resurrected Christ" in the midst of his own painful struggle of the "contradiction of flesh and spirit." Takakura quotes Bruce and Machen in emphasising that for Paul, "The Damascus road experience was the decisive power of his faith," and that we thus "must not forget that his Christology was built on the experience of being atoned through the Cross of Christ." Hence we can better understand why Paul’s Christology had such "deep meaning." In summation of this important point, Takakura states, "There was a deep, organic relationship between Paul’s faith and theology."140

---

136Emphasis original. "...objective fact" is "...kyakkanteki na jijitsu."
137op.cit. Takakura’s words translated into English here as "fellowship" and "the Christian Church" are characters accompanied by phoneticised Greek equivalents: "majiwari" with "koinonia," and "kirisutokyokai" with "ekurejia."
138"shukyoteki taido"
Takakura then notes five special characteristics of Paul's Christology. First is the close relationship between Christ and the Holy Spirit: "The Holy Spirit is not a vague, influence or power of God, but the Spirit given by Christ." Second, Paul, along with the other disciples, recognised Jesus as Lord and as the Son of God. Third, Paul acknowledged "the existence of Christ before the world." Among other texts, Philippians 2:6-7 especially shows this Pauline understanding. Fourth, Paul recognised Jesus as the "founder and head of the Christian Church." Finally, Takakura mentions the universal, cosmic meaning of Christ for Paul: "For Paul, Christ is the agent of the creation of the universe, and the goal of the universe's progress.... This really is a grand thought."

As he moves quickly to John's Christology, Takakura first notes the fourth gospel's emphasis on Jesus as God's Son, meaning His "perfect fellowship with God." Next there is John's "profound, grand thought" of the logos. Takakura summarises the meaning of the logos in John's Gospel by noting the logos' "supertemporal, eternal reality," its "perfect personality" and constant "fellowship with God the Father," its reality as a "spiritual energy which gives eternal life," and that "this logos became a human being in Jesus Christ of Nazareth." In pointing out the redemptive motive in the Incarnation of the logos as shown in John 1:14, Takakura notes, "The Christology of John's Gospel has reached its culmination in this verse." Other notable aspects of John's Christology include Christ's being described as the "light of the world," "truth," and "life."

---

141 Takakura notes that Philippians 2:6-7 is the "literal origin of the kenosis theory which became famous in later days." He also notes parenthetically that this theory is "empty" or "lifeless."

142 In Takakura's ongoing challenge to communicate, he writes "agent" in the unusual character combination "noin," accompanied by the phoneticised "eijento."


144 This verse, it will be recalled, contains the phrase used by Takakura for the title of his second book, Oncho to Shinjitsu. Cf. above, Part III, p.274(n.3).

145 FK, pp.63-65; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.343-345.
Takakura summarises New Testament Christology with three observations about elements common to all the authors:

To them Jesus was not some midway reality\(^{146}\) Who was neither God nor man, but He was to the utmost a human being possessing blood and flesh. Nevertheless they recognised that within this person of Christ there was superhuman consciousness and life. Next, the Christology of all of the New Testament writers was established in relation to the light of the experience of atonement given through Christ, the power of Whose person and work they had touched. Finally, the first disciples worshipped Jesus Christ as 'my Lord and my God', and they assumed a religious attitude towards Him. The Lord Christ was the object of their worship and faith.\(^{147}\)

In keeping with his running concern about contemporary Christianity, Takakura's subsequent and concluding remark is, "The living Christianity in the New Testament was something fundamentally different from modern Unitarian and liberal Christianity...."\(^{148}\)

Having spent sections two through six on the New Testament's view of Christ, Takakura next summarises the Christological formulations of the "past Christian Church" in section seven. Underlying the various recognitions given by Church councils to Christological "orthodoxy" has been the "faith of the Incarnation." The Church has been "aware"\(^{149}\) of God's miraculous and gracious gift in Christ, which was His superhistorical, redemptive revelation entering into human history. The eternal, living religious attitude of worship, as well as religiously motivated insight, necessarily have been intertwined with time-bound, cultural elements in the formulations of dogma. However, the truth that the core of Christianity stands on the "gracious" and "miraculous fact" of Christ as "eternal reality" entering "relative

\(^{146}\)chukanteki jitsuzai

\(^{147}\)FK, p.65; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.345.


\(^{149}\)The same equivalent term "jikaku" is used earlier in reference to Jesus' "Self-awareness." Cf. above, Part III, p.305(n.132).
history" has remained in the forefront of all right Christological thinking.\textsuperscript{150}

As to the Nicaean controversy in particular, Takakura summarises Arius' error as "touching the problem of the Incarnation out of philosophical, speculative interests more than religious ones." Athanasius, by contrast, being a man of "keen spiritual insight," approached the problem out of the "deep motive of atonement," and "strong motive of redemption." Based on his conviction\textsuperscript{151} that Christianity is the "absolute religion" of "grace" and "atonement," Athanasius provided a classic example of how "Christology is not simply theology, but it is the assertion through theology of earnest faith, of truth."\textsuperscript{152} These diametrically opposed approaches show how the Council of Nicaea was in fact a "major crisis of faith in the history of Christianity." It was a "crossroad," and depending on the route chosen either the Christian Church was to become a "speculative organisation" embracing a "cultural religion," or Christianity was to be the "living religion of the Bible." Moreover, the crisis of Nicaea illustrates for Takakura his own stated belief that, even though we should be gracious in forgiving others in practical, daily living, "compromise regarding fundamental truth can never be allowed: truth and calling are strictly and only a fight."\textsuperscript{153} It is thus with continuing zeal that Takakura proceeds next, in the last three sections of Chapter II, to the matter of how we should go about formulating a proper contemporary Christology.

To avoid a "shallow" and "subjective" Christology, we must see the New Testament as basic, as well as give full regard to the proper Christological formulations of the past. We must also build on both the Reformers' and Ritschl's emphasis on the

\textsuperscript{150}FK, p.66-67; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.346-347. Takakura follows and supports this basic point with a quotation of Karl Holl, which he terms a "deep word."

\textsuperscript{151}"kakushin"

\textsuperscript{152}These remarks on Athanasius follow a citation of DuBose's summary of "the meaning of the Christology which Athanasius emphasised."
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"historic Christ," while avoiding the Ritschlian loss of "absolute value and truth." There must be a faith-consciousness to synthesise the historical and religious.\textsuperscript{154} In other words, Christology must flow out of an evangelical experience of atonement for a correspondingly proper view of revelation.\textsuperscript{155}

With such a faith-consciousness based on an evangelical experience, we will thus be able to understand Christ in the "gospel of Christ," and avoid the fallacy of modern liberalism's "religion of Jesus." Thus it will be the case that, "In what practically amounts to recognising the divinity of Christ, seeing Christ as the object of faith necessarily is approving the absoluteness of His person." Moreover, within our fellowship with God, experienced through having been given the "grace of the forgiveness of sin in the Cross," we "must trace back"\textsuperscript{156} our faith and fellowship "to Jesus Christ’s Self-awareness of Sonship and to His power to forgive sins." As for the "meaning of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ," we will thus find that meaning in the realisation that "The object of our faith is Christ, Who as the majestic reality of the spiritual world\textsuperscript{157} now presses in upon us sinners.... He himself is resurrected and raised to the right [hand] of God; He is not simply a historical figure, He is experienced as a currently existing person." Takakura qualifies what he means here by adding, "Moreover, we must in no way think of this risen and exalted Christ separately from the historic Christ." If that relationship is severed, the "so-called living Christ will become something of vague content, and a Christ wrapped up in easily shaken, religious sentiment." Instead, the right, sure mindset is that of "experiencing the living Christ based on the Christ of the

\textsuperscript{154}In the midst of this discussion, Takakura also uses the well-known distinction between Religionsgeschichte and Heilsgeschichte, noting that there is a tension between the two. He writes the two respective terms in characters, accompanied by phoneticised forms: "shukyo rekishiha" with "rigerionsu-geshihitorihi," and "kyujijiteki" with "hairusu-geshihitorihi."

\textsuperscript{155}FK, pp.71-75; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.351-355.

\textsuperscript{156}"sakanoboranakeraba naranai"

\textsuperscript{157}"reikai no ogosonaru jitsuzai to shite"
Takakura goes on to make some fascinating remarks about Christ's absoluteness and divinity, holy love, transcendence and immanence, pre-existence, humanity and divinity, His relationship to the Father within the trinity, etc. As to Christ's divinity and humanity, Takakura stresses (again) how the problem may not be explained metaphysically, but "should be solved through the consciousness of justification." He comments that Christ embodied a personal unity of divine and human action and will. Takakura also notes that, in thinking about the kenotic problem of the Incarnation, it is helpful to make a distinction between "actual" and "potential" divine qualities, and between Christ’s "Self-emptying" and His "Self-fulfilment."  

Takakura provides his own summary of these various comments at their beginning and end. Upon reiterating that embracing Christ as the object of faith involves "in practice recognising the absoluteness and divinity of His person," Takakura remarks, "Of course, the divinity of Christ after all should be held by those having a faith-consciousness; to those not having taken the risk of faith, the certainty of the divinity of Christ will never be given."  

Takakura then concludes this Chapter II on Christology in the following comprehensive, and by now familiar, way:

It is within the truth of the Incarnation that the conviction of Christianity as the absolute religion, and as the religion of grace, is deeply and strongly enfolded. The religious meaning of the Incarnation is as follows: the Incarnation is the fact of Jesus Christ guaranteeing the certainty of the reality of God the Father; furthermore, it makes clear that this God the Father always takes the

---


161 This chapter is in fact the book’s longest in terms of sections (ten) and number of pages (forty-two).
Having thus summarised Christology in terms of the redemptive and atoning meaning of the Incarnation, it is only appropriate for Takakura to proceed to his third chapter, which deals with the atonement.

c. Chapter III: View of the Atonement

"The essence of Christianity is in nothing but the experience of the atonement...." This is how Takakura sums up his introductory remarks for this chapter. Having noted that the general idea of religion consists of worship of and fellowship with an objective, holy reality, Takakura points out the fundamental difference between "religious experience" and "cultural consciousness." In the latter, "self-consciousness is working"; but, "the author of religious experience...is 'the holy One'. Thus the utmost, distinctive quality of religious experience is that it is an experience of grace." After introducing quotations from "two contemporary German theologians," Vollrath and Althaus, Takakura explains how the religious experience of grace is indirect and mediated, i.e., through the "matchless historical revelation of Jesus Christ," as opposed to the alleged direct, immediate experience of mysticism and pietism. That is, atonement through Christ is essential for us sinners to know the Creator, the holy Father of the Bible.163

To understand the atonement requires understanding sin, Takakura explains.164 However, while the post-Reformation, and in particular Kantian, emphasis on the "ethical side of sin" is commendable, neither Kant,165 nor Hegel,166 nor

---


163Emphasis original. FK, pp.87-91; Chosakushu, Vol.2, 368-372.

164"Sin" is "zaiaku." The definite article "the" will continue to be haphazardly used with "atonement" to reflect general Japanese, and Takakura's own, language.


166According to Hegel's thought, "Sin is not essentially something bad...." Emphasis original. Ibid.
Schleiermacher \(^{167}\) "adequately recognises the religious side of sin." The Ritschlian explanation of the "'absolute value' of the human soul" also "does not at all match with the Bible’s view of a person." The Bible "views a person in relation to the holy God," and thus sees humankind as "something lost" and "by nature children of wrath."\(^{168}\)

Thus for Takakura it is once again the Reformers, and before them Anselm, who are the ones having a proper view of sin since the time of the time early church.\(^{169}\)

I believe that his [Anselm’s] theory of atonement\(^{170}\) is the greatest theory of atonement. He says that sin is not offering to God the suitable thing. The suitable thing to God is the creature absolutely obeying the will of God the Creator...[which means] returning glory\(^{171}\) to God; this is the creature’s highest blessing. Thus sin is man the creature not returning proper glory to God. In other words, the essence of sin is forgetting God’s will, the pride of seeking to stand on one’s own will.\(^{172}\)

Like Anselm, Luther exhibits an understanding of the "religous depth of sin"\(^{173}\) in his description of sin as "not believing God’s Word, God’s promise."\(^{174}\) James

---

\(^{167}\)Schleiermacher understands sin as arising "when a person neglects the desires of the spirit, and is drowned in sensuality." FK, p.93; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.375.

\(^{168}\)FK, pp.94-95; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.375-376.

\(^{169}\)Others, including even Augustine, were influenced by Greco-Roman thought and thus gave undue consideration to the soul’s immortality more than to its personal relationship with God, and its need to be saved from sin by God. FK, p.92; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.373.

\(^{170}\)The equivalent phrase for "theory of atonement" is written in the characters "shokuzairon," accompanied by the phoneticised "kuru-di-usu-homo" ("Cur Deus Homo").

\(^{171}\)The equivalent word for "glory" is written in the characters "eiko," accompanied by the phoneticised "ona" ("honour").

\(^{172}\)Emphasis original. FK, p.95; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.376-377.

\(^{173}\)"shukyoteki na fukami ni oite zaiku"

Orr, the Psalmists, and the prodigal son of Luke fifteen also point to the "religious nature of the idea" of sin: they describe or demonstrate sin to be a religious phenomenon filled with "selfishness, the power of the flesh, sensuality," as well as the "spirit of idol worship." Moreover, not only is sin private and individual, but corporate as the "kingdom of sin" and "kingdom of Satan's rule." Hence the Cross of Christ both frees individuals from the power of sin, and it saves people from the kingdom of Satan and transfers them to the kingdom of God.

In section three of the chapter, Takakura considers in turn the "so-called [idea of] original sin," the "consciousness of sin," and "punishment." As to the first of these, Takakura remarks that older theologians such as Augustine and Calvin taught the doctrines of the fall and original sin based on Romans five and the early part of Genesis. "Of course we cannot literally recognise the fall as historical fact, but if one thinks of...the theory of original sin from [the standpoint of] religious meaning, it really is a serious problem." With Pascal we must acknowledge that "original sin is a mysterious abyss, and something that surpasses our understanding. Nevertheless, if we do not affirm it, we cannot understand the deep, human dualism (the eternal battle of flesh and spirit). Thus the story of

---

175 The prodigal son shows this in saying, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you." Emphasis Takakura's.

176 The equivalent word for "selfishness" is written in the characters "jikoshin," accompanied by the phoneticised "serufishunesu."


178 The equivalent term for "original sin" is written in the characters "genzai," accompanied by the phoneticised "orijinaru-shin."

179 "batsu"


181 "shinen"

182 The equivalent phrase for "deep, human dualism" is "jinsei no fukaki nigensei." "Nigensei" is accompanied by the phoneticised "duarizumu."
Adam’s fall is not a historical fact, but a superhistorical truth.”183 In that "human nature is egoism," and because "we cannot help but feel responsibility for sin," then "of course Evangelical Christianity is convinced of the truth of original sin." Furthermore, Takakura points out again that there is a corporate solidarity of sin throughout the human race:184 the basic problem of flesh and selfishness runs through all of humanity, individually and corporately.185

Contemporary emphasis on God’s immanence has obscured His transcendence. Thus there is a lack of understanding "Christianity as a religion of conscience," since our duty to God has been reversed into our making God a means to our happiness. But as we "stand before God’s holy commands, our awakened religious conscience necessarily will acutely experience the contradiction of spirit and flesh." In this way proper consciousness of sin arises, which is necessary to experiencing atonement in Christ.186 Similarly, in this awareness of sin—which is "defying the holiness of God"--God’s "reaction of wrath and judgement necessarily falls." God’s wrath "works on sinners as punishment," and the "most fearful" punishment is to be expelled from fellowship from God, the eternal and holy Father. "This is hell, and none other than death." By contrast, the gospel is that sinners are brought into eternal life, which is fellowship with God. Moreover, insofar as atonement involves forgiveness of sin through its judgement, we can affirm that "God’s wrath is a means187 of God’s love."188

184Takakura employs an interesting geometric analogy here: "The sin of humanity not only has a mutual, plane-surface type of close relationship, but also a historical, three-dimensional type of necessary connection."
187The equivalent term for "means" is written in the characters "shudan," accompanied by the phoneticised "mitteru" ("Mittel").
188Emphasis original. FK, pp.100-102; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.382-383.
Having brought his readers to this point, Takakura is now ready to begin his more direct, positive description of the atonement. However, Takakura first offers the reminder that formulating a theory of the atonement is "not just something settled rationally as a head problem," but that "at the basis of a true theory of atonement there must be an earnest experience of the atonement." This is because, if left to ourselves and our own reason, we are "unimpressed by the sense of sin." But as sinners under God's wrath, our sin must be "covered by the blood of the Cross of Christ" if we are to stand before God as forgiven sinners, i.e., as having experienced atonement. Although theory must be distinguished from experience--e.g., with Paul--it is important to keep in mind that the former can never exhaustively interpret the latter, that there is a necessary connection between them, and that it is "in the faith of atonement that we recognise eternal value."\(^{189}\)

Takakura also deems it necessary to rebut three common misunderstandings of the atonement, namely ones based on viewing Christianity's essence as following the teachings of Jesus à la Tolstoy, co-experiencing the religion of Jesus or his "inner life" à la Herrmann, and the "so-called moral influence theory." Takakura disposes of these in turn. [1] The first fails to deal with "our problem [of] the contradiction of trying to love but being unable to love." [2] Suggesting that we share in Jesus' inner life misunderstands two things: first, there is a "difference in kind"\(^{190}\) between us and Jesus in regards to sin; second, "Without certainty of the forgiveness of sin, we sinners cannot draw near to God.... God does not live in the deep place of my soul." [3] By interpreting the Cross as an inspiration to our moral senses rather than something which "judges" our sin, the moral influence theory exhibits both an inadequate view of God as well as "not being deeply awakened\(^{191}\) to the dualism in human nature." All three of these inadequate

\(^{189}\)Emphases original. Takakura in fact emphasises the word "covered" ("oware") in three consecutive sentences. \(FK,\) pp.102-103; \(Chosakushu,\) Vol.2, pp.383-385.

\(^{190}\)"shitsu no chigai"

\(^{191}\)Another English equivalent might be, "being deeply unawakened" ("fukaku samete inai").
Theories, in other words, fail to "interpret deeply the atoning experience of the Bible."  

Takakura's own positive statement of his theory of the atonement, i.e., "the atonement theory which we believe to be good," consists of three parts. The first has to do with "both the objective and subjective sides of the solidarity between Christ and humanity/us." In describing here what are translated into English as this solidarity's "objective" and "subjective" sides, Takakura seems to be referring to what might more accurately be rendered as "corporate/universal" and "individual/personal," respectively. This appears to be an important, original point in Takakura's thinking; it therefore requires some particularly careful analysis.

In describing first the "objective" side of Christ's solidarity with the human race, Takakura does so in two complementary phases. In the initial phase, Christ is set forth as the divine Son of God, the Lamb of God, and the great High Priest. These

---

193 "Warera no yoshi to shinzuru shozairon"
194 The second has to do with the Cross (dealt with in section six, FK, pp.110-116; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.392-397), and the third with the relationship between the Cross and the Resurrection (section seven, FK, pp.116-117; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.397-399). Both of these will be considered below.
195 "Kirisuto to jinrui kyu warera to no soridariti ni ha kyakkanteki to shukanteki to no ryohomen...." Throughout this section, Takakura describes these two "objective" and "subjective" sides of the solidarity between Christ and humanity, but otherwise he does not define "solidarity." The word he uses is simply the phoneticised translation "soridariti." FK, pp.107-110; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.388-391.

In speaking earlier of humanity's corporate responsibility of sin, he uses an equivalent word for "solidarity" written in the characters "rentai sekinin"—which ordinarily would be translated either as "joint responsibility" or "solidarity"—accompanied by the phoneticised "soridariti." FK, p.99; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.380. Cf. above, Part III, p.315.

196 Previous uses of "kyakkanteki" and "shukanteki" ("objective" and "subjective"), which obviously relate to this discussion and will enter more fully into our analysis in Part IV, include those above, Part III, pp.291(n.79),293(n.85), 300(n.113),305(n.136),312. Further occurrences of these terms will be noted.
three roles together support, for Takakura, the corporate and universal significance of Christ's redemption: [1] "If we recognise Christ as God's only Son, His Cross becomes the unique Cross...namely, the Cross of God Himself. Thus the holy love of Christ's Cross becomes the holy love of God Himself.... If Christ is indeed God's only Son, His Cross more than saves the entire human race."  

Takakura then continues by noting that [2] in Jesus' life we see, through His "Self-awareness of coming 'to give His life as a ransom for many'," that "Jesus really is God's Lamb bearing the sin of the world." Moreover, "As we look up to the Cross of the Lord, we believe the thing of the past of the Lamb slain in the presence of God before the creation of the world." Jesus' being the Lamb of God thus shows the "redemptive meaning of the Incarnation." And this meaning involves no less than Christ also being the "second Adam"--because as the Lamb slain "before the creation of the world" He existed before the "first Adam through whom God created the human race"--through Whose Cross God will "again and anew create sinful humanity." [3] Being the Son of God means that Christ, as High Priest, is thus the "eternal" Priest. "On this basis," Takakura concludes, "The close solidarity between the sinful, entire human race and Him is established."  

In sum, Christ's divine Cross, His suffering as the second Adam, and His eternal priesthood respectively saves the entire human race, recreates (all of) humanity, and establishes solidarity with the entire human race.

In the second phase of his description of the "objective" solidarity between Christ and humanity, Takakura shifts from focusing just on Christ to look at "human

---

197 Takakura refers the reader to John 3:16, Romans 5:8, and I John 4:9.

198 "arishikoto"

199 Emphasis mine.

200 Our judgement regarding the soundness, or lack thereof, of Takakura's argumentation is not the main point for now. The present objective is an accurate and intelligible description of Takakura's own presentation, particularly at this juncture within Takakura's explanation of the "objective" side of Christ's solidarity with humanity. FK, pp.107-108; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.388-309.
society" as well, and in particular the "rigorous moral world order" that resides within society. That is, both the good and bad which people commit affect others. Similarly, as humanity's corporate sin and its results are "stormed" and "exposed" by the Cross, "We can believe that Christ's righteousness undulates into the entire human race, and gives a large influence to human sin."203

Takakura then immediately summarises, "In the above description, we thought about the objective solidarity between Christ and humanity."204 From our examination of that description, with its two complementary phases which consider the two partners within that solidarity, i.e., "Christ" and "humanity," we could just as easily--and perhaps more accurately and helpfully--use the English terms "corporate" or "universal" as we could "objective."

As for the "subjective" side of Christ's solidarity with humanity, Takakura is referring to the individualisation and personalisation of the Cross through the work of the Holy Spirit and faith:

The Lord's Cross becomes 'the power of God' and 'the wisdom of God' only to 'the one called', only to the one led by the Holy Spirit. In other words, if the Cross of the Lord Jesus is simply a historical fact, it is in no way the power that saves sinners.... The historical fact and its matchless Holy Spirit interpretation205 are the gospel and revelation.206

201 "jinrui shakai"
202 "genshukanaru dotokuteki sekai chitsujo"
205 "muhinaru seirei kaishaku"
206 op.cit. In the midst of describing this "subjective" side of the relationship between Christ and humanity, Takakura's seemingly sudden use of the descriptive term "historical" ("rekishiteki") in reference to the "fact" of the Cross--what might be considered part of the "objective" side of things--apparently casts its shadow back on the previous discussion on Takakura's use of the term "objective" ("kyakkanteki"), which we have interpreted as "corporate" or "universal." The possible implications of this apparently deepening, linguistic abyss will be
Takakura continues his explanation in a way that even more clearly shows the *individual* and *personal* sense of this section on the "subjective".\(^{207}\)

The Cross of Christ, Who was buried in a past grave, in order to work on *my* sin as a present living power, must be through the leading of the Holy Spirit. That which brings the experience of the historical Cross as the eternal Cross and the present\(^{208}\) Cross is the Holy Spirit [and] faith. In other words, to the one without faith, the Cross of the Lord Christ has no meaning.... Faith born through the Holy Spirit establishes solidarity between the Cross of history and *my* sin.\(^{209}\)

With these words Takakura closes his remarks on the "subjective" side of Christ's solidarity with humanity. Whereas near to what might be called a common notion of the English term "subjective," i.e., "personally experienced," Takakura’s intended meaning of "individual" is clear from his remarks quoted above. Together with his "corporate" sense of the solidarity between Christ and the human race, Takakura's description of this first part of his atonement theory thus establishes the scope of application for his discussion of the "meaning of the Cross of the Lord Christ," about which he now intends to "think deeply."\(^{210}\)

considered in Part IV.

\(^{207}\)Takakura’s related "historical" sense is evident as well.

\(^{208}\)The equivalent term for "present" is "genzai," which is identical with the previous "'genzai' living power."


\(^{210}\)FK, p.110; *Chosakushu*, Vol.2, p.392. Interestingly, immediately after completing his explicit discussion of the "objective" and "subjective" ("kyakkanteki" and "shukanteki") sides of Christ’s solidarity with humanity—but within the same section (five) of Chapter III and before proceeding to speak directly about the Cross’ meaning—Takakura feels it necessary to "say again one thing" relative to a *temporal* aspect of the Cross. On the one hand, Takakura notes, "We must not think of Jesus’ Cross separately from the rest of His life. Until the Cross of Calvary, the Lord Jesus’ life was penetrated by the unseen Cross." ("...miezaru jujika ni tsuranukarete ita.") But we must not therefore view the Cross only as an "extension" or "climax" of Jesus’ life. Jesus’ death on the Cross had its own unique significance, "especially" in that it "appeased God's wrath," as well as being the "power to justify sinners." Therefore with Christ’s death, "For the first time, sinners were brought into a new relationship with the holy God...." Emphasis mine. *FK*, p.110; *Chosakushu*, Vol.2, p.391.
In writing about this second part of his theory of the atonement which deals with the Cross, Takakura clearly has reached the heart of the matter. Takakura himself likely would have agreed to the statement that the entire FK was written "under the shadow of the Cross." He in fact begins the brief summation at the end of this Chapter III on the atonement by stating, "The essence of Christianity is the Cross." If there is one single place in the book where Takakura would have wanted us to remove our shoes due to being on "holy ground," this section on the Cross very well might be it.

Takakura describes this "mystery which is beyond our theory" via a pair of paradoxical facets of the Cross' meaning--the nature of which paradox he clarifies--followed by a single, explicit point. The pair of aspects are, "On the one hand, in the Cross is the most acute disclosure of humanity's sin, the thorough judgement of sin. On the other hand, the Cross is also God's deepest forgiveness of sin, the strongest gushing forth of God's holy love." The Cross exposes a person's sin in that, seeing Christ suffer punishment as one cursed, "The sin of the Jews of that time, the sin of the Pharisees, Judas' sin, Peter's sin is namely my sin." Moreover, God in the Cross "declares His eternal denial" of sinful humanity, He "fully emphasises His own holy righteousness," and He "becomes to sinners the most faraway God." Seen from the other side of forgiveness and holy love, however, God in the Cross gives His "affirmation through denial," He "saves sinners" (while "at the same time" declaring His righteousness), and He "also

How these comments might or might not relate to Takakura's "objective-subjective" (or "corporate-individual") schema, as well as to his comments about the "historical" nature of the Cross, will be considered in Part IV. Cf. above, Part III, p.319(n.206).

211Or, to recall an earlier analogy, "within the light of the Cross."
213"warera no riron o zesshitaru higi"; FK, p.113; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.394.
214"hodobashiri," reckoned here to be "hotobashiri"
becomes the nearest God." The paradoxical nature of the Cross comes from the fact that "a healthy atoning experience must have both sides," and one side or the other is experienced more strongly at different times. Therefore, Takakura concludes,\textsuperscript{216} saying that God "judges" and "saves" sin "at the same time" is not spoken with a "psychological meaning," but "as a truth problem."\textsuperscript{217}

The explicit point which Takakura feels that he "should make concerning the salvation of the Lord's Cross" is that, "More than the Lord's Cross existing first for people, it exists first for God." That is, "Jesus came to the world to construct\textsuperscript{218} the kingdom of God," i.e., "to recover the kingdom of God which for a long time had been lost among the human race."\textsuperscript{219} God's kingdom is "God's rule,"\textsuperscript{220} the "recognition of God's being King." That kingdom is thus realised insofar as "all creatures absolutely obey and trust God the Father and Creator, and aspire\textsuperscript{221} to live for His glory." In terms of "the salvation of the Lord's Cross," those who "experience the forgiveness of sin in the Cross come into fellowship with God in an attitude of worship."\textsuperscript{222} After remarking that the moral influence theory presupposes a "man-centred" experience of salvation, and that it is "meagre in the

\textsuperscript{216}And thus so shall we, for now, in terms of analysis.


Additionally, while approached from a different angle, here again is an intriguing reappearance of Takakura's concern with things temporal. Cf. above, Part III, pp.319(n.206),320(n.210).

\textsuperscript{218}The equivalent term here for "construct" is "kensetsu." A few sentences later, Takakura uses the word "kakuritsu" ("establish").

\textsuperscript{219}"Hisashiku jinrui no aida ni ushinawaretaru shinkoku o kaifukusen ga tame de atta-"

\textsuperscript{220}The equivalent phrase is "kami no shihai," the last word being accompanied by the phoneticised "herushafuto" ("Herrschaft").

\textsuperscript{221}"kokorozasu"

penetrating power" which produces a proper "attitude of worship," Takakura summarises by writing:

At any rate, Christ as the eternal Priest, together with forgiving a person's sin in the Cross, confronts a forgiven soul as King, and within that [confrontation] newly recovers God's holy rule, God's kingdom. That in Christ as the atoning Lord there are both the priestly side and the side of King is something we must not forget. The relationship of the Lord of the Cross with us begins as Christ for our sake, next is Christ in us, and in the end it becomes us for Christ's sake. The salvation of the Cross must be thought of as making us in the end to live for the Lord Christ alone.224

Although the reader might be left wondering where Takakura is speaking "psychologically" and where he means "truth," the quotation above is how he finishes making his point.

Finally, Takakura moves to the third (and briefest) part of his positive statement of the atonement, which is concerned with the relationship between "Christ's Cross and Resurrection." In reference to Paul's statements concerning both the uselessness of the Christian faith without the Resurrection, as well as knowing the power of the Resurrection, Takakura distinguishes two points: [1] "The Lord's Resurrection arouses the Lord's Cross from the grave of history," and thus the Cross "becomes the eternal Cross and exerts its atoning power on us in the present." Similarly the crucified Christ "becomes our object of faith," and (Takakura continues after quoting Luther) "eternally becomes the target of us sinners' confidence."225 [2] The Resurrection makes us sure of the Cross' atoning power: "Through the Lord's Resurrection we firmly believe the certainty of

223"nozomu"


225The phrase translated here as "eternally...confidence" is "eien ni warera tsumibito no shinnin no mokuhyo to maritamau no de aru." "Object" might seem more natural than "target," but the preceding quotation from Luther expressly carries the image of not moving the eye away from the "target" of faith. Also, the expression prior to Luther's words, i.e., "object of faith," uses a different word for "object," namely "taisho." FK, p.116; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.397-398.
forgiveness of sin through the Cross, and further, we become firmly convinced of the power to overcome the flesh and sin. Moreover, Christ’s Resurrection "gives hope of the coming day of the redemption of the body," and it "gives confirmation" of the eventual triumph of the kingdom of God, culminating in the new heavens and the new earth. Thus with sure "certainty," "hope," and "confirmation," our faith is not in vain, and we indeed know the power of the Cross in the Resurrection.

In his concluding paragraph to Chapter III on the atonement, Takakura begins by stating the central, essential place of the atonement in the Christian faith. He also repeats the "truth" that the Cross is "at the same time" the judgement of our sin and thus "our death"; but, as "God’s grace" the Cross is "our peace" and "life." Takakura then dramatically ends the paragraph and chapter: "Only the Cross is light, power, life. Where there isn’t the Cross, darkness, no power, death. I earnestly pray that we simply have no ‘boasting place other than the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ.’"

However, in order to build to his final climactic declaration, and further to

---

226Emphasis original.

227"kakusho"


229Mentioning the kingdom of God apparently brings to Takakura’s mind something he wants to say about the Church. First is that the atonement is not just for individuals but for "a people," i.e., the Cross has corporate as well as individual effects. Relative to the kingdom of God, the Church is "the centre of the kingdom of God, and it is given the precious calling that it should realise on this earth God’s holy rule." FK, p.117; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.398-399.


231This is what Takakura earlier terms a "truth problem." Cf. above, Part III, p.322(n.217).


summarise, Takakura follows his thought on how the Cross simultaneously judges and forgives with these words on the Cross' historical and eternal implications:

The Lord's Cross is at one point of history, nevertheless it surpasses history; in the Cross God the holy Father eternally, as well as through the history of the human race, establishes His rule within people's souls. We simply seek the glory of God alone, the Father and Lord of heaven and earth, in the Lord's Cross. In the Cross God presented to us, the human race, the biggest problem; in the Cross, God Himself eternally solved it. Under the Lord's Cross is eternal peace; nevertheless, from the Cross the eternal battle begins.  

While Takakura's intended emotive impact does come through, the writer of this thesis at least, in seeking to understand and analyse Takakura's thought, finds himself somewhat distracted by the lack of clarity he senses in encountering here concepts related to history and eternity. The question as to why there is such a lack of clarity, along with the resulting attention turned towards these issues, must be postponed until later. For now, we must appreciate Takakura's theory of the atonement as he has presented it, and move with him into the next chapter on the "life of faith."  

d. Chapter IV: View of the Life of Faith

Written in less than one day, this chapter flows smoothly through several reiterations of what Takakura has already written, yet this time in specific relation to faith. Takakura takes the first section to make various comments about faith itself; the remaining five sections speak in succession about faith in relation to eight


235Takakura wrote Chapter III on the atonement over the course of two full days, i.e., Friday and Saturday, 26-27 August. Interestingly, he notes in his diary entry for Saturday—when he wrote the second half of the chapter—that he "should be thankful for being able to discern ['mitome-eshi'] the most difficult portions of the theory of atonement" (emphasis mine). One could concur with Takakura's assessment of what he "discerned" by saying that the latter half of Chapter III has at times been challenging for the thesis writer, and perhaps for the reader, to follow. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," p.252.

236Takakura wrote Chapter IV on Monday, 29 August; by the afternoon Takakura had begun Chapter V, which he finished the following day. Ibid., p.253.
Takakura begins his discussion on faith by setting it in relation to revelation.\textsuperscript{237} Recalling Chapter I’s description,\textsuperscript{238} Takakura notes that the revelation of God in Christ "is the author of our faith, and at the same time the object of that faith."\textsuperscript{239} Revelation and faith are "correlative,"\textsuperscript{240} and thus "in fact one cannot think of only one side separately." Proceeding out of these understandings, Takakura stresses that "faith is first of all God’s work, God’s thing."\textsuperscript{241} "God through Christ ‘the Word’ presses in upon us," and through judgement and denial He forgives our sin and affirms us. "Hence, faith is the self’s or life’s crisis and bankruptcy. With respect to faith the self is made zero. From this nothingness, true life is born.... Dialectically God makes a person to believe."\textsuperscript{242} In bringing forth faith, "God alone works, the person becomes completely passive. Thus faith,

\textsuperscript{237}His first sentence reads, "If Christianity can be divided into an objective ['kyakkanteki'] side and a subjective ['shukanteki'] side, the former would correspond to ['ataru'] revelation, and the latter to faith." Upon reading this, one’s mind goes immediately back to the previous chapter’s discussions of "objective" and "subjective" elements within Takakura’s statement of his theory of the atonement. Be that as it may, Takakura makes no further mention of either "objective" or "subjective" aspects in this chapter on faith. \textit{FK}, p.119; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.2, p.400. Cf. above, Part III, pp.317ff.

\textsuperscript{238}Cf. above, Part III, pp.296ff.

\textsuperscript{239}"Author" is written in the characters "sakusha," accompanied by the phoneticised "osa"; "object" is similarly written as "taisho" and "obujekuto." One wonders if Takakura, in using the same wording ("doji ni")--for the phrase "at the same time"--as that which he explicitly discusses at the end of Chapter III, has in his mind any similar tension here that is related to his previous comments. Cf. above, Part III, pp.322(n.217),324(n.231).

\textsuperscript{240}"sokanteki"

\textsuperscript{241}"Shinko ha dai ichi ni kami no waza de aru, kami no mono de aru."

\textsuperscript{242}"Sore de shinko ha jiga moshikuha jinsei no kiki de aru, hasan de aru. Shinko ni okete ha jiga ha mu [accompanied by the phoneticised ‘zero’] to serareru. Kono mu kara, makoto no seimei ga umaredazuru no de aru.... [D]aiarekutikku ni kami ha hito o shinzen to suru no de aru."
better than being termed bilateral is called unilateral."243 What results from understanding faith as God’s work in this way is that one thus finds "certainty of faith."244

After thus articulating divine-initiated faith, Takakura moves next to consider "faith’s paradox,"245 namely the bringing together of "external historic fact" and "spiritual interiority."246 Christ and the Holy Spirit bring about this "complete miracle" and "mysterious thing": "The historic Christ--relative to me the Wholly Other--in the Holy Spirit becomes most deeply the Christ within me."247 In that "history and spiritual interiority in fact are incompatible things, like water and oil," Takakura says again that the historic Christ becoming the inner Christ "is something which infinitely surpasses human wisdom." This is the faith of what "can be called Evangelical Mysticism," and Takakura returns again to the "certainty and conviction" to be found with having the historic Christ as faith’s cause and object.248

From the subject of faith’s certainty, Takakura moves to commenting on that certainty’s relationship with "election." Although he has just cited Luther,249 Takakura does not mention Calvin or any subsequent theologian within his brief comments. He does, however, quote Paul as follows: "Our faith is something given through God’s ‘choosing us in Christ before the creation of the world’."250

243"Bilateral" is "somuteki," and "unilateral" is "himmuteki."

244FK, pp.119-120; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.400-401.

245"Paradox" is written just as the phoneticised "paradokkusu."

246"gaiteki naru shiteki jijitsu" and "reiteki naimensei"

247"Ware ni taishite zettai tasha to shite no shiteki kirisuto ga, seirei ni oite mottomo fukaku, wa ga uchi naru kirisuto to naru no de aru."

248Emphases original. FK, pp.120-122; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.401-403.

249In particular, Takakura refers to Luther’s Commentary on Galatians.

250Ephesians 1:4.
Takakura then comments that the meaning of the "faith of election" is that faith is not based on a "temporal" relationship between us and God, but instead a "supertemporal, eternal relationship." Faith "should be thought of as God's supertemporal gift," given through His "absolute freedom, as completely unconditional grace." Thus to have certainty, to know faith as given by God, is rightly to understand and to accept the meaning of what has been termed the "doctrine of election." In the remaining portion of section one, Takakura deals with two more matters. First is the inseparable, triangular relationship between faith, God's Word, and the Holy Spirit: "Faith is created within us by God's Word, Christ of the Cross, through the Holy Spirit." After quoting Brunner, Takakura points out that the Holy Spirit is not something "vague" and "emotional," a trap ensnaring Holiness and pietistic Christianity. Nor can religious psychology rationally capture faith, for "the essence of faith" produced by the Holy Spirit is "supernatural, superrational," and "on the other shore." Takakura then considers the second point, namely the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Christ. Briefly put, "The Holy Spirit is Christ's Spirit...." Amongst several biblical citations, Takakura remarks that "as the Spirit of truth, the Holy Spirit guarantees to us God's deep truth." Moreover, the Holy Spirit "guarantees to us" the certainty of salvation, and also "gives the

251"jikanteki"

252"chojikanteki"


254Emphases mine.

255"Kaku shinko ha...choshizenteki, chogoriteki.... Shinko no honshitsu ha...shukyo shinrigaku kenkyu no higan ni ari...."

256"Warera ni kami no fukaki shinri o shosite kureru," thus enabling the equally valid translation, "...[the] deep truths of God."

257The equivalent expression used here for "guarantees to us" is "hosho shite kureru." The preceding sentence uses the similar phrase, "sho shite kureru"; however, this could also be rendered "akashi shite kureru," which connotes more the meaning of "witness."
conviction of the finish of salvation." Speaking corporately, the Spirit "creates the Church" in that, "through the Spirit's work," a "supernatural holy fellowship between God and people, people and people" is established. With these two matters thus elucidated, Takakura closes his first, detailed section on the "life of faith."

Takakura then proceeds to describe the relationships between faith and a number of topics. First is the "peace and joy and victory" that come through faith. Certainty of fellowship with God through having been made righteous is found "only in God's Word, the Cross of Christ in the Bible," or through "faith alone." Being made God's children and freely living under God's rule is true peace, joy, and victory. Furthermore, being assured of God's rule gives a proper "prophetic optimism" in light of the ultimate triumph of God's kingdom.

Next, Takakura speaks of "true prayer" as it is understood and enabled through faith. The experience of the forgiveness of sin leads to a "dialogue" in which believers "experience the living God pressing in upon us as 'Thou', as the 'Wholly Other'." Thus we are not just to pray to ourselves in some sort of monologue, nor are we pray to a "god of the self's drawn-out desires," a "third person god," a "dead god." Rather, because prayer is an "eternal battlefield" where the believer's "sinful soul is incessantly crushed"--a "problem of will more than emotion"--the "biggest problem" of prayer becomes "where to discover the second person God, or put

\[258\] "sukui no kansei o kakushin seshimerareru"


\[260\] FK, pp.124-125; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.405-406.

\[261\] Cf. above, Part III, p.291(n.80).

\[262\] "Dialogue" is written in the characters "taiwa," accompanied by the phoneticised "daiarogu."
more strongly the first person God."263 This problem is met by the experience of faith, in connection with the Word and Holy Spirit, which enables the world of prayer to be "the most real," "the deepest, most certain world."264 And insofar as the believer dwells in this world of prayer, that person indeed lives by faith: as Takakura puts it at the end of this section, "The life of faith is the world of prayer."265

Takakura moves next to the question of the relationship between faith and morality. He quotes Paul’s words in Romans three to point out that none is saved by morality, but that faith without morality falls into antinomianism. In the end, faith fulfils the law and thus enables true morality: "Even though faith is the crisis of morality, also according to the deepest meaning it also fulfils it." Faith alone enables the conversion of the self, giving freedom to do good. In creating the motive of thanksgiving, "Faith is the root giving life to morality." Moreover, faith grants "true repentance": "Before the Cross, resolution is demanded of us."266 Takakura also points out that "faith gives the Holy Spirit," and "where the Holy Spirit works, holy character and morality necessarily are produced." After using the analogy of believers as a "temple of the Holy Spirit," as well as the pictures of the pure "flow of water" and "fruit" respectively produced by pure "sources of fountains" and "roots," Takakura closes this section by reiterating, "The morality

263Takakura has already used this same idea in Chapter I, in reference to speaking of God as personal. There he quotes Vollrath’s words, "The special characteristic of religious experience always is in God becoming I ['ware' accompanied by ‘ihhi’] and the person becoming you ['nanji' accompanied by ‘du’]." FK, p.39; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.319. Cf. above, Part III, pp.300-301.

264"mottomo shinjitsu na," "mottomo fukai tashika na sekai"


266"Warera ha jujika no mae ni kesshin o unagasacaru." Emphasis original. Takakura goes on to explain that the emphasis here is on choosing one side or the other, i.e., either flesh or spirit, this world or God’s kingdom, self or Christ.
given by the Holy Spirit is an intention morality.\textsuperscript{267}

Next Takakura discusses a fourth area, which is clearly related to the previous remarks on morality, namely the relationship between faith and love. Because of misunderstanding Paul, many Christians tend to place more importance on love than they do on faith. What they fail to see, Takakura points out, is that Paul never thought of faith and love separately: "For Paul, faith is the sinner's attitude towards God Who is holy." This Godward attitude, then, "must be manifest" as "love," which is the corresponding, interdependent "attitude towards one's neighbour." As interdependent attitudes, faith is passive, whereas love is active. Moreover, as von Hügel notes, love towards others is the result of faith, or the fruit of what could be called love for God. Hence real love, "love given through the Holy Spirit, through faith, is a supernatural love." This love does what the sentimental, abstract love of humanism cannot, namely "separate from the self and fully recognise the solemn, objective reality\textsuperscript{268} of human beings." As Takakura states in closing, "Our solemn duty towards our neighbour" is to be found only "in Christian love."\textsuperscript{269}

Continuing his neatly organised and well-marked progression through these various topics, Takakura next considers a fifth matter in relation to faith, namely that of

\textsuperscript{267}"Intention" could also be rendered as "inclination," "cast of mind." The equivalent term is written in the characters "iko," accompanied by the phoneticised "gejinnungusu-etiku" ("Gesinnungsethik"). \textit{FK}, pp.127-131; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol 2, pp.408-412.

\textsuperscript{268}"Objective reality" renders "kyakkanteki jitsuzai." Takakura uses this same wording twice in this section in reference to loving others versus the self. In anticipation of what must be considered in Part IV, it can be pointed out now that Takakura's apparent meaning here--while not excluding the ordinary English meaning of "objective"--nevertheless does seem to lend support to the interpretation given earlier of Takakura's usage of "kyakkanteki" in the sense of "corporate." Cf. above, Part III, pp.317ff.

personality."\textsuperscript{270} Here some earlier themes are repeated within different expressions. First, Goethe's "aesthetic, cultural" view of personality is quickly dismissed for its "concealed human-centred, artistic, pleasure-seeking" aspect. Second, Kant's view of "ethical autonomy" is once again commended for its proper emphasis on "touching the core of an ethical view of personality"; but, it is once again dismissed for its "fundamental" failure to solve the "dualism lying across the depths of human nature."\textsuperscript{271} Not surprisingly, Takakura espouses the view of personality "given through faith," exemplified by Luther's experience of having faith solve the Kantian dilemma of not being able to do what he knew he should. Human nature is saved through bankruptcy, such that "what becomes this personality's fundamental forte is not [Kantian] ethical autonomy, but responsibility to God the Creator and to Christ the Saviour." The "evangelical faith" thus produces a "heart of loyalty\textsuperscript{272} to live only for the glory of the Lord," a personality possessing a "strong consciousness of calling."\textsuperscript{273} Therefore, "the most necessary thing for contemporary civilisation is the evangelical personality."\textsuperscript{274}

What he offers as the solution for faith and personality is essentially what Takakura says about the next topic, faith and culture. According to Takakura, modern, liberal Protestantism loses faith by placing it within the world's "large flow of culture." Roman Catholicism's "hierarchical relationship" of "natural" culture and "supernatural" Christianity wrongly assumes a harmonious posture between faith and culture which simply is not the case. Mysticism's and pietism's neglect of

\textsuperscript{270} The equivalent term is "jinkaku." The English word "character" is another ordinary translation, but the thesis will follow Charles Germany's lead in opting for "personality." In his own copy of FK, Germany crossed out his original notation of "character" and wrote "personality" instead.

\textsuperscript{271} "jinsei no oku ni yokotawaru nigensei"

\textsuperscript{272} "chugishin"

\textsuperscript{273} "tsuyoki shomei ishiki"

\textsuperscript{274} Emphases original. FK, pp.133-135; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.414-416.
culture as the "work of the devil" and something incompatible with faith, "while evading civilisation, unconsciously compromises with it as a result." Hence the proper view is the "biblical, prophetic, evangelical" one. This view recognises "in the creature the given, deep dualism which is lying across, and thus it does not give glory to God the Creator." The gospel and faith alone solve this "tension,"275 this antagonistic, flesh-spirit dualism. Therefore, the only viable approach to the "spirit of civilisation,"276 which is "idol worship, the adoration of humanity," is to fight it, see it uprooted and replaced with God's Spirit, so that humanity will properly worship the Creator alone.277

The remaining two topics which Takakura considers in relation to faith are hope and the coupled subjects of the Church and the kingdom of God.278 In effect Takakura expands here on the concise comments he made earlier in connection with the Resurrection.279 For our present purposes, two points within each of the two respective discussions need to be at least mentioned.

In describing faith and hope, Takakura notes that "while the Bible does in fact think of humanity in terms of distinguishing between soul and body,"280 it much more often "religiously, ethically" distinguishes between "spirit and flesh."281 Hence the idea about the soul's immortality "came from Greco-Roman thought making the

275 The equivalent term is written in the characters "kincho," accompanied by the phoneticised "shupannung" ("Spannung").

276 Takakura seems basically to be using the terms for "civilisation" and "culture" ("bunmei" and "bunka") interchangeably here.


278 FK, pp.138-146; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.419-427.

279 Cf. above, Part III, pp.323-324(n.229).

280 "Soul" and "body" are written in the respective characters "tamashi" and "shintai," accompanied by the phoneticised "soru" and "bodi."

281 These are written in the respective characters "rei" and "niku," accompanied by the phoneticised "supiritto" and "furesshu."
absolute distinction between soul and body," whereas the Bible does not address
the alleged problem of whether unbelievers will "eternally continue or not after
death." Instead, the Bible is centrally concerned with whether people are spiritual
or fleshly, alive or dead, i.e., God-centred or self-centred.282

Also with regards to the "hope of eternal life necessarily given from the eternal
God, with Whom we are reconciled, being forgiven of sin through faith,"283
Takakura reiterates that Paul does not say (nor do we understand) this hope from
"so called head logic," but the "logic of conscience, logic of faith." But here
Takakura extends, as it were, the certainty of the logic of faith to a "universal
certainty"284 with respect to the hope of eternal life: "Just as faith through the
gospel is the most certain thing in all the universe,285 so is hope of eternal life
born from faith a similarly certain thing." Moreover, in that the believer presently
experiences by faith "supertemporal fellowship with God," the certainty of faith and
hope of which one "is convinced now"286 also guarantees the perfection of our
salvation. Whereas the Bible assures us that our salvation and God's kingdom will
be culminated on the day of Christ's Second Coming, "more than a coming
historical fact," this is "something that should be believed, and hoped for as a
superhistorical reality."287

These comments on the certainty of the Christian's hope, while not necessarily
clarifying what has been noted to be distractions related to Takakura's temporal-


283 This is another of the many, continuing examples of Takakura's presenting
together a whole network of facets of a single subject in order adequately to see it
in the proper light.

284 The entire phrase is, "shinko no ronri ha uchuteki na tashika o motsu."

285 "...zenuchu ni oite mottomo tashika naru mono de aru...."

286 Emphasis original.

287 "Superhistorical reality" is here written in the characters "chorekishiteki
shinjitsu," accompanied by the phoneticised "endo-geshihitorihhi"
eternal concepts, do stress again the important place of certainty within Takakura’s "Evangelical Christianity."

Finally, in regards to the Church, Takakura again says two things needing consideration here. First, after stating clearly that "the Church’s essence is the gospel and faith" and not "systems, organisations and people," Takakura rephrases "faith" as "the historical faith aroused by the gospel." He continues by saying that the true Church--as the fellowship of the saints standing on the faith of the gospel--must be manifest "not only in the ‘invisible Church’, but also in the ‘visible Church’ on the earth within history." The relevant point here is Takakura’s coupling of "the faith" and "the Church" with the latch of "history." That is, "the faith" is that which has been believed throughout (and within) "history" by "the Church"; similarly, "the Church," which must stand on "the faith," must do so within (and throughout) "history." This kind of thinking may provide yet another clue to the distraction-turned-puzzling concern relative to Takakura’s use of concepts concerned with history.

The second point Takakura makes is that the Church does not exist primarily for social service or the fulfilment of its members, but for the glory of Christ. Moreover, in that the Church’s life and essence are based on Christ’s gospel, as the "storehouse" of that gospel the Church must be about the business of preaching and

\[\text{288} \text{Cf. above, Part III, pp.324-325. However, the statement on the Second Coming quoted immediately above, as well as the attaching by Takakura of the German "endgeschichtlich" to what heretofore has been translated as "superhistorical," might provide a clue to follow in Part IV’s analysis.}\]

\[\text{289Emphases original.}\]

\[\text{290Emphases mine. Takakura goes on to rebut the Non-Church misunderstanding concerning the necessity of the visible Church.}\]

\[\text{291FK, p.143; Chosakushu, Vol.2, 424.}\]

\[\text{292With the additional connection here with the Church, there might be some correlation with Takakura’s notion of "corporate," or "objective." Cf. above, Part III, pp.319(n.206),320(n.210).}\]
evangelism. The sacraments, i.e., the Lord’s Supper and baptism, as "the clearest embodiment of the gospel," must also be given their due importance. Similarly, the Church’s unity must be based on the "gospel and truth." In sum, Christ and his gospel are always to be in the forefront of the Church’s raison d’être, mission, and unity.293

At the start of his concluding paragraph for Chapter IV, Takakura states, "I think that I have been able to make clear the meaning of faith and the life of faith." He then reviews the miraculous, gracious, Cross-centred nature of faith, and he speaks of the "eternal fight" that must take place along with the "eternal peace" that comes through faith: "Here is the mystery of the life of faith." Yet during the fight which rages in the midst of "this civilisation and history filled with contradiction and darkness," due to the hope born of faith we are "convinced of salvation’s completion and the realisation of God’s kingdom," and "with certainty we wait for the ultimate solution, the new heavens and the new earth." With moving words Takakura concludes, "Look at the lifeview and worldview which stands on the gospel: how high and deep the grandeur!"294

e. Chapter V: Special Characteristics of Evangelical Christianity295

Within the first of the five sections comprising Chapter V, Takakura reviews his understanding of the weaknesses of pre- and post-Reformation Christianity.296 As for the present, "Various contemporary cultural elements are penetrating Christianity, [and] they are imperiling the faith’s purity and strength." Takakura points out Japan’s particular vulnerability in this regard, for "in a Buddhist country it is easy for pantheistic, mystical elements unconsciously to flow into the Christian


295Within his general remarks about FK, Sato Toshio remarks that Chapter V "expresses well in a direct way the special characteristics of Takakura’s Evangelical Christianity." Sato, 1983, pp.113-114.

Thus there are two, major problems to be faced: The first is the "earnest rethinking" of the nature of Christianity as a "truth problem," a problem to be tackled from the related triad of "faith and thought and life." Dealing with this first problem is necessary for wrestling both theoretically and practically with the second, namely the "relationship between Christianity and general culture."  

In the second section, "as a help to clarifying the meaning of Evangelical Christianity," Takakura describes some "tendencies of faith" within the "contemporary Christian world." He first mentions "formal orthodoxy," or what is commonly known as "Evangelical Christianity." While holding to orthodox theological statements, this trend has fallen into dead intellectual assent of doctrine, Pharisaism, and clericalism. What is needed is an earnest, prophetic opposition that will "fight for the religion's truth and life," just as the Old Testament prophets did in opposing the priestly religion of their day. Only by the "overthrow of intellectualist, formal orthodoxy" can there be a "return to true, living evangelical faith." Takakura then describes in succession the good points, but as well the ultimately dangerous aspects, of "rationalist, naturalistic Christianity," of both the "cultural or philosophical" and the "romantic, mystical, humanistic" types of liberal Christianity, of pietism, and of Roman Catholicism.  

In the third section, once again "before explaining the special characteristics of Evangelical Christianity," Takakura deals with "how to think, in an evangelical way, about Christianity's important doctrines." Takakura in effect reviews the entire FK, writing in turn of God as Creator, Jesus Christ as God's Son and Saviour, humanity and sin, the atonement and faith, and various points related to faith mentioned in the previous chapter. Throughout his descriptions Takakura  

---

297 Takakura again uses this phrase without further explanation. Cf. above, Part III, p.322(n.217).
consistently contrasts various matters with aspects of contemporary Christianity and culture.\(^{301}\) Of particular note are his comments within the section’s last paragraph on the consummation of the kingdom of God:

God’s perfect rule which penetrates heaven and earth, namely the finished kingdom of God, is something the centre of gravity of which preferably should be placed at a transcendent, eschatological place; it is something given as grace, as miracle. Also, [about] the kingdom of God, rather than our thinking of it with a spatial idea, we should more often think of it as a temporal idea. We cannot know when the kingdom of God will come. We cannot know now the content of the finish of the kingdom of God, but it is certain that the kingdom of God will come. Accordingly, we must always wait with opened eyes. The kingdom of God is thereby judgement as well as salvation. Life or death. The special characteristic of the morality of the kingdom of God is thereby choice, resolution.\(^{302}\)

Takakura makes three basic points here. First is the "transcendent, eschatological" nature of God’s kingdom. These are ideas used sparingly so far in \(FK\);\(^ {303}\) but, their tie to the gracious and miraculous character of God’s rule brings them into more familiar territory, and thus into connection with others of his oft-used kingdom concepts, such as "eternal." The second--and new--point is the distinction between spatial and temporal conceptions of the kingdom, with Takakura’s dismissal of the former in favour of the second. Third is the step to the kingdom’s existential implications in its call for "choice" and "resolution." Taken together, this triad of the kingdom’s eschatological, temporal, and volitional qualities suggests a possible harmonisation and personalisation by Takakura of a number of otherwise separate, impersonal ideas.\(^ {304}\) This set of possibilities will provide further material for consideration in Part IV’s analysis.

This drawing together of ideas also leads to section four’s positive, summation

---

\(^{301}\) \(FK\), pp.160-163; \(Chosakushu\), Vol.2, pp.441-445.

\(^{302}\) Emphasis original. \(FK\), p.164; \(Chosakushu\), Vol.2, p.445.

\(^{303}\) Cf. above, Part III, pp.291,292,311,315.

\(^{304}\) Such ideas might include "history," "supernatural," and "miracle."
statement of "Evangelical Christianity’s fundamental, special qualities." First, Takakura feels compelled once more to distinguish the faith embodying these qualities from "traditional evangelicalism." Because "religious pharisaism is what we abhor most," the nature of evangelical faith is in no way to be decided by making a "theoretical decision" as to whether or not there is formal agreement with confessions and doctrines.305 "Unreflectively arranging" faith in that manner "lacks spiritual intuition." By contrast, the qualities of "Evangelical Christianity" to be described here must be considered "from a deep religious standpoint," and that is exactly what the rest of section four proceeds to do.306

In summarising Evangelical Christianity, Takakura elucidates four qualities. The first is that it is a "religion of the 'Word'."307 Takakura’s description proceeds from his quoting John, "In the beginning was the Word...." He then notes that beginning anywhere other than the Word—with religious sentiment, character, moral conduct, reason, speculation, or anything else other than "God’s atoning act"—does not give the "strength of fellowship from being seized by the living God," does not "certainly bind us to God," does not "make us sinners righteous before God," and does not give the "certainty of salvation." Only the "absolute authority" of the Word, i.e., only experiencing the "Christ of the Cross," the "historic revelation" of the Word in "necessary relationship with the Holy Spirit," is what "guarantees the certainty of salvation" and keeps one’s god from becoming a "postulate of the self, a dead god."308

The second fundamental characteristic is "in recognising original sin." "Of course,"

---

305 For example, Christ’s divinity, Christ’s atonement, the Resurrection, the trinity, the Bible’s inspiration...."

306 Fk, p.165; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.446.

307 As noted earlier, the possible Barthian influence some see in such statements as this one will be addressed later.

308 Emphases original.FK, pp.165-167; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.447-448.
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Takakura reiterates, "this bottomless riddle of human nature cannot be unravelled fully by the so-called theory of the fall of the human race." This "fate" of ours, expressed by the Psalmist as "I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me," is something "superrational." That is, we who are allegedly free human beings are "children of wrath" and "of the flesh," are "egotistical," and thereby "experience guilt." The religion of the Bible assumes this "hidden dualism" in "human nature and the world"; by assuming otherwise, "people’s spiritual life can in no way be understood." Ultimately, only "Christ’s Second Coming will solve the fundamental problem of the world and history," and "only in ‘God’s Word’, ‘the gospel’, ‘Christ of the Cross’ is salvation to be anticipated."

The third special characteristic of Evangelical Christianity is that it is a "religion of grace." Not any "human act" such as speculation, religious sentiment, or moral development, but "only faith, only God’s absolute grace in Christ can make us sinners righteous before God and save us." Moreover, Takakura follows a quotation from Karl Heim by stating, "Faith means the self’s crisis, disappointment in human nature." Yet there "is One sitting in this dark room of faith, namely ‘I am the way, the truth, and the life’, the coffer stone Lord Christ of the Cross." Only in the grace of the Cross is our strength and life.

"Finally, the most important special characteristic of Evangelical Christianity is that it is a religion of conscience, of calling." This quality is particularly crucial in light of contemporary Christianity’s having been "compromised and adulterated by

309 "kono sokoshirenai na zo"

310 "un mei"

311 Psalms 51:5.

312 "Guilt" is written in the characters "zaiseki," accompanied by the phoneticised "giruto."


modern culture." Thus the "most serious truth" of the creature's fulfilling its ultimate purpose of knowing, enjoying, worshipping, and serving God has been replaced by seeking life, peace, pleasure, and moral cultivation, i.e., "seeking self in God."\(^{315}\) God is thus made into a means for our "utilitarian, pleasure-seeking" ends. This is more like "Buddhism and Tenrikyo,"\(^{316}\) however, and "completely different" from the biblical and prophetic religion of conscience. Such a compromise is a fundamental "truth problem," in that it diametrically opposes the "truth of the religion of the Bible" that God does not exist for man, but man for God. Living by conscience or calling is to render "absolute obedience, absolute loyalty, absolute service to the Lord of the Cross."\(^{317}\) Thus Takakura closes this section with the challenge, "We must focus our hearts on what the Lord is seeking from us."\(^ {318}\)

After briefly reiterating these four qualities of the Word, original sin, grace, and conscience-calling, Takakura concludes section five, Chapter V, and the entire book with the brief conclusion outlined earlier.\(^{319}\)

3. General Reflections

Having thought along with Takakura as he has been composing *FK*, we leave his house--where he has been labouring earnestly during the final ten, sweltering\(^{320}\) days of August, 1927 (Showa 2)--with an accompanying sense of the heat of Takakura's passion expressed through what he has written. To be sure, we might

\(^{315}\)"kami ni oite jiko o motomete iru no de aru"

\(^{316}\)Cf. Part I, p.81.

\(^{317}\)This way of describing the religious "truth problem" may be a start in helping to clarify Takakura's otherwise unexplained earlier uses of this phrase. Cf. above, Part III, pp.322(n.217),336(n.297).


agree with criticisms of the book in regards to balance,\textsuperscript{321} omissions,\textsuperscript{322} and clarity;\textsuperscript{323} these and other deficiencies have been noted both by Takakura himself and by others.\textsuperscript{324} Without forgetting these alleged shortcomings, we must now attempt to draw together some reflections on the book. This will help in summarising both Takakura’s main concerns, or the book’s content, as well as his approach, or methodology.

An initial point about the content of \textit{FK}, something almost so obvious that one can miss its significance, is that the book is a \textit{religious} or specifically \textit{theological} work. Takakura did not write a book primarily about history, a science textbook, a political tract, or an anthology of poems: he wrote something religious. His audience was a particular religious group, the Christian community in Japan. Both the book’s title and five chapter headings were intentionally written and understood as addressing religious topics. Takakura apparently believed that ultimately the evangelical faith was the only real solution to the problems of all of civilisation and history; so, in that sense he was attempting to say something that was all-embracing, leaving absolutely no subject untouched. Nevertheless, in terms of classifiable areas of thought, \textit{FK} is best defined as religious.\textsuperscript{325}

\textsuperscript{321}For example, the introductory discussions for certain topics such as the view of the atonement are too long, and discussions concerning important topics are left undone." Kuwada, 1939 (Showa 14), pp.435-436, as quoted in Sato, \textit{Chosakushu}, p.472, and cited in Sato, 1983, p.113.

\textsuperscript{322}In his additional introductory comments to the third edition, Takakura expresses particular regret that "I have only briefly mentioned, and have not explained in detail, pneumatology, ecclesiology, and eschatology." \textit{FK}, p.4; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.2, p.286.

\textsuperscript{323}In the Introduction, Takakura terms the content "hazy, with both simple and complex levels of difficulty." In the added Introduction, he calls the book "unpolished." \textit{FK}, p.3; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.2, pp.284,285.

\textsuperscript{324}One particularly blistering critique of the book, and indeed of Takakura’s overall thought, which was written soon after the publication of \textit{FK} will be considered below in the midst of examining \textit{FK}’s wider, contextual connections.

\textsuperscript{325}Obviously, the earlier discussion in Part I as to what does and does not constitute something religious is relevant here. Addressing this matter further must
Furthermore, in addressing religious concerns, FK aims to cultivate religious life, certainty, and vitality. Takakura repeatedly and in various ways offers disclaimers against seeking either the growth of ecclesiastical structures, or bare intellectual assent to theological formulae. The healthy, strong, and true Evangelical Christianity embodied in FK is something presented as personal and demanding the involvement of one’s entire life and soul.

A third and final summarising reflection relates to the sources upon which/whom FK draws in addressing its concern for vital, religious life. Takakura clearly believed that the Old Testament prophets, the authors of the New Testament (particularly Paul), the Reformers (Luther and Calvin), and some selected contemporary theologians had grasped, and been grasped by, genuine religious faith. There were other isolated examples, for instance Anselm and Athanasius; but, according to Takakura’s own explicit statements and constant citations, the groups mentioned above comprise those writers whom Takakura judged as expressing the living, religious certainty which he himself so zealously was seeking to experience and communicate. In continuing to pursue the present goal of understanding Takakura’s own thought, it is essential to bear in mind the sources he himself considered worthy of emulation and attention.

Obviously there are more things that could be said in summary about the content of FK, e.g., how the book might be classified theologically beyond just "Protestant" and "Reformed." But because such matters would take us into a certain amount of detail and intricate problems, they are better postponed. For now, we shall summarise our reflections of the book’s concerns as an attempt to promote the religious life and vitality exemplified in the Bible and the sixteenth century Reformers.

be postponed until Part IV. Cf. Part I, pp.76-79.

326 Of course, even these two labels would have to be delineated further relative to Takakura’s own case.
How then might FK's manner of presentation, its style, its methodology be encapsulated? Once again a triad of reflections should suffice for the present summary. First, to borrow Sato Toshio's description,

This book is...a book of battle, fiercely fighting for his so-called Evangelical Christianity against various, different positions. As a type of manifesto which boldly and frankly expresses this emphasis, it gives body blows to the reader in going to the place of [real] meaning, as something having the authority to press in upon a person's heart.\(^{327}\)

Although emotional impact particularly is hampered by translation into another language, encountering FK even in English should give one a sense of what Professor Sato is seeking to convey here. There is a ferocity, a boldness, a personal authority that is experienced upon reading the book. One can see how the book's subject matter, the aim to produce vital religious life, is very much complemented by this style. Thus, more than being a tightly-reasoned, theoretical treatise that challenges the intellect, FK is an impassioned sermon that "presses upon" its reader's heart.

A second and related matter of methodology is that of explanation type, or style of argument, or the arrangement of ideas. Since FK is not an academic treatise, one would not expect to find carefully laid out syllogistic proofs, minute etymological detail, or philosophical hair-splitting. But much more striking than a simple absence of academic rigour is FK's manner of persuasion that, if not diametrically the opposite of deductive reasoning, is at least radically different.

At several places throughout the book, Takakura specifically distinguishes between mere "head logic" or "rational consciousness" on the one hand, and "faith logic" or "conscience logic," "superrational" or even "antirational" consciousness on the other.\(^{328}\) Experience is indeed the best teacher in understanding what Takakura means here, but the image of "body blows" which "press in upon" the reader is


helpful in describing the type of argument employed. Certain selected targets are pursued and struck with forceful blows. Not only do these blows come from different angles, but they often are packed with the power of the entire book condensed into multi-faceted, singularly focused points. The recipient is then forced, albeit willingly in the end due to the nature of the subject, to submit: what the book opposes I must give up; what the book favours I must accept.

Interestingly, there seems to be the need to describe this style from the perspective of the reader. This is revealing in that it shows how Takakura himself has experienced the same "assault" by the evangelical faith, and in that sense he wrestles alongside his readers with the subjects at hand.

In short, more than using rational deduction, FK employs a "focused attack" type of presentation in seeking to persuade the reader to embrace its "Evangelical Christianity."

A third point to be at least noted here in this summary reflection is in regards to what might be termed "structural" or "philosophical" matters. Throughout the book, Takakura seems to be seeking to fit his message into, or describe various matters by using, certain conceptual categories that ostensibly serve to systematise his thought. Thus the reader regularly encounters such pairs of ideas as "time-eternity," "absolute-relative," "objective-subjective," "corporate-individual," "reason-faith," "certainty-uncertainty," and "clarity-vagueness." Some of the confusion associated with these "conceptual organisers" has already been noted, and their further analysis will have to come later. For now, their presence needs to be noted as an important and striking feature of the approach which Takakura has taken in composing FK.

Thus far in Part III, Takakura's most representative work, Fukuinetei Kirisutokyo, has been examined to a certain point of care and detail. Preliminary observations have been made as to the meaning of the book's title, its challenge of cultural and

---
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linguistic translation, and its stated purpose. A chapter-by-chapter overview has brought to light a number of features of Takakura’s "Evangelical Christianity," and the book’s content and method have just been summarised. In order more painstakingly to decipher FK, and so that Takakura’s thought in its entirety might be dealt with more fully, we will now return to where Part III began, namely the historical context within which FK was formulated.

C. The Historical Context of *Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo*

To return to our meal metaphor, one could say that we have watched Takakura prepare the food, and we have begun to taste it. However, we now need more explanation as to how Takakura actually prepared the ingredients that went into the meal: how did he produce, using the elements of his own setting, his FK as we have encountered it? To begin to understand Takakura’s contextual recipe, the remainder of Part III—the specific objective of which continues to be to focus our attention on Takakura’s thought as his own articulation of the Christian faith—will look at the connections which his FK has with various aspects of its historical context. This does not mean simply tracing influences; nor must God’s often unpredictable leading and Takakura’s originality be forgotten. What it will involve concretely at this juncture of the thesis is considering how various matters described in Part I, both chapters of Part II, and the beginning of Part III stand in relation to the content and style of FK as it has been examined so far.

1. Takakura’s Life Context

To begin with something that perhaps was recalled amidst the discussion above of the intense, ferocious style of FK, one can see in that style a reflection of Takakura’s own "intense and strong" personality. Moreover, at least some, if not a great deal, of the pulsating drive within FK can be attributed to Takakura’s

---

331 Cf. Introduction, pp.3-4,6(n.11).
power as a preacher. The correlative problem of the "self," which Takakura carried with him into the Christian faith and theological studies, is evident here as well.

Mention here of Takakura's oft-described "problem of the self" helps in placing FK into its wider historical context. Within several of the analyses of Takakura's struggle with the "self," together with an acknowledgement of his own peculiar personality there is the recognition that this was by no means a problem unique to Takakura. Indeed, Takakura himself recognised that his was an "age of self-discovery, self-consciousness, self-liberation." During the first two decades of the twentieth century (from late Meiji through the first half of Taisho), wrestling with the self was a common problem among sensitive young, educated urbanites. Some have thus suggested that this period be called "the age of anguish over introspectively gazing at the self."

There were various facets of this widespread "problem of the self," and considering four of them here will shed some varying shades of light on FK. The first facet is socio-economic, having to do with the type of people who agonized over the self. Throughout FK, Takakura is constantly railing against both the "sentimental" and

---

333 One account by a first-time visitor to the Shinanomachi Church recalls Takakura's sermon as follows: "It was like the narration of a distress-filled, heated interior scuffle. That man's words resounded and echoed in my ears, and deeply pierced through to the depths of my heart." Yoshimura Yoshio, "Takakura Tokutaro Sensei," in Kaiko (Chance Meetings). Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1962, pp.88-89.


335 Cf., e.g., Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.390-392; Fukuda, 1934, pp.144-145.


"intellectual" elements of modern Christianity. These are precisely the type of qualities one would have expected to find amongst the strata of people comprising the Japanese Protestantism of Takakura's day, namely the urbanised middle-class intelligentsia. The makeup of the Church was in large part the kind of "clever, refined, modern people" whom Takakura saw as "stumbling over" the gospel, just like the educated Greeks of old.340

Somewhat paradoxically, Takakura's own example "represents" the very Christianity he criticizes: in his case, "The point of coming to Christianity through the medium of the problem of the self is typically represented." Takakura himself had been on an elite educational track, and that course had thus led him to migrate to the greatest urban centre of all, Tokyo. However, in spite of spending much of his adult life in the city, his home of Ayabe always held a strong attraction for Takakura. His simple, small town upbringing thus seems to have enabled Takakura to maintain a critical distance from his adopted, urban setting.344

338 Cf. above, Part III, pp.296,301,310,331,337,339,340.


342 Cf. Part I, pp.29,34,37,61.

343 Cf. above, Part III, p.276.

344 A concrete example of Takakura's attachment to the country, and critical distance from urban Christianity, is given during his reflections on his 1923 (Taisho 12) trip through the English Lake District (cf. above, Part III, p.279(n.28)). Upon recounting his walk through the small town of Gosforth, Takakura admirably remarks that the people there were very much country people, but Christianity is strongly suited to such simple people. Here there is not even a hair of Christianity belittled by delicacy and sentimentalism. This kind of reliable faith--immune to city sickness, the naive, vigorous faith of country people--still
Within the same socio-economic environment where Takakura and others were struggling with the acute "problem of the self" was the strong current of individualism in intellectual circles. While individualism per se is not critiqued in FK, intellectual and literary movements closely associated with individualist concerns, e.g., naturalism and humanism, are among the clearest targets of Takakura’s foundation-level attacks. To put these attacks in perspective, it is helpful to note that Takakura wrote FK in the continuing wake of a very satisfying experience of Christian community within the young church he had pastored for over two years by that time, the Toyama Church. Coupled with a commitment to the organised Church modeled for him by Uemura, one can see how Takakura came to emphasise the corporate implications of his "Evangelical Christianity," with a focus on the Church. One can also understand the related critique of Non-Church Christianity which appears at one point in FK.

remains in the English countryside.

"Kanbarando Yuki" Seisho no Kensan No.92, August, 1924 (Taisho 13), p.37; Zenshu, Vol.6, pp.342-343.


346Cf. above, Part III, pp.291,295,298,331,337. This is not to imply that Takakura criticised Naturalism as a literary movement, but naturalism and humanism as foundational, philosophico-religious postures.

347Takakura reflects in his unpublished 1931 (Showa 6) "Megumi no Ato" ("After Grace") on the crucial role Toyama Church had played in his own personal and theological development. This was written just a few months after Toyama Church became the larger, relocated Shinanomachi Church. Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.39-43. Cf. Part I, p.96.

348Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.124,188-190. Takakura’s (and in particular FK’s) relationship with Uemura will be considered below.


350Cf. above, Part III, p.287(n.61). Takakura’s posture towards Non-Church Christians thus becomes somewhat enigmatic, given his appreciation for much of what he read of Non-Church writers. One could even argue that some of these readings helped to fuel Takakura’s critique of the Christianity of his day. Cf. above, Part III, pp.277,278(ns.17,20).
A third facet of the "problem of the self" which, along with the socio-economic and intellectual-literary facets, illuminates FK's contextual connections is its relation to the political situation of the day. The urban middle-class had emerged amongst dramatic socio-economic changes, the overall capitalist cause of which had been instigated largely by the state. Moreover, the state consistently had opposed individualistic trends, which together with Christian and other imported ideas were often lumped into the category of "dangerous thoughts." In the face of the challenging power of the state, and due to the "difficulty of adapting to the actual society," countless intellectuals "fell into vertigo and anxiety" as they turned inward. As suggested earlier, Takakura’s turning away from political involvement and focusing on religious matters—which focus was the first general reflection given above of FK—would thus fit a very familiar pattern.

Moreover, in addressing inward, religious concerns as opposed to more social and public issues, FK fits the traditional pattern of religion in Japan, particularly Buddhism:

The variety of religions is broad and extensive in Japan. But, excepting Christianity....[i]he common concern of all these religions

---

352As argued in Part I, there was something illusory about the so-called "Taisho Democracy." Cf. Part I, pp.48-52,63.
355Cf. Part I, p.55. Matsuoka Fumitaka writes, "Sato argues that Takakura’s preoccupation with the notion of self was his own attempt to grapple with the meaning of the Christian faith in the midst of the Meiji nationalism." However, the thesis writer cannot find such a citation either in the reference listed, or in any other of Professor Sato’s writings. Moreover, Professor Sato confirms in a 13 December 1994 letter to the thesis writer that he did not write the statement quoted above. Matsuoka, 1978, p.71(n.l). While noting this apparent mistake does not help or hinder our view of Takakura either way, at least it helps "set the record straight."
is the internal problems of man. Their main focus is on immediate experience. How to remove worries and anxieties from man's mind is their main task.... But th[e]se religions do not show too much interest in the social life of the people.... Buddhism, with its influence penetrating very deeply into Japanese culture, has made the Japanese mind more and more introverted....

In other words, running parallel to the state’s relative position of power—e.g., during the Tokugawa period, and in "modern" Japan beginning in Meiji—is the centuries old focus by Japanese religion, especially Buddhism, on human interiority. As the above quotation further indicates, Christianity in Japan has demonstrated the willingness and ability to involve itself in addressing public concerns; the so-called "Social Christianity" is perhaps the best example of this. However, despite early "theological intention" to the contrary, there was a steadily increasing divergence within Protestantism between social involvement and a more kerygmatic emphasis.\(^356\) FK's choice between these two alternatives is clearly and emphatically for the latter.\(^361\) Insofar then as FK is viewed as a religious phenomenon \textit{in Japan},\(^362\) an emphasis on inner, spiritual concerns is to be expected.


\(^{358}\)If one wishes to distinguish between "community religiosity" and "individual religiosity" in Japan, the former enables demonstration of "civic responsibility," whereas the latter involves "personal adherence" to beliefs or organisations. Pertinent to the present discussion is to note that Christian faith in Japan, especially in "modern" Japan, would fit better in the latter category. Reid, 1991, pp.33-34.

\(^{359}\)Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.138-139.

\(^{360}\)Cf. Part II, ch.1, e.g., pp.143,189(n.327).

\(^{361}\)Cf. above, Part III, pp.292,334-335.

\(^{362}\)Its occasional rebuttals of Buddhism and Confucianism should cause hesitancy in labelling FK as a "religious phenomenon in Japan," which is then seen to bear marks of a "Japanese religion." However, the presence of critiques of Japanese religions in the book does not therefore prevent examining FK within such a framework as "Japanese religiosity" for the sake of analysis, and perhaps even eventual classification. Further difficulties and implications of viewing FK and Takakura's thought as a part of Japanese religious history will continue to emerge.
A fourth and final matter concerning which the "problem of the self" can serve as a bridge into FK's contextual connections is that of its relationship to Meiji Christianity. Whereas Takakura's generation of Christians shared with the previous generation the challenge of relating to the state, the younger Christians' introspective agony was new. Again, Takakura himself speaks of this, and he offers an accompanying analysis:

To the people of the [1868] Meiji Restoration, matters such as the self did not at all become a problem. Human nature was just forgetting oneself and facing outward only, discussing the empire, exerting strength towards how to mobilise the masses. All of the people of that time were taken up with external activities and did not have the leisure to examine the inmost heart; but, although pushed into a corner the self did not stay in the shadows. Thus their [the people of that time] lives were still ruled by traditional legends and customs, and there was not a waking up from themselves and a critical doubting of these authorities.

Although this particular statement refers not just to Christians but to Takakura's immediate forefathers in general, and despite the fact that it was written over twelve years before FK, it can safely be assumed that Takakura still would have possessed at the time of writing FK a similar understanding of Meiji Christianity's lack of inner awareness.

The subject of FK's relationship with Meiji Christianity is substantial enough to require its own, detailed consideration. While appreciating how the "problem of the self" has served as a helpful catalyst in illuminating FK and some it.

at various points in Part IV. Cf. above, Part III, pp.292,293,(ns.83,84),301,304, 336,341.

363Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.112ff.
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connections with the wider socio-economic, intellectual-literary, political, and generational context, we must now leave that particular thought (at least as an organising concept for our discussion) in order to focus on how FK ties into the Christianity of the generation which helped to produce its author.

2. Meiji Christianity

As pointed out earlier, Takakura’s primary contact with Meiji Christianity was through the NKK, and Uemura Masahisa in particular.366 Given both men’s importance within their respective generations, the carryovers and changes between Uemura and Takakura—in relation to the transition from first to second generation Protestantism in Japan—have thus been addressed by various analyses. Such writings include general surveys of Japanese Christianity,367 surveys of Christian thought or theology in Japan,368 and examinations of a particular, relevant topic, e.g., "evangelicalism."369 Moreover, besides the explicit attention given both by his commentators370 and by Takakura himself371 to his multi-faceted relationship with Uemura, there are several publications devoted primarily to comparing the two

369E.g., Uda, 1993, pp.157-164.
371There are numerous comments in Takakura’s diary regarding Uemura, many of which are cited by Oshio and Sato. Takakura’s published writings concerning Uemura were made after the latter’s death in January, 1925 (Taisho 14), and include: "Uemura Sensei o Shinobu" ("Remembering Pastor Uemura") Fukuin Shinpo No.1538, 22 January 1925 (Taisho 14), pp.7-8; "Shingaku o Oshieru Hito to shite no Uemura Sensei" ("Pastor Uemura as a Teacher of Theology") Tokyo Shingakusha Koyu (Tokyo Seminary Alumnus) Special Uemura Commemorative Issue, February, 1925 (Taisho 14), pages unknown; "Uemura Sensei no Sekkyo no Omoide" ("Recollection of Pastor Uemura’s Sermons") Fukuin to Gendai No.11, February, 1932 (Showa 7), pp.45-46. All three of these articles are reproduced in Chosakushu, Vol.3, 347-357. Cf. Part I, p.27(n.77).
men and the implications of their combined influence.\textsuperscript{372} As this wealth of material indicates, a comprehensive examination of Takakura’s overall relationship with Uemura is beyond the present scope of looking at \textit{FK}’s position relative to Meiji Christianity. Thus whereas Part IV will be able at least to supplement the present look at Takakura’s thought in relation to Uemura, the present discussion must confine itself to a few general continuities, some specific contrasts, and fundamental points of similarity and difference.

Uemura Masahisa stood for what was both called and understood as "evangelicalism." Moreover, our examination of \textit{FK} confirms that it shares many of Uemura’s fundamental "evangelical" positions. Thus while one must proceed with caution in light of the cultural and generational gaps hindering a straight carryover of such a varied and fluctuating set of identifying marks as "evangelicalism,"\textsuperscript{373} it seems only fair and properly in agreement with the prevailing interpretation of \textit{FK}\textsuperscript{374} to recognise it as at least having taken many of its leads from Uemura. Thus \textit{FK}’s upfront, general postures of opposing "liberal Christianity"\textsuperscript{375} and seeking to be "biblical"\textsuperscript{376} should be seen in connection with Uemura’s own similar positions.

There are other points of general evangelical agreement, of course, such as the importance of the atonement and ecclesiology. However, it is in these sorts of

\textsuperscript{372}E.g., Okada, 1993, pp.23-40; several articles in a special edition--entitled "Uemura kara Takakura he" ("From Uemura to Takakura")--of \textit{Fukuin to Sekai} No.3, 1985.

\textsuperscript{373}Cf. above, Part III, pp.284-286.

\textsuperscript{374}Cf., e.g., Germany’s essay title, "Takakura Tokutaro and the Theology of Biblical Evangelicalism." Cf. Introduction, p.13.

\textsuperscript{375}Cf. above, Part III, pp.291,308,310,332,337.

\textsuperscript{376}References are hardly needed here, since \textit{FK} seeks to present the Bible’s religion. However, for explicit references to the "Bible" and being "biblical," cf. above, Part III, pp.287-288,290-303,309,310,312,313,317,328,329,333-334,340-341.
theological areas where contrasts between Uemura's "Progressive Evangelicalism" and Takakura's "Evangelical Christianity" have been widely noticed and examined. With regards to the atonement, there is a common view that Takakura's thought crystallises and makes a "creative contribution" at this point;{378} FK thus improves upon Uemura's emphasis on Christ's person at the expense of Christ's work.{379} As to ecclesiology, whereas some might see Takakura's theological articulation of the nature of the Church{380} as the taking up an undone task inherited from Uemura,{381} others have severely criticised Takakura at this point.{382} One analyst calls for a return to Uemura's healthy, Puritan-like ecclesiology, the proper ethical posture of which is seen to have been in large part lost in Takakura's overemphasis on grace.{383}

In terms of further points of agreement, FK's emphasis that "truth and calling are


378 Germany, p.106. While not necessarily agreeing with this "popular" understanding, Matsuoka recognises the view. Matsuoka, 1978, p.74.


380 As for FK, cf. above, Part III, p.350(n.349). However, Takakura felt ecclesiology to be one of the areas he wanted to address further. Cf. above, Part III, p.342(n.322).


382 Kumano characterises Takakura's theology as an "unsettled ecclesiology" (Matsuoka Fumitaka's English translation). Kumano Yoshitaka, 1968, pp.375ff. Matsuoka, for example, notes Kumano's criticism in his own remarks on Takakura. Matsuoka, 1978, p.65. This criticism will be examined in Part IV.
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strictly and only a fight"\textsuperscript{384} can be seen as having been inspired by Uemura's "fighting theology."\textsuperscript{385} Similar is Takakura's occasional use of the term "aspiration," a hallmark of Uemura's understanding of faith.\textsuperscript{386} Furthermore, Takakura himself admirably notes Uemura's "conviction" and "spiritual insight,"\textsuperscript{387} two themes regularly appearing in FK.\textsuperscript{388}

While similarly holding to the two men's common theological approach, some analysts understand Takakura's "Evangelical Christianity" to have "deepened" Uemura's "Progressive Evangelicalism," especially through the former's "rich" preaching.\textsuperscript{389} It has also been claimed that Takakura, due to his having passed

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{384} Cf. above, Part III, p.309.
\item\textsuperscript{385} Cf. Part II, ch.1, p.184. An interesting corollary to this is the analysis offered by Takakura's late son Toru, who notes his father's frequent diary entry, "susume, susume" ("keep going, keep going"). In further noting his father's own mention of a particular sermon by Uemura stressing such a persevering spirit to follow Christ, Takakura Toru sees Uemura's particular influence in his own father's continual striving. Takakura Toru, "Uemura Masahisa to Takakura Tokutaro--Tokutaro no Nikki o Toshite" ("Uemura Masahisa and Takakura Tokutaro--Through Tokutaro's Diary") \textit{Fukuin to Sekai} No.3, March, 1985, p.24.
\item\textsuperscript{386}"kokorozashi" (or its verbal equivalent); cf. Part II, ch.1, p.184, above, Part III, p.322(n.221).
\item\textsuperscript{387}The equivalent terms are "kakushin" and "reiteki chokkan." Takakura also notes, "Otto's so-called Numinous [written here in phoneticised form, followed by the parenthetical, English 'Numinous'] element probably was in my teacher's personality." This evaluation is similar to one offered in FK in relation to Jesus' holiness. "Uemura Sensei o Shinobu" \textit{Fukuin Shinpo} No.1538, 22 January 1925 (Taisho 14), p.8 (\textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.3, p.349); "Uemura Sensei no Sekkyo no Omoide" \textit{Fukuin to Gendai} No.11, February, 1932 (Showa 7), p.45 (\textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.3, p.355). Cf. above, Part III, p.304(n.128).
\item\textsuperscript{388}As to "kakushin," cf. above, Part III, p.309(n.151). In its oft-used passive verbal form, "convinced" is the English equivalent. Cf. above, Part III, pp.309,311,312,315,324,327,329,334,336. "Kakushin" is closely related--if not equivalent--to "tashikasa" ("certainty"), which has been noted to be a prominent concern in FK. Cf. above, Part III, p.343.
\item\textsuperscript{389}The descriptive term used is "hojun." Oshio, in Kuyama, ed., Taisho-Showa vol., 1956, p.148.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
through the latter half of Meiji Japan’s German-oriented government school system, was thus able to "clarify," "purify," and "refine" Uemura’s thought. No matter how this last assessment is evaluated, Takakura’s education undoubtedly provided him a background for dealing in FK with basic Western streams of thought, e.g., Kantian, and certain themes of Japanese religion, e.g., Buddhism.

However, another analysis familiar with both leaders' thought argues that Takakura’s "Evangelical Calvinism," insofar as it was a particular "deepening" of Calvinism, in the end "gives a change of religious character" to Genevan, Scottish, and New England Puritan religiosity in a manner that Uemura’s own version of Calvinism did not. This evaluation begins by remarking, "Upon reading Takakura’s Complete Works directly after reading Uemura’s Complete Works, we are impressed that there is a certain disparity there." In attempting to identity this "feeling of disparity," the same analysis goes on to note: "The road from Uemura to Takakura is a road of change from a religion of ethics to a religion of grace," as well as a change "from a theology of evangelism to theological evangelism." Moreover, such contrasting starting points as Uemura’s "problem of extroverted practice and determination" versus Takakura’s "problem-consciousness of the self," and the understandings of the human-divine personal relationship as "covenantal" versus "union-like," are highlighted. While particulars of this analysis would need closer scrutiny, it is clear that such a viewpoint

---

393 "gaikoteki jissen ya kokorozashi no mondai"
394 "yugoteki"
396 This would especially include the analysis of Takakura’s understanding of the divine-human relationship as "union-like," in light FK’s frequent, and often qualified, statements on mysticism. Cf. above, Part III, pp.291,297,299,301,312, 327,332,336,337.
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approaches cutting the very life-nerve connecting Uemura’s evangelicalism and Takakura’s evangelical faith embodied in FK.

While more careful analysis of this sort of view positing fundamental, religious differences between Uemura and Takakura must wait until Part IV, it is instructive to note here some aspects of the background of Takakura’s sense of prophetic calling which he had upon returning to Japan from Britain. After the initial, euphoric devotion to Uemura’s sermons after his conversion, Takakura began to find his mentor’s messages unsatisfactory and dry. A few years later, Takakura began to wonder about the spiritual well-being of the NKK and Church in Japan as a whole, specifically noting a lack of a "spirit of prayer" and "intimacy with Christ" amongst his elders. While in the midst of his running disagreement with Uemura over the future of the seminary, Takakura set sail for the West in 1921 (Taisho 10) with a sense of personal calling to gain more philosophical training. Takakura’s purpose in receiving such training was that, like "true" theologians such as Paul, Augustine, and Calvin, he might be able "systematically" and "philosophically [to] express" the Christian faith. As to why he needed to be able to express the faith as such, Takakura notes, "If true theology does not spring up, Christianity cannot deeply take root in our country." One

397Cf. Part I, p.95.
399Oshio, pp.60-63. Oshio quotes from Takakura’s diary entries, and he offers the psychological analysis that Takakura’s criticism of Uemura’s sermons was in fact self-criticism.
401Cf. Part I, p.27(n.77).
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is thus left to wonder to what extent Takakura felt that Christianity had taken root at all in Japan during the generation previous to him.

Continuing out of that background, Takakura managed to steer his own course upon returning to Japan from Britain in 1924 (Taisho 13)—particularly as that meant staying out from under Uemura’s large and heavy thumb—by starting what became the Toyama Church, all the while teaching simultaneously at Uemura’s seminary.\textsuperscript{403} Such an arrangement reflected Takakura’s concern, which he had expressed before leaving Japan, that the Church was focusing more on quantity than on quality.\textsuperscript{404} In light of that move taken in the wake of all of his running concerns, one analyst thus concludes that Takakura was seeking to bring about a reform movement within the NKK. By this interpretation, Takakura had seen a hardening of the NKK under Uemura into a secularised, middle-class organisation, and hence he was trying to “uproot and throw away all of the embellishments” in the Church with which his conscience could not co-exist.\textsuperscript{405}

Such an interpretation holds a great deal of plausibility. It helps to explain FK’s emphasis on prophetic Christianity, including the reference to the need to address evangelicalism’s clerical, priestly character.\textsuperscript{406} The total absence of citations from Japanese theological works—and Uemura’s writings would stand as clear examples of possible references—might similarly be understood from Takakura’s lack of recognition of their being “true” theology.

\textsuperscript{403}Cf. Part I, p.95.


\textsuperscript{405}Miyamoto Takenosuke, “Kirisutokyo no Shukyoka to sono Kokufuku—Showa Shoki no Takakura no Ich to Kada” (“The Religionisation of Christianity and its Conquest—The Position and Task of Takakura in Early Showa”) Fukuiin to Sekai No.3, March, 1964, pp.44-48 (quotation from p.44).

\textsuperscript{406}Cf. Part III, pp.337,339.
None of this would have to entail a position that Takakura disdained, or saw as non-Christian, either the NKK or Uemura, of course: Takakura’s public statements and continuing membership in the NKK in fact indicate otherwise. What our understanding of Takakura’s sense of prophetic calling does do is heighten our awareness of Takakura’s conviction of the importance and nature of the task of his FK, as well as accent for us his concern for the NKK and indeed for Japan. In comparison to Uemura, whereas the elder church statesman’s labours on behalf of the NKK and Japan could have only reinforced Takakura’s similar concerns, the two leaders’ respective visions and means to reach them undoubtedly were different. Contrasting political contexts within which they were educated, and perhaps more importantly different family backgrounds vis-à-vis having a sense of socio-political responsibility, i.e., Uemura’s samurai background versus Takakura’s merchant heritage, could go a long way towards explaining the two men’s respective visions for the Christianisation of Japan.  

Again, the possibility that there were significant differences between the very natures of the religious makeups of Uemura’s and Takakura’s respective Christian faiths, and how that might relate to Takakura’s strong sense of calling, will be examined further in Part IV.

3. Western Christianity

Regardless of whatever differences there were between Takakura and Uemura, there were several points of consonance in regards to Western thought. On the one hand, Takakura shared Uemura’s posture of Japanese theology’s independence, at least in terms of ministerial training.  


undoubtedly shared the common view that the Western nations were Christian;\(^{409}\) therefore, "theology" as well was by definition "Western."\(^{410}\) As to where in the West one should look for the best theology, a mutual appreciation of Scottish theology, and most particularly Forsyth, is clear.\(^{411}\) Much attention justifiably has been given to the connections FK has with Western theology, so it is to that set of concerns that we must now turn briefly in order to complete this particular contextualisation section.

Takakura himself provides the best summary of FK's Western connections both in the book's comments on when and where true evangelical theology has arisen in post-biblical times--the Reformation and contemporary Germany--and in the Bibliography.\(^{412}\) Besides the explicit references to authors spread throughout FK,\(^{413}\) Takakura gives evidence of drawing upon many of the theologians considered earlier in Part II, Chapter 2. Besides Forsyth,\(^{414}\) one can quickly see contemporary German and Swiss thinkers (even someone as relatively unknown as Vollrath\(^ {415}\)) in FK's emphasis on the Word;\(^{416}\) von Hügel's stress on grace in

\(^{409}\)Cf. Part I, p.43.

\(^{410}\)This is the easiest, most obvious explanation for why Takakura cited Western works exclusively, and not Uemura's for example. Cf. above, Part III, p.359.


\(^{412}\)Cf. above, Part III, p.286,291(n.78).

\(^{413}\)There are many references not mentioned in Part III, although the chapter-by-chapter overview has attempted at least to mention several representative citations.

\(^{414}\)In light of the extension attention paid to Takakura's affinity with Forsyth, that connection will be given particular, concentrated consideration in Part IV. Cf. n.411 above.

\(^{415}\)Cf. above, Part III, pp.312,330(n.263). Interestingly, the thesis writer could find no information in Edinburgh on Vollrath. However, Vollrath's book that is both quoted and listed in the Bibliography by Takakura, Das Problem des Wortes (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1925), is housed in the Tokyo Shingaku Daigaku Library. FK, pp.88,173; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.369,454.
religious experience appears to be a prominent and recurring theme; Troeltsch's "historical intuition" concerning post-Reformation Protestantism is evident in Takakura's own analyses; and, regularly throughout FK there appears an appreciation for the Old Testament prophets gained through Oman. Takakura's explanation of the Christology of Acts arising out of the early Church's experience of fellowship is very much akin to the ideas of the Anglican O.C. Quick. Moreover, others have noted the indebtedness to Mackintosh in Chapter II on Christology, for example, as well as Takakura's use of Karl Holl's phraseology, "religion of conscience."

Related to FK's connections with Western theology is an especially scathing criticism which it received soon after the book's initial publication. This critique was an article, appearing in the Fukuin Shinpo, written by Sato Shigehiko. Sato had studied in Germany under Karl Holl, and he is associated in Japanese theological circles both with Lutheran thought as well as a position critical of


420Quick is not mentioned explicitly either in Part II, ch.2 of the thesis or the text of FK. One of his works, Liberalism, Modernism and Tradition (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1922) is included in the FK Bibliography, and his explanations of the rise of early Christology in that book (e.g., pp.92-95,140) find an echo in some of Takakura's descriptions. FK, p.175; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.458. Cf. above, Part III, pp.305-306.


423Sato Shigehiko, "Takakura Kun no Shingakuteki Tachiba o Nanzu" ("Criticising Mr. Takakura's Theological Position") Fukuin Shinpo No.1683, 17 November 1927 (Showa 2), pp.5-9.
dialectical theology.\textsuperscript{424} In his article, Sato links Takakura with Barth (despite the fact, Sato asserts, that Takakura does not really understand German thought), particularly through the idea of God as "Wholly Other."\textsuperscript{425} Sato then argues that Barth, and Takakura, have left Paul and Calvin, particularly in the disavowal of pietism's and mysticism's "living Christ."\textsuperscript{426} Sato then goes on to suggest that Takakura's thought shows that he himself has not had a genuine experience of that living Christ.

In his quick reply,\textsuperscript{427} Takakura first distances his own position from Barth's "hidden God," describing his own understanding of God as the holy One Who reveals Himself to sinful humanity in Christ. He further notes that German thinkers such as Schaeder, Althaus, and Holl have helped him in his understanding of Luther and God, especially in relation to the "Eastern pantheism" prevalent in Japan.\textsuperscript{428} In his prompt rejoinder, Sato explains why he had addressed Takakura's personal faith, and he apologises for doing so. However, Sato in no way retracts any of his theological criticisms; indeed, he even expands on them.\textsuperscript{429} Apparently this subsequent article was more agreeable to Takakura, for he notes in his diary upon reading it that it was "more discerning in its courtesy than the earlier one."\textsuperscript{430}

\textsuperscript{424}Germany, p.151; Sato, 1992, p.73.

\textsuperscript{425}Cf. above, Part III, pp.293,300,327,329.

\textsuperscript{426}Cf. above, Part III, pp.297,310.

\textsuperscript{427}Takakura wrote the reply on Monday, 21 November, and it was published as "Sato (Shigehiko) Kun ni Kotau" ("Replying to Mr. Sato (Shigehiko)") \textit{Fukuin Shinpo} No.1685, 1 December 1927 (Showa 2), pp.5-6; \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.5, pp.201-211. Cf. \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.10, "Nikki," p.255.

\textsuperscript{428}"Sato (Shigehiko) Kun ni Kotau" \textit{Fukuin Shinpo} No.1685, 1 December 1927 (Showa 2), p.5; \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.5, pp.204,206-207.

\textsuperscript{429}Sato Shigehiko, "Takakura Kun ni Tou" ("Questioning Mr. Takakura") \textit{Fukuin Shinpo} No.1688, 22 December 1927 (Showa 2), pp.8-9.

For our present purposes, it is sufficient to note what the quotations throughout *FK* already bear out: Takakura was very appreciative of much of what contemporary German and Swiss theologians were articulating, but he did not consider himself to be Barthian. There is not one quotation of Barth in *FK*, whereas there are several of Brunner, Holl, Heim, Althaus, and others. Moreover, it is appropriate to note that, just as one would expect from the makeup of Takakura’s German readings after he returned to Japan from his period of overseas study, there is a mixture of theological and ecclesiastical affiliations, most obviously between Lutheran and Evangelical. This is not to say that Takakura simply wrote in *FK* what he had been reading in German (or in English) during the months leading up to August, 1927 (Showa 2). If anything, it is to suggest that the things Takakura had been reading were being driven by the concerns he ended up addressing in *FK*.

In thinking again back to Takakura’s studies overseas, it should not be surprising to note that *FK* exhibits in prominent fashion the three main issues dealt with in the research Takakura conducted in Britain, i.e., those of language-culture, philosophical attitudes, and authority. The linguistic and cultural challenges

---


The alleged Barthian influence on Takakura will be examined further in Part IV.


facing Takakura in FK have already been noted, and our overview demonstrated just some of the manifold ways in which the translation of words alone was a constant barrier in writing the book. In disavowing speculation and a strictly rational approach, FK concurs with the philosophical posture of the thought Takakura encountered in the West. As for the matter of authority, Chapter I expressly states the central importance of this issue right from the beginning, and hence devotes considerable space to dealing with it. Again, instead of this implying that Takakura simply parroted in FK what he had learned in Britain, one could say that what Takakura learned in Britain matched the issues which he carried there with him, and later dealt with in writing FK.

For Takakura personally, the coalescence of Western theological issues and the ways he addressed them in FK reflected Jesus Christ's bringing Christianity to him through the West in a way that met his own quest for answers to questions raised within his own historical context. As seen in the first section of Part III, Takakura's continuing context was a Japanese one. Further examination of the development of his thought should thus help to demonstrate in what sense issues addressed by FK arose out of Takakura's background, and how those same issues were addressed by the Western thought which Takakura encountered along the way. More in-depth analysis of how FK deals with particular theological topics and thinkers must wait until a more appropriate place in Part IV. In the present section, we have seen how the book reflects Takakura's encounter with Western theology as outlined in Part II, Chapter 2 of the thesis, both in terms of sources used and the ways particular issues are approached.

Having therefore examined how Takakura used his contextual ingredients in producing his most representative work, we now have a fuller appreciation for the taste of his thought as we have partaken of the meal thus far. We have placed FK

\[436\text{Cf. above, Part III, pp.286-287.}\]

\[437\text{Cf. above, Part III, pp.343,344.}\]

\[438\text{Cf. above, Part III, pp.290,294-298,304-305,339.}\]
within Takakura’s own life context, noting some of the ways he drew on Meiji and Western Christianity in order to articulate his own understanding of the Christian faith. This has helped to explain some otherwise obscure ideas, as well as to concretise what might have seemed to be abstract concepts.

However, in terms of presenting Takakura’s thought as a whole, the thesis actually has only whetted our appetite, and has served to pique our curiosity. There is much more to be seen in the rotating, multi-faceted diamond of Takakura’s thought, e.g., in connection with the development of his thought, or how he deals with certain theologians and theological topics. To borrow Takakura’s own metaphor, there are many items still in shadowy corners—e.g., some of the puzzling "structural" elements of his thought—to be brought out into the light for our viewing. To bring out those items, to gaze further into the diamond, to partake of more food and examine some detailed recipes is therefore the complex challenge, for thesis writer and reader, to be met in Part IV.
Part IV. Analysis of Takakura’s Thought

In our attempt to understand Takakura Tokutaro, we have taken a historico-theological approach to his thought. We have thus travelled through examinations of Takakura’s life context, the Meiji and Western expressions of the Christian faith that came to him, and his most representative work, *Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo*. All along the thesis itself has been seeking to "translate" Takakura into the present form of an English-language dissertation. That challenge has involved not only producing equivalent English renderings of Japanese terms and expressions, but the more difficult-to-discern process of communicating Takakura’s own, particular thought within the historical and cultural categories of our own thinking—categories which necessarily accompany our own use of the English language.

The task at hand here in Part IV continues to be to seek to understand Takakura as clearly as possible, without doing violence to the reality of what, how, and why he thought the way he did. The remaining analysis should prove to be the biggest challenge yet in coming to grips with Takakura on his own terms. Moreover, several matters requiring our attention have been postponed along the way, so we must not forget to speak to those concerns within the ensuing discussion.¹

¹Listed here according to their location in the thesis’ Parts (with page #), those postponed matters include the following questions:

Part I:

* (18) What were the differences between Takakura and the first generation, Christian leaders due to their respective merchant, non-samurai and spartan, samurai backgrounds? This matter has been addressed somewhat, but by no means exhaustively. Cf. Part III, p.360(n.407).
* (36-37) What role did the philosopher and Kanazawa high school teacher Nishida Kitarō play in Takakura’s thinking?
* (90) How are we to understand and interpret Takakura’s conversion to Christianity?

Part II, ch.1:

* (126,n.78) What was the nature of Takakura’s interest in Catholicism while he was in Britain? Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.219(n.104).
* (193) How did Takakura take on the "incomplete task" passed on by
As a help in moving ahead, we can follow the lead of the conclusion of Part III. There it was suggested that the matters needing further consideration were the development of Takakura's thought, his articulations of specifically theological matters, and some of the structural elements of his thought. Part IV will thus seek to deal with these three topics in turn, all the while tying up in orderly fashion the numerous loose ends left dangling in Parts I through III.

A. The Development of Takakura's Thought

Throughout the thesis, the goal has been to examine not just Takakura's "theology," but his "thought." That is, instead of systematising according to more familiar theological categories what Takakura said and wrote, the current approach has sought to consider Takakura as a concrete, Christian human being who lived at a particular juncture within world history. Especially because he occupies a place in history different from those of thesis reader and writer, Takakura's total context has been a

Uemura Masahisa? Again, this subject has been touched upon, but its importance demands further attention. Cf. Part III, pp.353-360.

Part II, ch.2:
* (240,n.189) What were the "continuing issues" for Takakura in Britain, given that he was not a tabula rasa?
* (258,n.269) What are Oshio's and others' treatments of Takakura's theological themes and development?
* (262,n.283) How did Takakura receive and use dialectical theology? This is another matter requiring discussion beyond what has already been given. Cf. Part III, pp.363-364.

Part III:
* (277-278) How did Takakura receive and use the thought of the many Japanese writers whose works he read?
* (342,n.325) What does it mean in this thesis for something to be "religious"?
* (343) How might Takakura be classified theologically?
* (345) How are we to understand some of Takakura's "conceptual organisers," or his thought's "structural elements"?
* (351,n.362) How might Takakura's thought be seen within Japanese religious history?
* (361,n.414) In addition to certain other Western thinkers, why did Forsyth apparently hold a particular attraction for Takakura?

2Cf. Introduction, pp.5-6.
constant, multi-faceted factor in the ongoing discussion. This has tended to keep our examination on the rim of a circle containing within itself both clarity and comfort; nevertheless, the extra, required effort has been essential in order to gain the reward of mapping this real person's own journey of faith.

In proceeding now to consider the development of Takakura's thought, it should be pointed out, however, that seeking to understand Takakura as a concrete individual—and in particular as an explicitly Christian thinker—does not imply here an assumption of an underlying, ineffable religious experience that causally dictated his resulting articulations of faith. Discussions involving cross-cultural and interreligious interaction are just as susceptible to this kind of approach as they are to the sort of theological prejudice which the present thesis has tried to keep at arm's length. Thus while giving allowance for unconscious factors in the development of Takakura's thought, the present discussion will consider "concepts, grammatical rules, and linguistic practices" to have just as much of a causal, formative place in Takakura's thought and overall religious experience as elements which he might not have intellectually identified and labelled.

Speaking positively, what considering Takakura as a particular human being does

---

3This is not to rule out up front the possibility that for Takakura an underlying mysticism was present. The intention simply is to keep the question open at the outset of the ensuing discussion concerning how his thought developed.

4Cf., e.g., the working assumption stated in the Introduction of John P. Keenan, *The Meaning of Christ: A Mahayana Theology*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1989, p.1: "The Christ meaning is born from and moves within a mystic realm of meaning in which meaning is constituted not by thinking and judging, but by the immediacy of contact, of being touched. Indeed, this base experience is the source from which all theologizing springs."

5That is, the thesis has sought to avoid "unconsciously reckoning its own categories of thought to be the normative standard of judgement," particularly those unseen categories comprising the "ghost" of Western Christendom. Cf. Introduction, pp.2,4.

entail is giving full significance to all avenues of input into his developing thought. In Takakura’s case, this holds special importance for his thinking prior to his conversion to Christianity. Heretofore, most analyses have focused on Takakura’s theology, and they have thus paid little attention to the place of his thought before he embraced the Christian faith. To be sure, Takakura’s focus on the problem of the self—with which he wrestled before conversion—has received extensive treatment. Even so, this subject has been seen primarily in terms of its implications for Takakura’s theology. While not at all meaning to be critical of or in essential disagreement with these several examinations of Takakura’s thought and theology, the present examination simply seeks to be broader and more comprehensive in scope.

Since over forty percent of Takakura’s almost forty-nine year lifespan saw his thought developing outside the pale of the Christian community, Takakura’s pre-conversion years merit their own consideration in the ensuing treatment of the development of his thought. The almost-fifteen years from the time of conversion until his leaving for overseas study can then serve as a convenient second period for examination. The third and final time frame used here will be the almost-thirteen years from Takakura’s departure for Europe until his death in 1934 (Showa 9).

1. Birth Until Conversion

---

7This situation is fully understandable in light of the fact that the analyses have been conducted by theologically-trained Christian writers. Moreover, other than a relatively small proportion of his correspondence, all of Takakura’s extant writings were written after his conversion.


9On the contrary, this thesis obviously is deeply indebted to the high quality of both scholarly and more personal analyses that have served as helpful guides along an often winding, and otherwise dimly-lit, path.

10There are a few examinations which touch on selected aspects of Takakura’s thought—besides the problem of the self—prior to his becoming a Christian. These analyses will be dealt with at the appropriate places in the ensuing discussion.

11Takakura was baptised into the Christian Church at age twenty-one, in 1906 (Meiji 39). Cf. Part I, p.88.
A quick review of the first two decades of Takakura’s life will show that he was born and raised in the small town of Ayabe, studied as a junior high school student in Tokyo, and then spent his three high school years in Kanazawa. Tracing only the highlights of these eventful and critical years requires careful selection of influences which helped lay the foundation for Takakura’s lifetime of thought. Even so, just a moment’s reflection will show that the first—and arguably the single most crucial—set of inputs into Takakura’s early and continuing thought came via that which cultivated him during childhood, his family heritage: “To know the persons and ideas that dominated a man’s childhood is to know, to some extent at least, the man himself.”

Because Takakura’s mature thought turned out to be explicitly religious, it is thus incumbent upon us to investigate his religious heritage in particular. The

---


13 Barmann, 1972, p.1. Also, "Freud has taught us that the essential foundations of character are laid down by the age of three and that later events can modify but not alter the traits then established." E. Jones, The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud. Vol.1. New York: Basic Books, 1953, p.13, as quoted by Paul C. Vitz, Sigmund Freud’s Christian Unconscious. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1988, p.12. While not wanting to bind itself to following Sigmund Freud, the thesis does acknowledge both the importance of a person’s early years for thought formation, as well as Freud’s place in helping to instill that notion in contemporary understanding.

The importance of inherited thinking and of early education has come up already in a number of places throughout the thesis. Cf., e.g., Part I, pp.72-74, where Mori Ogai and Natsume Soseki are compared; and, Part II, ch.1, pp.167-168, where it is suggested that Ebina’s and Uemura’s differing theological postures be viewed in light of their differing educational backgrounds.

14 This was noted by the summary examination and reflection upon FK. Cf. Part III, p.342.

15 As promised earlier, the widespread discussion concerning the meaning of "religion" or "religious" will not be extended here. For our present purposes, however, a comprehensive approach suggested by scholars from within Takakura’s own Japanese, Mahayana Buddhist context suggests itself as appropriate for lending guidance. Cf. Part I, pp.76-79.

To borrow Yagi Seiichi’s term, the present investigation will thus seek to proceed "philosophicotheologically." Yagi Seiichi, "Christ and Buddha," in R.S. Sugirtharajah, ed., Asian Faces of Jesus. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1993,
importance of Takakura’s (or anyone’s for that matter) religious past for his life and thought cannot be underestimated. This is especially the case here in light of Takakura’s change of religious affiliation as a young adult, and his subsequent status as leading spokesman for his new faith, Christianity.

The well-known Japanese Christian theologian and writer Koyama Kosuke, "a man of several cultures," is one who has looked to his own Japanese heritage for "keys for his own self-understanding and for understanding and proclaiming Christian faith." Noting here as well the corresponding struggles of modern African Christian thinkers to integrate their "ontological past," i.e., their living religious heritage, with their newly-found Christian identity helps to illuminate the Christian, "theological importance of the religious past." Along with Koyama, both Takakura and his African counterparts had the challenge of deciphering the Christian faith as it came via the West, thus complicating the task of giving "account of...the religious consciousness of the African [and Japanese] Christian." In Takakura’s case, the "ontological past" particularly bequeathed to him as a boy was the fervent faith of his grandparents, Jodo Shinshu ("True Pure Land" Buddhism), and specifically the Hongwanji version of it. Jodo Shinshu (sometimes called just "Shin") began with Shinran in the thirteenth century as a new stream within Mahayana Buddhism, and it focuses its teachings and practices on faith in Amida-Buddha. The amalgamating character of Japanese religious life and

---


18 Cf. Part I, pp.19,85. Note especially Takakura’s close and continuing relationship with his grandmother in this regard.

19 Simple definitions of religious movements are always inadequate, but helpful preliminary descriptions of Jodo Shinshu include those by Yagi, 1993, p.45(ns.6,13); Reid, 1991, p.17; Earhart, 1974, pp.62-63; and, Ueda Yoshifumi and Dennis Hirota,
practice would imply that Jodo Shinshu was not the exclusive religious influence which Takakura inherited; and, his experience as a youth in fact shows a certain measure of "religious pluralism." Nevertheless, Jodo Shinshu undoubtedly was the dominant faith of Takakura's home when he was a young child, and hence it must have been the fundamental matrix within which his young thought took shape.

The most appropriate way of considering what this might have meant for the development of Takakura's thought is to examine--necessarily only briefly--some of Jodo Shinshu's main tenets and characteristics. Before doing that, however, since no previous analysis of Takakura has included this possible aspect of his thought, we must further convince ourselves of the fact that Shin Buddhism was of particular importance to Takakura. One easy way of seeing that this was indeed the case is to note the constant interaction throughout his life with Buddhism, and especially with Jodo Shinshu.

As noted in Part III's summary of FK, Takakura in that work makes periodic criticisms of traditional Japanese religion, most often singling out Buddhism. Other writings, sermons, lectures, and correspondence of the same general period include smatterings of similar comments; notably, several additional remarks focus


20This has been noted in reference to Uemura, for example. Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.172-173.

21Cf. Part I, pp.85-86.


23This refers to the last of the three time periods being used in this consideration of Takakura's thought development, i.e., following his departure for Europe in 1921 (Taisho 10).

24E.g., for writings, cf. "Omoidazuru Mama" Fukuin Shinpo No.1369, 22 September 1921, pp.4-5 (Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.32-35); "Junreisha," in Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.135 (Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.47); "Katorishizumu ni kansuru Kyomi" Fukuin Shinpo No.1463, 12 July 1923 (Taisho 12), p.6 (Chosakushu, Vol.1, 246); "Oncho ni Kataruru made" ("Until Overcome by Grace"), in Oncho to Shinjitsu,
on Jōdo Shinshū in particular. Takakura made a similar range of statements


throughout his earlier years, i.e., before travelling to Britain. While most of these comments are negative—and for the most part quite brief remarks made almost in passing—their regular appearance shows the consistent attention Takakura gave the subject, both for addressing his audiences and (more importantly for our purposes) to clarify his own thinking.


For sermons, cf. "Oto no Kami" ("God of Response"), in *Oncho no Okoku*, p.26 (Zenshu, Vol.1, p.72); "Kenhi to Kakushin" ("Humility and Conviction"), in *Oncho no Okoku*, p.291 (Zenshu, Vol.1, p.91); "Kito no Hito Iesu" ("Jesus the Person of Prayer"), in *Oncho no Okoku*, p.64 (Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.24); "Kutsu no Higi" ("The Mystery of Suffering"), in *Oncho no Okoku*, p.257 (Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.31); "Seisho o Yomu Ajiwau Koto" ("Appreciating Reading the Bible"), in *Oncho no Okoku*, p.326 (1917; Taisho 6); "Reikai no Ingaritsu" ("The Spirit World’s Law of Causality") *Bunmei Hyoron* 7, No.4, May, 1920 (Taisho 9), p.25 (Zenshu, Vol.1, p.253); "Kami o Tsugu Mono" ("The Person who Inherits God"), in *Oncho no Okoku*, p.6 (Zenshu, Vol.1, p.269); "Fukaku Seimei" ("Deep Life"), in *Oncho no Okoku*, p.115 (Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.85).

27Although the following kind of statement will be examined more fully later, perhaps it is appropriate to go ahead and note the comments made towards the conclusion of Takakura’s only extant English essay, written during his time in Edinburgh (and reproduced as written here):

The object of worship must be not only a postulate, but an axiom. I think, Amida-Butsu who is the personal God believed by some faithful Japanese Buddhists is the most gracious beautiful idea of worship except the god of Jesus Christ. But Amida-Butsu [Amida-Buddha] is only the projection of human subjective religious need and consequently has no real historical basis.

Zenshu, Vol.5, p.24; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.370. The timing of these remarks puts them at the transition point from the second to third periods (as they are being employed here) of Takakura’s thought development. Moreover, one can see here
Besides frequently mentioning Buddhism and Jodo Shinshu in particular, Takakura often read writings by Buddhist authors. Moreover, there were some occasional, special opportunities for interaction with famous Buddhist scholars. The opportunity to study Buddhism under Anesaki Masaharu at the Tokyo Imperial University can be recalled. Takakura also had some "unforgettable" conversations with Sasaki Gessho on ship en route to Britain. Sasaki, who was ten years older than Takakura, was a well-known lecturer on the history of Buddhist doctrine and of Pure Land Buddhism. The time spent with Sasaki was stimulating enough to prompt Takakura to want to write a critical essay on Jodo Shinshu. All of this evidence suggests, then, that throughout his lifetime Takakura experienced a regular give-and-take with Buddhist, and especially Jodo Shinshu, thought and life.

Although this extensive interaction with Buddhism by itself does not prove that

some of FK's later (five to six years) emphases on certainty and historicity being employed in criticizing Jodo Shinshu.


30Oshio, p.93.

31Sasaki was travelling to Europe in 1921 (Taisho 10) to see the religious situation there. After returning to Japan in 1924 (Taisho 13), he became the president ("gakucho") of the East Hongwanji educational institution. Nihon Dai Hyakka Zensho, Vol.10, 1986, p.119.

32Takakura mentions this intention—which apparently went unfulfilled--in his "Kami no Kuni ni kansuru Kosatsu sono Ta" Fukuin Shino No.1391, 23 February 1922 (Taisho 11), p.3; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.208.

33One early indication of what might be called Takakura's internal "interreligious dialogue" is some comments he makes in a letter while in his first pastorate in Kyoto. After visiting the Pure Land Buddhist temple near his Yoshida Church, Takakura remarks how he had felt attracted while inside the temple and while looking at the image of Buddha, and that "without thinking I mumbled the Nenbutsu." 17 June 1913 (Taisho 2) letter, Zenshu, Vol.10, "Shokan," p.28. (Oshio quotes this letter as well, but with no comment except that it "shows a part of [Takakura's] daily life while in Kyoto." Oshio, pp.68-69.)
Takakura necessarily had an unusually strong, conscious interest in Buddhist thought, it does help substantiate what could properly be assumed anyway: the basic importance for his thought of his family's religious heritage. In that his heritage was Jodo Shinshu, what might that have entailed for Takakura's thinking?

Insofar as Takakura's background was Buddhist, one would want to look in his thought for some evidence of what Professor Anesaki has termed "the central idea in Buddhist teaching," namely "the gospel of universal salvation based on the idea of the fundamental oneness of all being." There is "one continuity throughout" all of the world's "manifold existences and innumerable beings," and "attainment of Buddhahood on the part of each and all" will thus lead to "the full realization of the universal communion." Moreover, given Jodo Shinshu's twin character of being Mahayana and centred on Amida-Buddha, one would expect Takakura's religious heritage to have included notions of pietistic faith in Amida for salvation—or trust in "Other power" versus "self power." As "perhaps the central term in Shinran's [the founder of Jodo Shinshu] thought," this "faith" or "entrusting" must have been

34Anesaki, 1930 (Showa 5), p.66. Compare the following claim regarding Confucianism, which along with Buddhism has had a long, deep impact on much of Japanese thought: "At the heart of all...Confucian speculation is the doctrine...that the universe is a harmonious whole in which man and nature constantly interact on each other in all aspects of life." Tsunoda, de Bary, and Keene, comps., 1958, p.56.

35Anesaki, 1930 (Showa 5), pp.169,171.


37Emphasis original. Ueda and Hirota, 1989, pp.146-148. Other English translations include "awakening" and "central religious...experience in the Pure Land path...." Shinran's term is "shinjin," and what its English (or any other non-Japanese) equivalent should be has been the subject of a tremendous amount of research and study. Minor and Ann Rogers, Rennyo: The Second Founder of Shin Buddhism. Berkeley, California: Asian Humanities Press, 1991, pp.37-40; Takeda Ryusei, "Shinran's View of Faith: A Translation of 'Shinjin' and 'Faith'," in Shinran Jodokyo to Nishida Tetsugaku (Shinran's Pure Land Buddhism and Nishida's Philosophy). Kyoto: Nagata Bunshodo, 1991, Appendix II (in English), pp.43-76. I am grateful to Dennis Hirota for directing me to each of these two books.
an essential feature of the faith passed down to Takakura as well.

In terms of a mode or manner of thought, the posture of the religious mindset to which Takakura was exposed would have been an introverted focus on direct, immediate experience.\(^{38}\) Furthermore, instead of analytical dissection and organisation of conceptual truth or dogma, the approach modeled for Takakura would have been more intuitive, a mindset that transcends typical Aristotelian, Western logical thought patterns.\(^{39}\) The resulting introspective, intuitive mode of thought—in combination with "the fundamental nondualistic structure of reality in Mahayana thought"\(^{40}\)—is a subjectivity that is "immediate and direct consciousness [which] is no longer seen as mere subjective consciousness, but as essentially self-transcendent and self-extricated consciousness...."\(^{41}\) This mindset of "subjectivity-only," within which one "grasp[s] reality without objectifying it in any way,"\(^{42}\) thus enables a goal of simultaneously "transforming" the self and the world "at its [their, for a 'logical' mindset] roots."\(^{43}\)

Obviously, as a young boy Takakura would not have been able to comprehend or articulate the religion of his family heritage, especially its mode of thinking as just described. And there is no way of knowing to what extent his grandparents (and mother) modeled and taught their "only 'true' Takakura son"\(^{44}\) the content and


\(^{40}\)Ueda and Hirota, 1989, p.71. Note the coalescence here with the above-mentioned "central idea in Buddhist teaching...of the fundamental oneness of all being," as phrased by Anesaki.

\(^{41}\)Abe, 1988, p.357, including n.12.

\(^{42}\)op.cit., pp.68-75 (the latter quotation is from p.73).

\(^{43}\)Ibid., p.56.

\(^{44}\)Cf. Part I, p.19(n.22).
method of thought of Jodo Shinshu as it has been summarised. Nevertheless, as we proceed in our examination of both the development and other aspects of Takakura’s thought, we must keep in mind these general characteristics of Jodo Shinshu religious thinking that undoubtedly are a factor in the subject of this thesis’ entire consideration.45

Along with his religious past, other formative elements in Takakura’s developing thought would have included his small town upbringing and his family’s merchant tradition. The former would have provided a dual sense of isolation and stability, thus possibly heightening the feeling of crisis he experienced upon moving to Tokyo and elsewhere, as well as deepening his longing for the security of slower paced rural life.46 As for the Takakura merchant legacy, at least one role this might have played in affecting Takakura’s later thought as a Christian leader would have been to reduce his "sense of socio-political responsibility," particularly in comparison to Uemura and other Meiji samurai statesmen, relative to the Church’s role in the life of Japan as a nation.47

Along with the two factors just mentioned, the importance of Takakura’s formal education has been described earlier in the thesis.48 But besides what his education meant for familiarity with things German and loyalty toward the imperial state, Takakura’s studies in various scientific disciplines surely helped to shape his

45Just as one analyst sees Freud’s Roman Catholic nanny to have had a lasting impact in terms of causing him to have a lifelong, inner battle with Christianity, so this thesis can thus look for a similar impact of the religious heritage Takakura encountered as a young child. Vitz, 1988, pp.2ff.,212ff.

46Takakura’s lasting attachment to his hometown, along with some of the attending implications, have already been touched upon. Cf. Part III, p.348(ns.343,344).

47Cf. Part III, p.360(n.407). This raises the possibility as well of a dovetailing effect with understanding Takakura’s thought as having characteristically Japanese religious traits, e.g., introverted. Cf. Part III, pp.350-351(n.362).

developing thought as a youth.\textsuperscript{49} One would expect that the materialist and evolutionist thought prominent in the halls of higher education in the late 1880's (around Meiji 20)\textsuperscript{50} would have found their way into the classrooms of children like Takakura one decade later.\textsuperscript{51} Such ways of viewing the world clashed with what Takakura inherited as a young boy. Moreover, the "scientific spirit" of the disciplines Takakura studied likely conflicted with his own inherited way of thinking of life's issues and problems, a conflict someone like Mori Ogai had experienced.\textsuperscript{52}

As an aid to such a conflict, Takakura had at least one example of a Mahayana-type of Japanese thinker wrestling with the interrelationships of vastly contrasting thinking styles, namely his high school teacher, Nishida Kitaro.\textsuperscript{53} As one commentator puts it, "Nishida never lost sight of his central problem, namely, the confrontation of Oriental Buddhistic ideas with Western philosophy."\textsuperscript{54} Another analyst describes Nishida's genius by noting, "The novelty that resulted in his thinking may be considered in terms of an Eastern way of seeing renewed by Western thought or of a Western way of thinking renewed by an Eastern way of seeing...."\textsuperscript{55} Such a model potentially served Takakura well not only during his high school days, but throughout his lifelong dealings with Western thought.

Nishida, while disavowing his own family's Shin Buddhism, nevertheless held in high esteem both Shinran and Jodo Shinshu's widely read and deeply loved classic,

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{49}E.g., he studied geography, science, history, geography, natural history, physics, chemistry, economics, psychology. Cf. Part I, p.33.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{50}Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.145-147.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{51}For the dates of Takakura's education, cf. Part I, pp.28-29.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{52}Cf. Part I, pp.68-71.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{53}Cf. Part I, pp.36-37. Regarding the religious, Zen-Mahayana character of Nishida's thought, cf. Part I, p.77(ns.295,296).}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{54}Noda Matao, "East-West Synthesis in Nishida Kitaro" \textit{Philosophy East and West} 4, 1954/1955, p.345.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{55}Nishitani, 1991, pp.40-41; cf. Part I, p.66.}
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Moreover, it was by having his own life and thought rooted in the long and deep tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism that Nishida was able to give the anguished young hearts of Takakura’s generation a "feeling of being unmovably rooted in Japan’s spiritual foundation." This in turn "produced feelings of intimacy and stability" among many relative to Nishida’s thought. One scholar who encountered Nishida has described his own and others’ view of Nishida as a "living fountain of life." It would be surprising indeed if the uprooted young Takakura, while carrying his family’s Mahayana religious heritage and labouring amidst demanding academic studies, would have been much different from his peers in his response to Nishida. Given the apparently close interaction which Takakura had with Nishida, that surprise would be even greater.

What the encounter with Nishida might have meant for the continuing development of Takakura’s thought can be gathered from a glance at Nishida’s 1911 (Meiji 44)


The English equivalent to the title "Tannisho" is "Collection Inspired by Concern over Heresy." It is believed that one of Shinran’s disciples compiled his master’s sayings into the form of the Tannisho, with the view of forming a definitive statement to combat heresies and schisms amongst Shinran’s followers. Tsunoda, de Bary, and Keene, comps., 1958, p.216.


58The equivalent Japanese expression is "ikita seimei no izumi." Kosaka, in Ibid., p.78. Kosaka also refers to Kurata Hyakuzo’s weeping amidst a type of stunned joy upon discovering Nishida’s 1911 (Meiji 44) Zen no Kenkyu. pp.71-72.

59Oshio argues, from both Nishida’s and Takakura’s diary entries made during the time Takakura was a resident in the private dormitory where Nishida was involved, that the two did in fact have significant interaction with each other. Oshio, No.1, 1954, pp.60-63.

60Apparently the only published analyses concerning Nishida’s possible influence on Takakura’s thought are two relatively brief ones. Oshio remarks that Nishida’s influence on Takakura as a theologian was nil, but that his impression on Takakura the youth was great. Oshio continues by saying that the influence of Zen no Kenkyu was unconscious but great on Takakura and his fellow students. Ibid., pp.62-63.

The second consideration is in a short article by Unuma Hiroko, in which she
Zen no Kenkyu; the essence of this work was being developed during the years which included Takakura’s personal interaction with Nishida.61 By all accounts the central concept of the book is "pure experience,"62 an idea which in fact contains within itself all of Nishida’s later thought.63 In Zen no Kenkyu, Nishida proceeds from the idea that

the scientific world-view as given by modern physics does not reveal reality itself... He believes the painter is nearer the truth than the physicist.... Nishida contends that the immediate experience is prior to the distinction of subject and object. The ‘pure experience’, as he puts it, is the basis from which the subject-object correlation can emerge.64

Hence instead of suggesting a rank subjectivism, Nishida "wanted to connect his own theory of pure experience to transcendent philosophy or metaphysics by grasping experience as active."65 As Nishida himself says in the book’s preface about his idea of "pure experience": "It is not that experience exists because there is an individual, but that an individual exists because there is experience. I thus arrived at the idea that experience is more fundamental than individual differences, and in this way I was able to avoid solipsism."66 The unification by Nishida of

devotes a paragraph to the respective relationships between Nishida and three Christian thinkers whom he had met. After noting Oshio’s opinion of the importance for Takakura of meeting Nishida, Unuma gives two quotations of Takakura’s earlier writings, what she terms works of "the Takakura before he reached the depth of grace-religion." Unuma suggests that one can see Nishida’s influence in Takakura’s "expressions having an immanentist tendency." Unuma, 1980, p.49.

61As mentioned before, this interaction took place during 1905-1906 (Meiji 37-38). Cf. Part I, pp.36-37. That Zen no Kenkyu was indeed taking shape at that time is explicitly stated in, e.g., Shimomura, 1988, p.197.

62"junsui keiken"


"experience," "activity," and "metaphysics" reveals that a "subjectivity-only" mindset, described briefly above, is operative.\textsuperscript{67}

One particularly interesting section of the book is the one entitled, "God as Reality." There Nishida writes of "a spiritual unity at its [nature’s] base," which "must be one with nature" since "in the universe only one reality exists." He continues, "That which submerges the distinctions between subjectivity and objectivity,\textsuperscript{68} and unites both spirit and nature is God." This same "spiritual basic principle...is identical with the Atman and Brahman which are the fundamental principles of the Hindu religion. God is the great spirit of the universe."\textsuperscript{69} In discussing in this manner God as "the basis" of "the ultimate unity of the self and the universe," Nishida understands his thought as neither theism nor pantheism, but instead as a type of "panentheism."\textsuperscript{70}

Nishitani Keiji, one of Nishida’s followers and leading philosophers in what became known, starting with Nishida, as the Kyoto School of Philosophy, summarises \textit{Zen no Kenkyu} about as succinctly as possible:

\begin{quote}
Nishitani Keiji, one of Nishida’s followers and leading philosophers in what became known, starting with Nishida, as the Kyoto School of Philosophy, summarises \textit{Zen no Kenkyu} about as succinctly as possible:
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{67}Cf. above, Part IV, p.378.

\textsuperscript{68}This language sounds much like that of Polanyi: "The personal...is neither subjective nor objective.... It transcends the disjunction between subjective and objective." Emphasis original. Polanyi, 1962, p.300. Within the ensuing analysis, however, at least two differences between Nishida’s/Takakura’s and Polanyi’s thinking will emerge. Cf. Part I, p.79(n.304).

\textsuperscript{69}Nishida, 1988, pp.85-86.

\textsuperscript{70}Abe, 1990, p.xx. Immediately preceding these comments (p.xix) are some other helpful words by Professor Abe clarifying the meaning of the "good" for Nishida (i.e., why the book is titled \textit{A Study of Good}):

The problem of morality, for Nishida, is always grasped in connection with the problems of truth or ultimate reality.... Accordingly...personality is grasped as the infinite power of unity in terms of pure experience and is realized by ‘forgetting’ the subjective self.... With this angle on personality, Nishida maintains that the purpose of the good is...to fulfil one’s deepest nature, to realize one’s personality.... To realize the fundamental identity of the self and the universe is to realize this infinite reality as infinite truth, good, and beauty.... [Emphasis original.]
The conscious unity that resists all definition and yet on whose basis all things come about is the unity of pure experience that embraces the universe and the unity of cosmic consciousness where our true freedom lies. At the bottom of this unity of consciousness we come into direct contact with the divine visage, which has deep ties with our own spirit. True freedom as a living unity of pure experience merges nonobjectively—in a single unifying activity—with the absolute freedom in the person of God.  

How Takakura handled such a message remains to be seen within the ensuing analysis.

Before the discussion leaves Nishida behind in Kanazawa and moves to Tokyo with Takakura—and correspondingly converts to Christianity—it should be pointed out that Takakura did in fact read at least some of Nishida’s later writings. Important to note is that Takakura’s continued reading of Nishida included the time when Nishida produced his second major work, Jikaku niokeru Chokkan to Hansei (Intuition and Reflection in Self-Consciousness). By one analyst’s account,

In Nishida’s second systematic work, Intuition and Reflection in the Consciousness of the Self (1917), the ‘pure experience’ of A Study of Good has been expanded and deepened into ‘self-awareness’ (consciousness of the self). Nishida’s self-awareness is the consciousness wherein that which knows and that which is known are together identical as the self. . . . He considered ‘the consciousness of the self’ (jikaku) as a more basic and ultimate thing than subject and object and their opposition, but he considered the basic substance of


72Cf. Part III, p.277. Nishida’s work which Oshio notes Takakura reading en route to Britain was "Shin Riso Shugi no Tetsugaku" ("The Philosophy of New Idealism"). This short piece was part of a summary of special lectures, published the following year, which Nishida gave at Kyoto University in 1916 (Taisho 5). Nishida Kitaro, Nishida Zenshu (The Complete Works of Nishida). Vol.14. Tokyo: Iwatani Shoten, 1966, pp.5-6,30-47,717.


384
that 'self' as absolute free will.... The center of the will, i.e., the self, is always the present. It is 'the eternal now'. In the will all experiential content is unified in an active state.74

Upon reflection, one can detect here some themes noted earlier in our summary of FK, e.g., "self-awareness" ("jikaku"),75 and "the eternal now."76 However, considering now what relationship these ideas of Nishida's might have with Takakura's later crystallised thought would be rushing ahead too quickly. For now, the idea of "the self"77 will lead us—as by his own testimony it did him78—to Takakura's conversion.

2. Conversion Until Overseas Study

Upon examining the development of Takakura's thought from the time of his adoption of the Christian faith, we will henceforth have the benefit of Takakura's own concurrent writings.79 Takakura has provided a convenient entry point into these writings—as well as his own version of this section of the thesis—in an autobiographical sketch of the fifteen-year period we have just entered. This essay

74 Shimomura, 1988, p.208.

75 Cf. Part III, p.305(n.132),308(n.149). Abe Masao notes, "In philosophical writings, particularly in Nishida's philosophy,...jikaku signifies a fundamental, ontological-awareness which is beyond the self-and-other-duality, and hence also beyond self-consciousness in the psychological sense." He thus prefers the English translation "self-awakening" to the normal "self-consciousness," for which there is a different corresponding Japanese term ("jishiki"). The importance of this point should emerge as the discussion ensues. Abe, 1988, p.356(n.7).

76 Cf. Takakura's pulling together of eschatological, temporal, and volitional ideas. Part III, p.338.

77 Besides "the self's" appearance in the quotation immediately above, Professor Abe's description of Nishida's thought as including the idea of the self in unity/identity with the universe should be recalled here as well. Cf. above, Part IV, p.383(n.70).


79 There are a few published letters which Takakura wrote to his family during his junior high and senior high school years, which despite their limited number do help in understanding the process leading to Takakura's conversion. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Kashin," pp.170-184.
is the preface to his first book, *Oncho no Okoku*, published just before Takakura set sail for his time in Europe.  

A primary, running theme throughout this reflection over his life to date as a Christian is the "self." The essay's first sentence is, "Ever since a long time ago my heart has clung to, and has not separated from, the problem of the 'self'." The last paragraph begins with, "Upon reflection, I have been disillusioned by the self, and up until now tormented by the self." The story is not total despair, however: Takakura also testifies to having found the solution to the self "in faith alone, in grace alone"; and, he states his belief that "the almighty power of God's grace" will continue to lead him despite his weakness and selfishness.

What Takakura means here by the "problem of the 'self" is of course a central question. As he describes how his search for the solution to the problem led him to baptism and theological studies, Takakura puts the matter in terms of looking for answers to questions: "What properly speaking is the 'self'? What can one do to

---

80 The essay is entitled "Shukufukuseraruru Made," referred to in Part I in reference to the thesis' initial considerations of Takakura's problem of the self and conversion. Cf. Part I, pp.25(n.68),91(n.355). Takakura notes that he wrote this preface to *Oncho no Okoku* "At the end of May, 1921, before travelling to Scotland for study." "Shukufukuseraruru Made," in *Oncho no Okoku*, p.17; *Chosakushu*, Vol.1, p.27.

81 "Watashi no kokoro ha zutto mae kara jiga to iu monai ni kobiritsu hana nenakatta." Emphasis original. In the following sentence, Takakura cites his infamous remark which he wrote in the Sansan Juku memorial album, "The thing one should love the most is oneself." "Shukufukuseraruru Made," in *Oncho no Okoku*, p.1; *Chosakushu*, Vol.1, p.18. Cf. Part I, p.26(n.70).


free, fulfil, and thoroughly realise it?" An initial period of "passionate faith" temporarily put the issue aside. But the destructive influence of a friend who was studying philosophy sent Takakura into scepticism and despair, such that

The self, which had been completely concealed in the shadows of zealous faith, gradually raised its head. I became dissatisfied with a faith that had been implanted by an authority from the outside. I came to doubt both the salvation of the Cross and Christ’s divinity. I even came to a point of not understanding whether or not there was a god. At that time I thought that only the self alone had any authority. I came to the desperate state of defying and refusing anything and everything that sought to shackle or deny the self.

It was in that state, Takakura reflects, that he defied his father in quitting legal studies. Moreover, in his theological studies he "led a monstrous life of mixing together God and the self." Finally, he awoke to the self’s true condition as something thoroughly egotistical, and coming to that awareness was the first step at least toward solving the problem itself: "Isn’t it at the point of becoming keenly aware that one is foul and selfish that the possibility of self-abolition is understood? I want more and more strongly and keenly to be aware that I am egotistical, for

85"Jiga to ha itta nan de aru ka, do sureba kore o kaihoshi, jujitsushi, tetteiseshimeru koto ga dekiru ka." op.cit., in Oncho no Okoku, p.1; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.18.

86This euphoric time was particularly nourished by an ardent devotion to Uemura’s preaching. Cf. Part I, pp.89-90, Part III, p.358.

87"Gaibu kara keni o motte chunyuserareta shinko...." From the preceding footnote, one could infer that Takakura is referring here to Uemura as the external authority; Uemura at least would be one possibility among others.

88"Shukufukuseraruru Made," in Oncho no Okoku, p.4; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.20.

89...kami to jiga to o tsukimazeta yo na nueteki seikatsu o yatte otta." Another possible English rendering would be, "led a mysterious life of pounding together God and the self." In the context, Takakura’s point seems to be one of emphasising the self’s audacity, without any self-realisation of the fact.

90The term for "aware" is "jikaku"; this is the word for the previous "aware" as well.
it is from here that the new heavens and new earth open up."91

Before continuing with Takakura through his recounting of his struggles with the self, we must pause to consider what he has said about both his coming to the Christian faith and his beginning to come to grips with his egotistical self. By his own description, how to define and fulfil the self motivated Takakura to adopt Christianity. His writings at the time of conversion tell of struggling intellectually regarding God's personality, coming to believe in God's accepting love, and being impressed with Uemura's preaching.92 A bout of scepticism seemed both to destroy all aspects—intellectual, emotional, and volitional—of his newfound authority, as well as to release his own self into a new stage of ugly egotism. But with the resurgence of his own autonomy came an awakening to the true nature of the self, which in retrospect Takakura could claim to have been an essential silver lining to help him escape from his cloud of despair and searching.

To return to Takakura's own account, he notes that while the new heavens and new earth may have started to open up, he "still was not solving the problem of the self." Until the latter stage of his time in Sapporo,93 Takakura was still seeking—albeit unknowingly—to discover and fulfil "the true self" through a mystical merging of Christ and the self. Relative to biblical language, Takakura "greatly sympathised with such verses as Paul's 'It is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me', but... at that time I did not seriously appeal to the meaning of the words of the first half of this verse, 'I have been crucified with Christ'."94 However, writing a

93Until about the end of 1916 (Taisho 5), Takakura notes.
94Galatians 2:20. "Shukufukuseraru Made," in Oncho to Okoku, p.8; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.22-23. Takakura notes that his essay "Kirisutokyo no yorite Kaizoseretaru Jiga oyobi sono Tokushoku" ("The Self as Reconstructed by Christianity and its Characteristics") was written at this time and with this object of self-fulfilment in mind. This essay has been reproduced in Oncho to Okoku, pp.339-
commentary on Romans effec\n
First, Paul's words in Romans 3:23-24, concerning all of humanity being sinners and being made righteous by God's grace in Christ's atonement, "deeply penetrated my heart." Takakura writes, "'Sin' is the soul's condition of being separated from God. Lurking at the bottom of the soul is the evil nature itself." Having come to "feel acutely" that there was "not one point of strength inside myself to save the self," Takakura's "experience of the atonement rose" to the extent that he preached a series of five sermons during Passion Week of 1918 (Taisho 7) on "the salvation of the Cross and blessing of the Christian."

However, "The self which I thought had already been solved once again made its influence felt, and the self I thought was dead started twitching, moving, and harassing me." But it was here that Takakura "collided" with the message of Romans at a second significant point, namely Paul's words in chapter seven about the flesh (egoism) and spirit (love). By discovering more deeply this fate common to all human beings alike, Takakura could testify that, "Compelled by the soul's logic

---


Takakura initially wrote this as a series for the Seisho no Kensan, from December, 1916 (Taisho 5) until February, 1921 (Taisho 10). He only wrote comments on the text up through 8:17 before leaving for Britain. These articles appeared in Seisho no Kensan, ranging from Nos.1-51, January, 1917 (Taisho 6) through February, 1921 (Taisho 10); they have been reproduced in Zenshu, Vol.3, pp.237-526.

After returning from Britain, Takakura gave seminary lectures through Romans twice. In the case of the overlapping sections, his notes for these lectures are basically the same as his earlier ones. The later notes have been reproduced in Chosakushu, Vol.5, pp.1-479, and Zenshu, Vol.7, pp.1-473. Cf. Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.5, pp.482-483.

96".... Tamashi no okutei ni wadakamatte oru akusho sono mono de aru."

97"tsukan"

98"butsukatta"
of necessity, I had to hang onto the grace of forgiveness of sin." Moreover, by mid-1920 (Taisho 9) Takakura could write of beginning to experience a life of "reality and necessity" through self-surrender and by faith in the indwelling Christ. Thus Takakura could affirm at the end of his 1921 (Taisho 10) preface, "I became convinced that other than through faith, there is no other way of solving the self." Takakura’s mention here of the importance of Paul’s writings brings up the central place of the Bible for the development of Takakura’s thought. In his preaching before leaving for Britain, for example, Takakura usually used a particular Bible text either as a starting point for commenting on other related biblical passages, or as a guiding outline for the entire message. As just seen in Takakura’s recollection of his struggle with the self, it was when Paul’s words "deeply penetrated [his] heart," and when he "collided" with Paul’s words, that Takakura sensed progress and growth.

It is important to note Takakura’s posture in approaching and expounding the Bible. To him the Old and New Testaments were not an "authority from the outside," such that the intellectual equivalent of an alleged propositionally-contained meaning was to be determined and, in the case of preaching/teaching, conveyed verbatim to

---

99“Watashi ha tamashi no hitsuzen no ronri ni shirarete, shazai no onkei ni sugarazu ni ha orarenakatta.”

100“hitsuzensei to shinjitsusei”

101“Hitsuzen no Michi” ("Road of Necessity"), in Oncho no Okoku, pp.146-162; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.7-17.


103The most thorough collection of Takakura’s extant sermons is in Zenshu, Vols.1,2. The pre-overseas sermons are in Vol.1, pp.3-316.

104His previous remarks on external authority should be recalled here. Cf. above, Part IV, p.387.
an audience.105 Instead, the Bible was something more dynamic and internal than that. As he has written in the Introduction to his commentary notes on Romans, Takakura understood that book to be "a grand drama of the soul."106 Moreover, "in the depths of Paul,"107 who after all was a man of his own era, "we discover Paul as a Christian having a permanency, as well as Paul as a single universal human."108 That is, Paul drew on his experience both as a Pharisee and as a Christian, and he wrote "not with a logic of the head, but a logic of the soul." He thus "exhibits an eternal humanity which completely transcends eras and environments...."109 Thus, as we are able to "touch" Paul and his "central thoughts," we can "always discover a new Paul" in Romans. This newness we find comes not from the book's "novel meaning"; rather, it lies "in the freshness contained in all the deep, eternal things"110 that we encounter there.111

---

105 This description of a view of biblical inerrancy, or of "verbal inspiration," cannot represent the variety of nuances within that "conservative" view. Gabriel Façkre, Ecumenical Faith in Evangelical Perspective. Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1993, pp.3-19.


106 "...idai naru tamashi no gikyoku [accompanied by the phoneticised 'dorama']...."

107 "pauro no oku ni"

108 "...warera ga...eikyusei o motta kirisutosha to shite, mata ikko no fuhenteki na hito to shite no pauro o hakken suru..." Similarly, Takakura notes that Paul in Romans four "understands Abraham...spiritually, universally. That is, the convert is Abraham's heir." Chosakushu, Vol.5, p.148.

109 "...jidai to kyougu to o mattaku choetsushite eikyu no ningensei [accompanied by the phoneticised 'etanaru hyumaniti'] o shimesu."

110 "...subete no fukaki mono eien naru mono ni fukumarete iru shinsensa [accompanied by the phoneticised 'furesshunesu'] ni aru...."
Most writers who have reviewed Takakura’s life have included in their accounts his encounter with this "freshness" of Romans.\textsuperscript{112} Also, like Takakura’s own writings, these examinations begin their considerations with Takakura’s conversion and his attendant problem of the self. It is thus helpful at this point further to bring into our purview these various analyses of Takakura’s life and thought.\textsuperscript{113} In order to facilitate our discussion’s interaction with these views, we can at least offer outlines at this point of what might be called the "positive" and "negative" characterisations of Takakura and his theology. In the end, these two evaluations differ in particular over the issue of how "successfully," in his life and theology, Takakura dealt with the problem of the self.\textsuperscript{114}

The positive and more widely recognised position is represented by Sato Toshio, who by far has written more on Takakura than anyone else.\textsuperscript{115} Professor Sato’s view is that Takakura shared with many other young contemporaries the struggle of the self.\textsuperscript{116} Also, from the time of his conversion until shortly after his return from overseas, Takakura’s theology went through a "formative period."\textsuperscript{117} Over the course of these two decades, Takakura dealt with--somewhat in succession--the

\textsuperscript{111}\textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.5, pp.9-11,45. As a reminder of the context of Takakura’s writing these comments on Romans, cf. above, Part IV, p.389(n.95).


\textsuperscript{113}These are analyses of his life and theology, as noted earlier.


As one would expect, numerous other factors enter into the varying evaluations as well, e.g., interpersonal matters, some of which are beyond the scope of this thesis. Cf. Sato, 1983, pp.188-205.

\textsuperscript{115}Cf. Introduction, p.12.

\textsuperscript{116}One will note that the thesis has used, in general agreement and alongside other similar examinations, Sato’s analyses in examining Takakura’s dealings with the problem of the self. Cf. Part III, pp.347-348(ns.335,337,341).

\textsuperscript{117}"keiseiki"
problems of the self, of Christianity and culture, and of the Church. Takakura then came to a point of "establishing" or "settling" on his "Evangelical Christianity," which represents for his own time at least a viable "biblical, Reformation faith, and if put in a slightly more narrow and limited way, a prophetic, Calvinistic faith." Especially since the Takakura Tokutaro Chosakushu (Collected Works of Takakura Tokutaro) were published in 1964 with Professor Sato's accompanying explanatory comments, this view of Takakura's theological development and settled position has become a standard point of reference for subsequent discussions.

A much more negative, critical position concerning Takakura's theology has been taken by Kumano Yoshitaka in his essay, "Unsettled Ecclesiology in Takakura Tokutaro." While acknowledging that Takakura's problem of the self was not unrelated to that same widespread issue of his day, Kumano sees Takakura as having had his own particular, unique struggle throughout his whole life. There is thus a

---


119"kakuritsu"

120Sato's meaning here refers particularly to the stage of development of Protestant theology in Japan, specifically ecclesiology. Sato argues that the main criticism of Takakura's theology (outlined below) focuses on ecclesiology, and that it is made from a later, more developed vantage point. Hence Sato, borrowing a phrase from Kuwada Hidenobu's similar defense of Uemura's understanding of the Church, terms the position critical of Takakura "not a 'kind' criticism." Sato, 1983, p.174.


122The prominent place of this view has only been enhanced by the 1992 publication in Japanese of the previously-mentioned Nihon Shingaku Shi (History of Theology in Japan). Professor Sato composed the chapter covering 1907-1945 (Meiji 40-Showa 20), which includes a section on Takakura and "Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo." Cf. Furuya, ed., 1992, pp.63-123 (especially pp.70-73); Introduction, p.12.

123"Takakura Tokutaro ni okeru Miteikei Kyokairon," ch.7 in Kumano, 1968, pp.375-426. The translation "unsettled" comes from Matsuoka, 1978, p.65; other possibilities would include "undecided" or "pending."
consistency and uniformity throughout Takakura’s theology. That is, the problem of the self was not so much a motive for developing a theory of atonement which subsequently addresses the problem, but the struggle with the self remained the "driving force" for Takakura’s whole theological thought. Thus in opposing sentimentalism, culturalism, humanism, or egoism (which in Takakura’s own words is the main obstacle to ecclesiology/church life), Takakura was consistently speaking to himself. This critical understanding of Takakura and of his theology is by no means a solitary view: some cite Kumano to support their own similar interpretations, and others have arrived at a similar position more independently.

Keeping in mind these two contrasting lines of interpretation of Takakura’s theological development should help as we continue through the present analysis. Other studies, of course, will be able to offer their own unique contributions to our discussion as well. At this juncture, while we cannot attempt to offer a

124 "hakuryoku"


E.g., Kato, 1972, pp.318,320(n.11),371,373(n.1),378,385(n.8); Matsuoka, 1978, p.65(n.1).

Ishihara, 1964, pp.15-17; cf. Part I, p.90(n.354). Ishihara, however, seems more willing than Kumano to acknowledge the change in Takakura’s theology into its final, more crystallised form. Also, he is aware of the limitations of his own essay, due to having simply followed Takakura’s own descriptions and understanding of the self.

E.g., in addition to Charles Germany’s influential essay, there is a study upon which Germany himself drew for his suggestion of "a central problem in his [Takakura’s] thought...the relationship of the doctrines of justification and sanctification." Germany, pp.118-120(n.106). This was Yamamoto Kano’s "Takakura Shingaku ni okeru Seikaron" ("Sanctification in Takakura Theology") Fukuin to Jidai 3, Nos.1,2,4, January, February, and April, 1948, pp.27-31,32-37,25-30, respectively. One would expect Yamamoto’s examination especially to come into play in the section on theological topics.

A more recent study on Takakura and five other "modern" Japanese Christian thinkers could pay more immediate dividends. Cited earlier in the thesis, it is based on an "ethical" (as opposed to explicitly "theological") "fulcrum," and thus should throw some fresh light on our considerations. Unuma, 1988, pp.25,187-216.
satisfactory solution to the dispute just outlined, it seems appropriate to press the question concerning the possible connection between Takakura’s pre- and post-conversion thought: how might we describe the various continuities (and discontinuities) we see in Takakura’s thinking between the way it developed during the first twenty-one years of his life, and how it continued to develop over the course of the next fifteen years? Asked in a more explicitly theological way, what sorts of changes, adjustments, and/or affirmations did Jesus Christ bring to Takakura’s mind upon his conversion into, and growth within, the Christian faith?

In taking up this question relative to the intense and widespread "problem of the self," any answer must recognise Takakura’s and others’ analyses. But in addition to attributing Takakura’s struggle to his personality and/or the far-reaching socio-political changes which had accelerated with the Meiji Restoration, might not the inclusion of Takakura’s own "ontological" religious heritage throw some helpful explanatory light on his thinking? Moreover, Nishida Kitaro was a powerful example—personally encountered by Takakura immediately prior to his conversion to Christianity and subsequent study of (Western) theology—of a Mahayana thinker who was digesting and reshaping Western philosophico-scientific thought. Was it not likely the case that Nishida reinforced a similar, deeply ingrained mindset in Takakura?

With specific regard to the "self," one can take, for example, Takakura’s own description of his coming to grips with Paul’s words in Galatians 2:20. Viewing Takakura’s account in light of Yagi Seiichi’s comments on the same verse is instructive. In the wake of several years of illuminating discussions on the encounter

---

129 As for the study noted earlier which examines Sato’s and Kumano’s respective interpretations, it sees strengths and weaknesses in both analyses, and then seeks constructively to offer a further point of research. Higashide, 1990, p.66; cf. above, Part IV, p.392(n.114).

130 Cf. above, Part IV, p.388.
of Christian and Buddhist themes, Professor Yagi differentiates between "Christ [as] 'the true Self' of Paul" and "the ego of Paul." In the former sense, "Christ in me" and "I" are identical. Nevertheless, the ego of Paul was clearly distinguished from Christ. That is, "the ego and Self are...one while at the same time remaining two." One can add, along with Yagi, the distinction between confrontation and interiority models of religious experience, both of which

---

131 These discussions and their evaluations by others, along with Professor Yagi's own published testimonials concerning the correlative development of his thinking, are pertinent to the direction of our present discussion. The "Yagi-Takizawa [Katsumi] Debate" started in the 1960's apparently as a discussion in philosophical theology between respective students of Bultmann and Barth. Hence the debate has often been evaluated largely within these terms, e.g., in Tagawa Kenzo, "The Yagi-Takizawa Debate" *The Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* No.2, March, 1969, pp.41-59; and, John Barksdale, "Yagi and Takizawa: Bultmann vs. Barth in Japan" *Japan Missionary Bulletin* 24, Nos.1-4, January/February, March, April, May, 1970. (The thesis writer was unable to secure a copy of Barksdale's series. Like Tagawa's essay, it is listed as a reference in James M. Phillips, *From the Rising of the Sun: Christians and Society in Contemporary Japan*. American Society of Missiology, No.3. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1981, p.272(n.46).

However, as James Phillips puts it, "Both Yagi and Takizawa substantially modified their positions as a result of their debate... Buddhist thought had been a catalyst in the evolution of their own positions." Phillips, 1981, p.248.

According to Yagi's recent description of the running discussions he had with Takizawa, not only was Buddhist thought a catalyst, but it was an active ingredient throughout. Yagi Seiichi, "Buddhist-Christian Dialogue in Japan: Varieties of Immediate Experience" *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 14, 1994, pp.11-22.

Moreover, in the midst of his discussions with Takizawa, Yagi spoke of the help and challenge encountering Buddhist thought had been in his progression from being raised in an "orthodox" Christian (Mukyokai) home, to studying Bultmann, to thinking with the aid of Buddhist outlooks. Yagi Seiichi, "Bukkyo to Kirisutokyo no Setten" ("Points of Contact between Buddhism and Christianity"), ch.2 in Takizawa Katsumi and Yagi Seiichi, eds. and comps., with Akizuki Ryomin and Nakamura Etsuya, joint-authors, *Kami ha Doko de Midasareru ka* (Where Can God be Found?). Tokyo: Sanichi Shobo, 1977, pp.59-99.

132 It seems to be no simple coincidence that Yagi, along with Ohki Hideo, was among the first Japanese Christian thinkers to begin to cry out in the 1960's, "Deliver Japanese theology from Germanic captivity!" Phillips, 1981, pp.228,270(n.1). Cf. Part III, pp.355(n.383),357(ns.392,395).

133 Yagi, 1993, pp.37-38.

are found in "for instance, Paul, Francis of Assisi and Shinran." By doing so, one can see how at least part of Takakura's progressive development in his understanding of the self/Self\textsuperscript{135} was a searching within these two simultaneously present, but conflicting, types of relating to "the ultimate."\textsuperscript{136}

Taking into account some of Nishida's and other basic Mahayana views can cast even more hues on what hopefully begins to appear to be a colourful and helpful way of viewing Takakura's struggle. Assuming "the ultimate unity of the self and the universe" within a mindset of "subjectivity-only,"\textsuperscript{137} Takakura's unwitting desire for a mystical-type of merging of Christ and the self/Self seems only natural.\textsuperscript{138} Moreover, might not Takakura's notion of Paul's "experience," which according to Takakura the Apostle used in writing his letters, be akin to the fundamental idea of Nishida's Zen no Kenkyu, "pure 'experience'"\textsuperscript{139} Also, insofar as the "Self" of Galatians 2:20 is understood as the "Trans-Individual,"\textsuperscript{140} Takakura's understanding of our meeting in Paul a "single universal human" and "eternal humanity" receives

\textsuperscript{135}Henceforth, Takakura's "problem of the self" will thus be called his "problem of the self/Self."

\textsuperscript{136}Yagi, 1993, pp.36-37. In utilizing Peter Berger's distinction here, Yagi points out that "Only in Christianity where the feeling of one's sinfulness is strong is the encounter model dominant...." Thus Takakura the Christian would have felt an affinity for the phrase he picked up and used often, "Wholly Other." The encounter theme comes out even more in Takakura's later descriptions of the divine Self: "He is not something like the highest value or the objectification of the self's life search, but something different from the self, the so-called 'Absolute Other'." "Kirisutokyo Koyo" Fukuin to Gendai No.7, October, 1931 (Showa 6), p.49; Zenshu, Vol.5, p.285. Cf. Part III, p.363.

\textsuperscript{137}I am indebted to Professor Yagi Seiichi for pointing out the significant distinction between "subjective" and "subjectivity" ("shukanteki" and "shutaiteki"), and thus the possible implications for approaching Japanese theology. Meeting, 21 December 1994; 6 March 1995 letter to the thesis writer.

\textsuperscript{138}Cf. above, Part IV, pp.378,387-388.

\textsuperscript{139}One could add here the possibility of the further similarity to Takakura's notion of his own experience. Cf. above, Part IV, pp.382,384,389,391.

\textsuperscript{140}This is a notion which Yagi notes he learned through dialogues with Akizuki. Yagi, 1994, p.15.
a "fresh" angle of interpretation.\textsuperscript{141}

Beyond the "problem of the self/Self," Takakura's preference for "soul logic" over "head logic" can easily be compared to Mahayana's intuitive subjectivity as opposed to a typically Western, discursive logic.\textsuperscript{142} Jodo Shinshu's characteristic "pietistic" religiosity could help further to explain Takakura's similar focus on the more inward aspects of faith.\textsuperscript{143} One should add here the well-known similarity between Shin Buddhism's central emphasis on "faith" or "Other power" and Protestant

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{141}Cf. above, Part IV, p.392. This also could help in understanding Takakura's meaning in two other types of remarks. [1] The prophets' certainty of God's reality "explains the universal human nature in them." Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, p.192. [2] There is a "universal certainty" in Christianity's eschatological faith. That is, faith's eternal certainty now is a part of the whole Church's certain faith, including the past and future. Cf. Part III, p.334. The ensuing discussion should further clarify possible connections here.
\item \textsuperscript{142}Cf. above, Part IV, pp.378,389,391. Takakura elucidates this preference in FK, it will be recalled. Cf. Part III, p.344. In light of the comments above on Takakura's approach to the Bible, it is important to note that he describes the verse-to-verse connections in 1 John as not "logical"; instead, "the truth of this book is intuitive" ("intuitive" is written in the phoneticised "inchuitibu"). "Kami no Ai to Kami he no Ai," in Kami no Ai to Kami he no Ai, p.34; Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.184.
\item \textsuperscript{143}Cf. above, Part IV, p.377. The suggestion that FK's "pietistic" trait can in some way be attributed to its being a "religious phenomenon in Japan" is pertinent here. Cf. Part III, p.351(n.362).
\end{itemize}

For the thesis writer personally, reading Oncho no Okoku showed how fundamentally different the book's inward focus was from what he unwittingly expected from a work entitled Kingdom of Grace. Without being fully aware of the type of "territorial Christianity" comprising the matrix of his own understanding of what God's kingdom, i.e., "Christendom," should "look like" (cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.196-200), this reader anticipated some sort of blueprint of a Genevan "godly society." Upon encountering Takakura's inner wrestlings with the heart and self, however, some of the implications for this thesis began to unfold.

What this writer currently understands to have been happening within his encounter with Takakura is a clashing interaction between contrasting religio-cultural traditions. Similar encounters took place between, for example, Uemura Masahisa and the American Christianity brought to Japan by missionaries (cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.107-108,135-137,142-144, Part II, ch.2, pp.196-200), as well as between Uemura the Meiji samurai Christian and Takakura of merchant and Buddhist lineage--the aspects of which are still being sorted out as our discussion proceeds.
Christianity’s (and Takakura’s) message of “faith alone.”

Limitations of both space and scope prevent further exploration right now of this important theme of the relationship between Takakura’s pre- and post-conversion thinking. This matter, and other examples of Takakura’s writings, will need to be considered further within the ensuing discussion. Presently, our examination suggests that there was indeed a great deal of continuity between Takakura the youth and Takakura the adult Christian convert. Not only does such an interpretation help explain how Takakura wrestled with the "self/Self," but it also throws further light on such other issues as to why his religious thought seemed to take on a contrasting character in comparison to that of his "sensei," Uemura Masahisa. All things considered, it is not at all surprising to conjecture that Takakura's thinking and experience at conversion were similar to those expressed by a contemporary who was a well-read, consciously practising Shin Buddhist at the time of his sympathetic explorations into the Christian faith: "Christianity is not another religion, but my religion.

---


145Cf. Part III, pp.357-358,360. Unuma Hiroko contrasts Takakura’s thinking with Uemura’s "Bushido" Christian worldview at various points. She sums up her analysis by terming the two NKK leaders’ overall thought as "worlds supported by fundamentally different aims" ("konponteki ni kotonaru shiko ni sasaerareta sekai"). Similar to all other analyses of Takakura’s thought, however, Professor Unuma does not take into account Takakura’s religious heritage. Unuma, 1988, pp.187-216 (quotation from p.216). Cf. Part II, ch.1, p.168(n.253), above, Part IV, p.394(n.128).

146We must not forget other factors playing a part in Takakura’s conversion, e.g., the influence of his Christian parents, as well as the personal changes he was experiencing. Cf. Part I, pp.88-89.


It is fascinating, and highly suggestive, to note that Professor Ohki, in his essay which suggests fundamental religious differences between Uemura and Takakura (cited again just above, Part IV, p.396(n.132)), quotes from this well-known book of Kamegai in explaining the difference between the religio-ethical ethos of Puritan Christianity (à la Uemura) and the environment created by Jodo Shinshu.
3. Overseas Study Until Death

In line with the dramatic Meiji shift away from China to the West, and in similar concurrence with the prevailing assumption of where Christian theology was to be found, Takakura was taught Western thought extensively, both during high school and seminary. Moreover, the development of Takakura’s thought during the fifteen years just hastily reviewed compares favourably with the theme of "personal experience of salvation through Jesus Christ," which was characteristic of Takakura’s Western readings during those years. Combined with the manner in which Western Christianity came to Takakura during and following his period of study in Britain, plus in light of how his thought crystallised in FK, the following, concise analysis is therefore helpful:

In a sentence, up to the period of his mature thought it is possible to trace the path of Takakura’s development by way of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Herrmann, von Hügel, Troeltsch, Forsyth, and, finally, the crisis-theology stirrings in Europe, as reflected particularly in Brunner.

While this summary undoubtedly is accurate, it lends itself better to the discussion to come on theological subjects. For the remainder of this overview of Takakura’s thought development, the focus will remain on his thought as a particular, Japanese Christian human being.

However, in the very same section of his paper, Ohki describes the same difference between Uemura and Takakura—but fails to draw any connection between Takakura and his Jodo Shinshu background. Ohki, 1963, pp.152-156.


152Germany, pp.93-94.

Just prior to leaving for the West, Takakura wrote of two, twin desires:

[1] "After firmly becoming a person of the kingdom, I want to be pushed out by grace, thoroughly living a life of social service.... Subjective experience of grace should be deeply objectified and become service." 

[2] "In order to perform living good works, I want truly to be blessed." 154

En route to Britain, Takakura noted similar ambitions to see faith worked out in daily life, and to see Christians focused on the objective kingdom of God as well as their own individual salvation. 155

The specifically theological matter of the kingdom of God and the "structural" question of Takakura's use of "subjective-objective" will be taken up in later sections. What becomes appropriate for our consideration here is what has been termed Takakura's move from the "problem of the self/Self" into the "problem of culture." 156

What this phrase "problem of culture" does not mean is the examination of challenges and opportunities for Christianity brought about by a variety of cultures. 157 As a matter of fact, Takakura quite naturally writes of these kind of "cross-cultural" matters in what he sends back to Japan from overseas, 158 but that is not the primary subject his analysts see him beginning to address. What is meant by the descriptive phrase "culture" is better translated as "civilisation," or "the 'wider world' beyond one's own inward experience." Given that meaning, one can see Takakura's shift

154 "Shukufukuseraruru Made" ("Until Blessed"), in Oncho to Okoku, p.15; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.26. These comments are at the end of this essay, which guided our examination of Takakura’s post-conversion, pre-overseas thought. The latter of Takakura’s two wishes explains the essay’s title.

155 "Omoidazuru Mama" Fukuin Shinpo Nos.1369,1370, 22,29 September 1921 (Taisho 10), pp.4-5,5; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.33-37.


157 This matter of multi-cultural expressions of Christianity is, however, a central concern of this thesis, of course.

158 These kind of topics come up, for instance, in his "travelogues" and "impressions." Cf. Part III, p.280(ns.28,29).
towards dealing with the problem in, e.g., his increased readings on the British labour movement.\textsuperscript{159} Moreover, Takakura's writings show a noticeably heightened interest in bringing the Christian the faith to bear on "society" or "civilisation."\textsuperscript{160}

Even some of Takakura's writings which might not appear at first glance to be addressing the so-called "problem of culture" in fact have as their main object the matter of dealing with the "wider world" beyond personal religiosuity. His well-known "Junreisha,"\textsuperscript{161} for example, does not speak simply of the individual believer's pilgrimage of faith, but of Christ graciously leading and meeting the needs of the whole human person--both individual and corporate. While not disparaging the modern, Protestant "Hebraic" emphasis on conscience as exemplified in Bunyan's \textit{Pilgrim's Progress}, Takakura suggests that the Golden Middle Ages of Dante's \textit{Divine Comedy} more appropriately can meet the total "Hellenistic" needs of Japan's searching youth.\textsuperscript{162} Likewise, Takakura's series on Catholicism, more than expressing an interest in Roman Catholicism per se,\textsuperscript{163} has as its main object the development of a "vision" and "conviction" for building a "new civilisation" or "new humanity." Takakura observes that, due to its atomistic tendencies, Protestantism has

\textsuperscript{159}Cf. Part I, p.54(n.193), Part II, ch.2, p.260(n.272).

\textsuperscript{160}A review of his more "didactic essays" written overseas will show this increased interest. Cf. Part III, p.279(n.30).

Relative to the distinction between Takakura's "problem of culture" dealing with "civilisation" more than "multi-cultural" issues, one could surmise that his travel to a different culture would have at least accentuated his concern with the wider world or "civilisation."

\textsuperscript{161}The essay's title in English is "Pilgrim"; it is noted by even his severe critic Kumano to exemplify Takakura's "religious genius," as quoted by Sato, \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.1, p.403, and by Oshio, p.129.

\textsuperscript{162}This is particularly the case, Takakura asserts, in light of the lack in past Japanese literature of any "divine love," as well as a poor development in the Japanese character of a "strong sense of the individual" or "discipline of the self." "Junreisha," in \textit{Oncho to Shinhitsu}, pp.127-154; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.1, pp.40-62.

\textsuperscript{163}Takakura explicitly assures his readers back home, "I am not at all thinking of moving towards [or 'being smitten by'] Catholicism. I intend truly to acknowledge Protestantism's essential, good points." Emphasis original. He repeats later in the essay, "I am in no sense someone doubting the meaning of Protestantism."
been unable to build such a new civilisation. Hence his interest in Catholicism is for its potential help in addressing the hopeful signs of the "contemporary Japanese awakening to the demand for civilisation."\textsuperscript{164}

Why is it that Takakura developed this interest in the wider "culture" or "civilisation"? Sato sees the dual rise during the Taisho years of a wider social/cultural consciousness and of new communal movements as the primary, causal background for Takakura’s concurrent interest;\textsuperscript{165} Takakura’s specific mention of various social problems and of certain new religious communities certainly bears out such an observation.\textsuperscript{166} Ouchi analyses that Takakura’s 1921-1925 (Taisho 10-14) writings on the "problem of culture" make the following three summary claims: [1] the individual who is saved is in turn to work to save the whole world; [2] in that this world is a stage for God’s acts, my salvation is a microcosm of God’s overall display of saving the world; [3] my/our acts (ethics, history, culture) are a response to God’s gracious salvation. Ouchi then further asserts that such a development of the problem was really just a reflection of Takakura’s own inner development.

\textsuperscript{164}..."genzai Nihonjin ga bunka he no yokyu ni sameru koto...." Takakura also echoes some of the analysis expressed in his "Junreisha" over the lack of "realisation of human nature," and thus "civilisation has not sufficiently grown," in Japan. (Takakura even refers the reader to look at "Junreisha" along with the present work; the two were written at basically the same time, in the spring of 1923 (Taisho 12.).) "Katorishizumu ni kansuru Kyomi"\textit{ Fukuin Shinpo} Nos.1456-1458,1460-1461,1463-1465, 24,31 May, 7,21,28 June, 12,19,26 July 1923 (Taisho 12), pp.3-4,3-4,4-5,3-4,6-7,5-6,5-6 passim; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.1, pp.210-255 passim. Takakura notes elsewhere that part of the reason that Catholicism had been attracting interest among many was its alternative authority to contemporary science: the latter was proving inadequate for "modern people searching for the soul’s eternal home." ("...tamashi no eiennaru furusato....") Dogmatics lectures, in \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.8, p.146.


\textsuperscript{166}Just in the series on Catholicism, for example, Takakura discusses issues of post-World War I Europe and Russia, the League of Nations, war and industry, Marxism, labour problems, the women’s movement, and Nishida Tenko’s Kyoto-based "Ittoen." "Katorishizumu ni kansuru Kyomi" \textit{Fukuin Shinpo} Nos.1457,1461,1463,1464, 31 May, 28 June, 12,19 July 1923 (Taisho 12), pp.3-4,6-7,5,5; \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.1, pp.217-219,221,223,238-245,247-248.
Hence, coupled with the reality that the "Taisho Culture" which provided the context for Takakura’s interest lacked "vitality,"\textsuperscript{167} Takakura’s development of the problem was inadequate.\textsuperscript{168} These are insightful analyses concerning the contextual and personal factors giving rise to Takakura’s interest in what he himself later termed "Christianity’s objective, ethical side."\textsuperscript{169} In concurrence but also in addition, this discussion sees the relevance of taking a lead from an observation, cited earlier, concerning both Nishida’s and Natsume Soseki’s "quest for the self." Nishitani Keiji remarks that their search "began from itself as center and reached outwards instead of simply turning further inwards in search of itself," hence enabling a concern for wider social problems.\textsuperscript{170} Taken all together, these two figures’ overall message which resonated within Takakura’s generation, Nishida’s personal importance for Takakura, and Takakura’s own recorded reading of Natsume\textsuperscript{171} suggest that part of the impetus towards looking outwards came from these two intellectual and literary giants.

\textsuperscript{167}"seisai"

\textsuperscript{168}Ouchi, 1985, pp.20-22. This evaluation holds true as well for Takakura’s speeches made after returning to Japan from overseas. Cf. the works mentioned in Part I, p.54(ns.190,191).

Germany, whose book has an explicit sub-theme of evaluating various theologies’ social ethics, also criticises Takakura here. "Quite obviously... he failed to recognise adequately, or did not consider relevant, the complexity of any human society and, particularly, Japanese society.... He was unrealistic...." Germany, Preface, pp.xii,118. Sato also recognises Takakura’s failure to have "much of a concrete idea concerning the problem of Christianity and culture." Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.399.


\textsuperscript{170}Cf. Part I, p.67.

\textsuperscript{171}Cf. Part III, pp.277-278. Both in terms of timing and content, Takakura’s citation of Natsume’s Kokoro--including a direct quotation--in his 1920 (Taisho 9) "Road of Necessity" is noteworthy. Not only is this on the front end of Takakura’s interest in the wider world, but the quotation is to demonstrate the utter selfishness of humanity. "Hitsuzen no Michi," in Oncho no Okoku, p.149; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.9. Cf. above, Part IV, pp.389-390(n.101).
The particular intellectual point of consonance would have been "the ultimate unity of the self and the universe" inherently a part of Takakura's, Nishida's, and Natsume's common Mahayana heritage. This heritage also bears a characteristic mindset of "subjectivity-only," which with its "total practical or existential standpoint" demands the goal of simultaneously "transforming" the self and the world "at its [their] roots." It could thus only be expected that Takakura eventually would have had to move into some sort of direct consideration of the world beyond the self. Indeed, what this current analysis would like to claim--in a specifically Christian, theological way--is that Jesus Christ worked in and through all of Takakura's context, including his inherited religious heritage, to lead him into dealing as a Christian thinker with the wider world and culture.

Most analyses of Takakura's developing theology describe his interest in "civilisation" while he was in Britain in the terms which he himself often uses,

172 Abe, 1988, p.357(n.12).


Interestingly, however, despite its inherent "total practical and existential standpoint," a "subjectivity-only" mindset historically often has implied "a kind of idealism" as well. Ueda Yoshifumi, "Reflections on the Study of Buddhism: Notes on the Approaches of Ui Hakuju and D.T. Suzuki" The Eastern Buddhist Translated by Dennis Hirota. 18, No.2, 1985, p.121.

It is in fact "a kind of idealism" that Professor Kato repeatedly attributes to Takakura--entailing his lack of concrete development of the "problem of culture." Kato, 1972, pp.342,361,382.

Such a discussion begins to move outside the bounds of the thesis' capabilities; nevertheless, the total connection with Takakura's thought is intriguing and suggestive.

174 We must be quick to add here that God's leading in Takakura's thought most definitely included Takakura's constant interaction with the Bible. Even so, this interaction took place within Takakura's context. Thus, for example, when Takakura in his later years reads in Isaiah's "remnant" the goal to "transform" Israel (written in the characters "henshitsu" accompanied by the phoneticised "toransufomu"), his "subjectivity-only" mindset undoubtedly has been involved. "Yogensha no Shukyo Undo" ("The Religious Movement of the Prophets"), in Chosakushu, Vol.3, pp.79,80; "Yogensha Izaya no Shinko" ("The Faith of the Prophet Isaiah") Fukuin to Gendai No.5, August, 1931 (Showa 6), p.19 (Chosakushu, Vol.3, pp.119).
naming the kingdom of God and the Church. Here, we will delay speaking as such until the following section on such theological themes. For now, we must return to Japan with Takakura in early 1924 (Taisho 13). Accordingly, following him in his thought development involves passing through two more stages.

First is the coming together in his heart and mind of his "Evangelical Christianity" in mid- to late-1925 (Taisho 14). Takakura's writings and sermons clearly take on a consistent, "FK" tone from that point, and his contemporary self-analysis claims, "I am now feeling the joy and responsibility of my inmost feelings [or 'true heart'] relative to the prophetic, evangelical faith." Sympathetic analyses similarly recognise a significant crystallisation of "Takakura Theology" taking place at this time.

Takakura makes a similar recollection several years later, noting that "When I returned from England, strictly speaking my faith had not yet become evangelical." Takakura continues by testifying that his faith progressed together with the newly-

---

175Cf., e.g., Oshio, pp.108-109,133-134; Sato, _Chosakushu_, Vol.1, pp.398-402.

176As for writings, his "Warera no Shinko Kokuhaku" ("Our Confession of Faith") is distinctively "FK." This actually was a church lecture, suggesting an original formulation time of the summer (the normal camp and retreat time). It was later produced in pamphlet form, and it has been reproduced in _Chosakushu_, Vol.2, pp.64-77. Takakura's November, 1925 (Taisho 14) sermon entitled "Megumi no Fukami" ("Depth of Grace") also marks a clear consolidation point. "Megumi no Fukami," in _Oncho no Shomei_, pp.1-22; _Chosakushu_, Vol.4, pp.122-136.

177...watashi ha ima yogenshateki, fukuinteki shinko ni chushin no kanki to sekinin to o kanjite iru." Also written in November, 1925 (Taisho 14), this statement follows his evaluation that there were parts of _Oncho to Shinjitsu_, published earlier that same year, along with the even earlier _Oncho no Okoku_, that were as yet lacking in this respect: "The depth and strength of a thorough experience of grace were not yet living." _Oncho no Okoku--Oncho no Okoku Daiyonhan no Jo--" ("Kingdom of Grace: Preface to the Fourth Edition of _Kingdom of Grace_"), in _Chosakushu_, Vol.2, pp.32-34.

begun Toyama Church which he was pastoring. Noting this testimony of Takakura, Sato insightfully points out how Takakura’s "Evangelical Christianity" thus was not so much an intellectual, formalised system as it has sometimes come to be understood, but instead something "subjectively experienced.... ‘Subjectivity is truth’ is living here." Part III’s examination of FK wholeheartedly concurs with this observation.

An initial reading of FK—or at least of an English translation of it, such as the summary in Part III of this thesis—can give a similar feel as that given by dialectical theology, and by Barthian thought in particular. Part of the explanation for this impression can be sought in the timing of Takakura’s accelerated German reading after returning to Japan from Britain, which was coincidental with the settling of his "Evangelical Christianity." That Takakura therefore may have adopted some of the language of dialectical theology should not, however, lead to the hasty conclusion of some sort of "Barthian influence." As explained both earlier and later, such a supposition simply contradicts Takakura’s own testimony, ignores the evidence of what he read, and fails to understand his characteristic use of Western theology.

Rather than through the eyes of German crisis theology, the type of change that took place with Takakura’s progression into his dynamic, all-embracing evangelical faith can be seen well through his sermon, "Seimei to Oncho" ("Life and Grace"). Having

179This recollection is part of Takakura’s 1931 (Showa 6) "Megumi no Ato" ("After Grace"), which was his contribution to the similarly-entitled collection put together by members of the then former Toyama Church. Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.41. Cf. Part I, pp.95-96.


In light of earlier comments on the term, it is interesting to note here Professor Sato’s descriptive uses of "shutaiteki" ("subjectivity").

181Cf. Part III, pp.296(n.98),339(n.307).


been composed in March, 1925 (Taisho 14), this message was included in Takakura's third book, Oncho to Shomei (Grace and Calling). It was then republished in late 1930 (Showa 5) as part of a pamphlet entitled Shukyo ni tuite (Concerning Religion), but this time with a corrective postscript by Takakura.

The message itself begins with a rendition of the evolution of life, a process culminating in human personality: "The essence of personality is freedom and creation. Culture, which blooms only in human society, is the secret working of the life of humanity." Soon thereafter, and sandwiched between quotations from Browning and Genesis 1:27, Takakura comments further on this life of humanity: "Within our life, there is something like God, something close to God." Later, Takakura asserts that it is God's working, more than human working, which comprises the essence of religion: "Religion is God within us, God Himself

---

184 The sermon is on pp.45-59. This sermon collection was compiled and published in late 1926 (Taisho 15); cf. Introduction, p.10.

185 Germany notes this sermon, with the later postscript, as evidence for a late presence in Takakura's thinking of "romantic strains" due to a "deposit of influence" left by Schleiermacher. Germany, p.94. This way of describing Takakura's thought in relation to Western theologians will be evaluated further below.

The sermon and postscript have been reproduced in Chosakushu, Vol 4, pp.112-122; cf. Sato's explanatory note on p.444.

186...hito no seimei no omyonaru hataraki de aru." Emphasis original. "Seimei to Oncho," in Oncho to Shomei, pp.45-47 (quotation from p.47); Chosakushu, Vol.4, pp.112-113 (quotation from p.113).

187 An English translation of Takakura's Japanese citation of Browning is, "We are clods of earth, but within these clods one flash of light is glittering." The Genesis 1:27 quotation reads, "God created humanity in His own image."

188"Warera no seimei no uchi ni ha, kami rashiki mono, kami ni chikaki mono ga aru." op.cit., in Oncho to Shomei, p.48; Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.115. The word rendered "like" in the phrase "something like God" connotes identity, i.e., the English meaning, "something which is the same thing as God." Japanese has a different expression ("no yo na") which also translates into English as "like," but that wording connotes an ontological difference in the things being compared.
searching for God."189 Pascal's example of finding God in the face of Jesus Christ is then used to illustrate the culmination of the long, divine-human evolutionary religious quest: "The universe, and humanity, has for a long, long time sought for God's face, coming to the point of gasping for air. Now that prayer has been fully satisfied."190 One cannot help but read in this message some sort of amalgamation of scientific-evolutionary and Nishida-type of "panentheistic"191 worldviews--themes which clash rather dramatically with FK.192

Hence, although the message is included in its original form in the Oncho to Shomei,193 Takakura feels compelled to add some corrective comments to its later publication. Noting that he now finds the essay "extremely unsatisfactory," Takakura suggests that its "lack of thoroughness"194 comes from its "romanticism" of faith. He focuses on the essay's failure to mention either sin or the basic dualism of flesh and spirit within human nature; hence, the understandings of grace and of the Cross also are inadequate. Takakura even states, "Strictly speaking, the god of this essay is not the God of the Bible."195 Even so, he concludes his remarks by stating his hope that the essay will convey the truth of religion's being "rooted in the necessary

---

189 "Shukyo to ha kami ga warera no uchi ni atte, kami mizukara ga kami o motomeru koto de aru." Ibid., in Oncho to Shomei, p.55; Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.119.

190 "Uchu ha, jinrui ha, nagaku nagaku kami no kao o tazunemotome te aeide kita. Ime sono kigan ha junibun ni mitasareta no de aru." Ibid., in Oncho to Shomei, p.57; Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.120.

191 Cf. above, Part IV, p.383.


193 As noted above, this book was published a full year after Takakura's "Fukuitenki Kirisutokyo" seemingly jelled in his heart and mind. Aware of that discrepancy, but unaware of the later corrective postscript, this writer was almost stupefied upon his first reading of this message.

194 This term is "futettei," which could also be rendered "inconclusive" or even "lukewarm."

195 "...kono bunsho ni okeru kami ha genmitsu na imi de, seisho no kami to ha natte inai."
demand of human life."196 Having thus cleared away the "romantic" view of humanity which he had come to oppose so vehemently, along with restating the heart of "Evangelical Christianity’s" message of atonement, Takakura feels free to allow this pre-FK essay to go public once again.

Besides the settling of his faith and increasing church involvement within two years of his return to Japan, Takakura faced (what he considered at least) opposition within the wider Church, namely rationalism, liberalism, and "Social Christianity." Moreover, contemporaneous with the 1926 change from the Taisho to Showa Eras was a shift in intellectual circles from the "Taisho Culture" to Marxist thought.197 These combined circumstances contributed towards Takakura’s inability to continue much of any direct emphasis on the "problem of culture."198 Relatedly, Takakura focused wholeheartedly on propagating "Evangelical Christianity,"199 and he had to carry an overwhelming amount of administrative burdens.200 Within these circumstances, Takakura could not help but manifest what some analysts have observed to be a hardening or stagnation of his thought.201

Further consideration of the crystallisation of Takakura’s thought will be undertaken in later sections of the discussion. To conclude here the overview of the development of Takakura’s thought, a second change in Takakura’s post-overseas thought must be noted. This "shift in tone," one could almost call it, occurred about two years before his death in April, 1934 (Showa 9). Timing suggests that the

---

196 "...hito no seimei no hitsuzennaru yokyu ni nezasu...." "Tsuiki" ("Postscript") to "Oncho to Shomei," in Chosakushu, Vol.4, pp.121-122.

197 This was soon followed by economic depression, plus tightening government control on "dangerous thoughts" and a drift towards fascism. Cf. Part I, pp.47ff.,60.

198 Sato, 1968, pp.119,140-141,143.

199 Ibid., pp.140-141.


change could be purely symptomatic of his concurrent onset of illness.\textsuperscript{202}

Nevertheless, having been noted to be one of the "turning points" in Takakura's life and thought,\textsuperscript{203} the change needs to be considered on its own, if only briefly, here.

One analyst notes how Takakura began to focus more on weakness and smallness in church life.\textsuperscript{204} Another close observer describes the shift through the following analysis of Takakura's latest sermons:

Certainly in his last years' sermons, fellowship, forbearance, peace, and love were concretely spoken of as the type of qualities the person of faith should have. However, that was due to his ascertaining the anxiety over the contemporary society's state of affairs and church's condition. Often in his sermons, there were confessions of his own sin, weakness, and shortcomings. The sense is still deep of those confessions giving to us who heard them a sympathetic response, together with leading us to repentant prayer.\textsuperscript{205}

This analysis from a personal hearer and compiler of Takakura's last sermons clearly does not want us to forget the continuity in emphases that might be overlooked in a change brought about by a darkening political context.\textsuperscript{206}

If there was real development in Takakura's thought during his last years, it must of course be seen in connection with his own illness, as well as with the mounting dread of the 1930's (early Showa). Nevertheless, as the discussion prepares to move into looking at Takakura's thinking relative to more explicitly theological matters, at least as "food for thought" this writer would like to recall the theme of religious heritage that has been probed in relation to Takakura's developing thought. If that heritage in fact played a meaningful role in Takakura's thinking--and our examination has suggested that it did--might not this last apparent shift in Takakura's emphases be

\textsuperscript{202}Cf. Part I, p.99.

\textsuperscript{203}Ishijima, 1934, p.38.

\textsuperscript{204}Ibid., pp.38-39.

\textsuperscript{205}Karasawa Shosaku, "Atogaki" ("Afterward"), in Oncho no Eiko, pp.280-281.

\textsuperscript{206}Cf. Part I, pp.48,52-55.
seen in relation to Jodo Shinshu? To be specific, is it beyond the realm of possibility that increased talk of weakness and of "fellowship, forbearance, peace, and love" reflected a further settling in Takakura's experience relative to the mercy and compassion of Amida-Butsu, whom Takakura years earlier had termed "the most gracious beautiful idea of worship except the god of Jesus Christ"?207

Takakura had fought hard for the truth of "Evangelical Christianity." Besides fighting against the outward foes of idolatrous philosophies, Takakura faced the constant inward "problem of the self/Self." While he himself perhaps had no theological tolerance for a "projection of human subjective religious need,"208 his "ontological" religious heritage was part of his continuing identity as a human being. Having then "fought the good fight"209 of faith for several gruelling years, the time had come for some respite, some "settling" of the dust. Insofar as that settling involved a measure of integration for Takakura as a Christian person, coming to terms with the mercy and compassion present in both his inherited faith and his adopted faith would have been a central "religious need" for Takakura personally.210 While such a possibility may seem audacious or even offensive to some, our examination so far suggests that the idea is at least digestible "food for

---

207 Cf. above, Part IV, p.375(n.27).
208 As such, Amida-Butsu thus "has no real historical basis." Cf. preceding note.
209 II Timothy 4:7.
210 The whole matter of "settling," or of "integrating," in Takakura's thought could be seen as well in terms of language and of reference to Japanese thinkers. That is, whereas Takakura's references to non-Japanese speaking authors is dominant throughout most of his life, from around 1930 (Showa 5) there is a noticeable increase in his mention of fellow Japanese Christian writers in his sermons. This can also be seen as part of an overall integration in Takakura's thought. "Herikudaru Mono" ("The Humble Person") Seisho no Kansen No.163, July, 1930 (Showa 5), p.5 (Zenshu, Vol.2, p.335); "Seiai ni Kotaete" ("Responding to Holy Love") Fukuin to Gendai No.7, October, 1931 (Showa 6), pp.2-3 (Zenshu, Vol.2, pp.481-482); "Kohitsuji he no Fukuju" ("Obedience to the Lamb") Fukuin to Gendai No.23, February, 1933 (Showa 6), p.4 (Zenshu, Vol.2, p.619).
B. Takakura’s Thought in Relation to Western Systematic Theology

"Takakura contributed the first systematic statement of theology in the Japanese Christian world." This observation has been echoed by other analysts, and others still have mentioned Takakura’s focused interest on systematic theology. Along with Takakura’s expressed desire "systematically [to] express" his theology, plus the actual existence of the fruits of his labours in the forms of his "theological classic" FK and his dogmatics lectures, these characterisations

211Kamegai Ryoun’s example here is thought-provoking (cf. above, Part IV, p.399(n.147). Years after converting from Shin Buddhism to Christianity, and becoming a pastor no less, Kamegai’s mother died. How his conversion and calling to the Christian ministry affected his mother had been a running concern of Kamegai’s. Upon her death, he writes: "In form my mother was a devotee to Amida. Her heart was that way as well. But my mother’s Amida was also Christ."

Part of Kamegai’s "reasoning" in support of that kind of assertion was a preference, at least in religious matters, for logical contradiction: "The ocean of truth is deep and wide. I think that the way of contradiction is good. I believe contradictions as such.... One cannot harmonise [contradictions] in the world of the head. But in practice they are in complete harmony." Kamegai, 1976, pp.222,238.

Although it would be a dubious conclusion fully to equate Kamegai’s thinking here with Takakura’s posture towards logic, the similarity is striking. Moreover, a further parallel (in addition to their Shin backgrounds) can be drawn relative to Takakura’s grandmother. Upon hearing of her death, he writes (from Sapporo to his parents in April, 1918 (Taisho 7)) of her belief in God, her being called to heaven, and his hope of fellowshipping with her spirit in prayer. Given his grandmother’s Shinshu commitment, it is not hard to see Kamegai’s same "practical harmonising" going on with Takakura. Zenshu, Vol.10, “Kashin,” p.260.

212Germany, p.87.


could lead one to assume that approaching Takakura’s thought in relation to so-called "traditional theological" themes would thus be via a smooth, well-marked path.

However, it has also been noted that Takakura’s "Evangelical Christianity" was more of a living experience than systematised, intellectual formulae. Colleagues and students alike have almost uniformly been more impressed by their friend and teacher’s theological attitude than by his formulated system. Our earlier examination of FK as well showed Takakura’s explicit goal of religious life over intellectual orthodoxy, along with what he calls a method of "faith logic" over "head logic." Analysing "Takakura Theology" may thus involve adjusting the traditional rules more than initially anticipated.

What this section therefore proposes to do is examine Takakura in two correlative ways. First, we will look at his relationships with selected theologians; second, a few critical topics will be explored. This approach should help us do proper justice to the man whom one admiral has termed "the first Japanese theologian who could think and express himself in his own terms."

1. Takakura and Other Theologians

What is the most constructive way of considering Takakura’s dealings with a host of "household names" in the history of Western theology, including his progression from Schleiermacher to German crisis theologians? An in-depth analysis of the

---

217 These have been reproduced in Zenshu, Vols.8,9.

218 Cf. above, Part IV, p.407.

219 Kuwada, 1935, p.70; Okada Masao, "Wasurenu Koto domo (1)--Takakura Sensei kara Uketa Mono--'Shingaku suru' to iu Koto" ("Something Unforgettable (1): What I Received from Pastor Takakura--'Doing Theology'") Fukutin to Gendai No.5, 10 April 1972, p.4.


222 Cf. above, Part IV, p.400.
relationship which Takakura had with any one of the great thinkers with whom he interacted would require its own lengthy study; obviously, then, we are limited here. Even so, the limitation is partly of the thesis' own design. Both to justify what might therefore seem to some to be a relative brevity of space given to this consideration, as well as simultaneously to consider Takakura's relationship with various theologians, a reminder and two observations are in order.

The reminder is that placing Takakura in the history of human thought, including Christian theological thought, gives the initiative to his cultural and historical context. While on the one hand assuming such a posture has been the prerogative of the thesis, the primacy of cultural-linguistic heritage and of particular historical circumstances has demonstrated itself throughout this study. For Takakura, his "life and times" as outlined in Part I, as well as the Japanese character of his thought as emphasised at the beginning of Part III, were the ordained regulators for the development of his thought just reviewed in Part IV-A. Our continuing study concerns how the multi-flavoured wine of Part II was poured into Takakura's own peculiar wineskins.

The first of two supporting observations is that the Japanese Christian tradition into which Takakura was baptised, and then functioned for the remainder of his life, had at least as much "influence" on Takakura's theology as did Western theology. Speaking in terms of the thesis' structure, Part II, Chapter 1 is just as critical theologically\textsuperscript{223} as Part II, Chapter 2. Uemura Masahisa's theology was of course particularly important for Takakura. Many other Japanese Christians as well gave crucial impetus to Takakura's development.\textsuperscript{224} Thus, for example, in listing Hatano Seiichi's book as one of the three to which he "owed the most" in writing a theological paper in Edinburgh, Takakura is simply giving credit to where credit is

\textsuperscript{223}This is even clearer upon distinguishing between "theology" in its technical, restricted meaning and "theology" in a wider sense, i.e., according to the word's literal meaning, "words' referring to 'God'." Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.141-145.

\textsuperscript{224}Specific mention of the writings of Japanese Christian thinkers are spread throughout Takakura's own writings. Cf. Part III, pp.277-278.
due. The only significant addition to this English essay from the earlier, Japanese essay from which Takakura essentially has translated this English paper, is the inclusion of a section on "the west-southern school" of the [sic] modern German philosophy" represented by Windelband and others. Takakura agrees with this school's position of placing the seat of faith's authority in the "Transcendental or Apriori Value." As it turns out, Windelband's particular position is also used in Hatano's cited book, thus showing the source of the most meaningful input into Takakura's thinking.

Another example of this first observation of the Japanese Christian initiative for Takakura's thinking is the set of didactic essays Takakura wrote in Britain for readers back in Japan. Some of these writings were, by Takakura's own evaluation,

---

225 Takakura also omits an entire section on the "character of authority," which the English Table of Contents lists as dealing with the authority of the prophets, Church, the Bible, and Jesus Christ. Time and language limitations must have caused this deletion.

226 Takakura also adds the following, brief paragraph:

Lastly we may add the philosophy of vital intuition or mystical creative evolution of Bergson. He does not argue about religious, [sic] I think. But it is very interesting to me if we could think his pure experience or vital intuition as primary ground of faith. [sic]

This thesis writer sees Takakura's interest in Bergson's "pure experience or vital intuition" as somehow related to Takakura's similar, Nishida-type notion of "pure experience." Cf. above, Part IV, pp.382,389,391.


It was suggested earlier that W.P. Paterson might have directed Takakura to Windelband's "Das Heilige," cited by Takakura in his English paper. Combined with the fact of his longer friendship with Takakura, his close relationship with Windelband makes Hatano a more likely possibility than Paterson. Twelve-Member Editorial Board, in Hatano, 1963, p.III; cf. Part II, ch.2, p.203(n.34),214(n.86), Part III, p.277(n.18).
composed under the particular influence of, say, von Hügel or Forsyth. Yet the adjustments and comments he made in ensuing essays often were prompted by correspondence he had received from readers back home. This is only natural, of course, in light of the continuing contact which Takakura maintained with the friends with whom had to live in Japan once he returned there. In comparison, books of deceased theologians were not nearly as interpersonally demanding.

This leads us to a second observation of Takakura’s relationship with traditional (Western) theology, which concerns the manner in which Takakura used various theologians’ thought. On the one hand, he could be very quick to pick up on and use someone’s ideas; on the other hand, he could also be very quick to recognise the "influence" and move beyond it according to his own, continuing agenda and circumstances. Thus, in order to seek help for developing a vision for a new civilisation, Takakura reads von Hügel in his Oxford room beginning in late 1922 (Taisho 12); he writes the following spring in order to share his thoughts with:

---

228 Takakura himself acknowledges these two writers’ respective influences in his writing of "Junreisha" ("Pilgrim," considered earlier; cf. above, Part IV, p.402) and "Osodokushi oyobi Fukuin Shugi no Honshitsu" ("Orthodoxy and the Essence of Evangelicalism"). The latter essay was written in 1924 (Taisho 13), i.e., after Takakura had returned to Japan; it was then published in the Fukuin Shinpo, as well as included in the following year’s Oncho to Shinjitsu. Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.16,21; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.19,23,469.

229 For example, Takakura’s series on Catholicism ran in the widely-read Fukuin Shinpo from late May through July of 1923 (Taisho 12). His next series on supernaturalism in Christianity, written in August with its first instalment appearing in the 23 August Fukuin Shinpo, begins with apologetic clarification of his main point within the previous articles on Catholicism, i.e., his understanding of Christianity and culture/civilisation. In effect he assures his Protestant evangelical readers of his central concern for the salvation of Japanese people. "Kirisutokyo no Tokushoku to shite no Choshizen" Fukuin Shinpo No.1469, 23 August 1923, p.1; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.256-257. Cf. Part III, p.279(n.30), above, Part IV, pp.402-403.


friends back home;²³² he adjusts his thought upon their feedback; finally, within just seventeen months' more time, he acknowledges in published form his feelings of "deep shame and responsibility" for what he wrote while having been "carried away" by von Hügel's thought.²³³ This seems to be one of several examples of Takakura having his "Eastern way of seeing renewed by Western thought,"²³⁴ thus further enabling him to become a "Japanese theologian who could think and express himself in his own terms."²³⁵

One can see a similar progression through Ritschl. Having read him in seminary,²³⁶ Takakura evidences no active interest in Ritschlian thought until his 1921 (Taisho 10) movement towards the "problem of culture."²³⁷ At that point, Takakura takes up his concern within the idea of the "kingdom of God,"²³⁸ and he specifically uses Ritsch's ellipse-with-two-foci model to express his own "mutually agreeable ideas"


²³³The equivalent term is "sarawareta"; emphasis original. Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.16; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.19.

²³⁴This is Nishitani's phrase in reference to Nishida Kitaro. Cf. above, Part IV, p.380.

²³⁵Cf. above, Part IV, p.414.

²³⁶Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.203(n.32). It should be pointed out that this writer at least can find no confirming evidence for Germany's assertion that Takakura was reading Ritschl "during [his] early period," although one can safely assume that his seminary readings at least would have included this dominant figure. Oshio finds evidence--likely in Takakura's unpublished diaries--of Takakura's having read, during his first two years after seminary, both Orr's and Garvie's well-known books on Ritschlianism. Germany, p.94; Oshio, p.60.

²³⁷Cf. above, Part IV, pp.401-410.

of God's individual and corporate salvific purposes. But after just three months in Edinburgh, Takakura is already intending to "subjugate" Ritschl's position by combining the kingdom of God and the atonement into one purpose, claiming the two ideas to be "no more than names for viewing the same truth from differing perspectives." Having thus intuitively "collided" with that which "submerges [Ritschl's] distinctions between subjectivity and objectivity," Takakura soon terms Ritschlian thought as "gnostic voluntarism," and labelling certain thinkers as having Ritschlian tendencies becomes a criticism.

Along with this rapid use and discarding of Ritschl, however, is another of Takakura's characteristic uses of Western theologians, namely retaining and refining some sort of key insight or theological attitude. In the particular case of Ritschl,


240"Kami no Kuni ni kansuru Kosatsu sono ta" ("Consideration of the Kingdom of God and Other Matters") Fukuin Shinpo No.1389, 9 February 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.5-6 (quotation from p.6); Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.192-193 (quotation from p.193). The term "subjugate" ("kokufuku") is from Sato's explanation. Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.397-398.

Just before leaving Edinburgh, Takakura shared his idea of uniting the kingdom of God and the atonement in answer to a question by W.P. Paterson. By Takakura's account, Paterson's praiseworthy response to Takakura's answer included the remark, "That is a very, very interesting idea...." How much this idea expressed what Takakura truly thought is evidenced by his diary for that day (18 June), where Takakura writes of Paterson, "How thankful I am to have found for the first time someone in Scotland who responds to the depths of my heart" ("...yo no kokoro no oku ni respond suru hito..."). "Edinbara Saigo no Mikkakan" Seisho no Kensan No.74, January, 1923 (Taisho 12), p.43 (Zenshu, Vol.6, p.291); Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," p.187.

241"Collided" is one of Takakura's own favourite expressions; cf. Part III, p.291(n.78), above, Part IV, pp.389,390. The latter quotation is from Nishida; cf. above, Part IV, p.383.

242He writes this in his English essay, written in Edinburgh. Zenshu, Vol.4, p.13. This quotation is also noted by Germany, p.94.

243Cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.208(n.54),243,251(n.241).
Takakura incorporates into his own thought the notion of the "historic Christ." This sort of selective implementation is also evident in Takakura's focusing on Athanasius' "keen spiritual insight," Otto's "so-called Numinous" emphasis, Anselm's appreciation for the religious seriousness of sin, and Pascal's faith in the God of the Patriarchs over a philosophical god. In his "pre-FK" years as a Christian thinker, Takakara can group together Schleiermacher, Augustine, Goethe, and Tolstoy due to their common, youthful spirits; he singles out Dostoevsky as a "modern writer who felt a fierce attachment to the personality of Jesus"; and, he latches onto and uses Francis Thompson's "tremendous lover" as a phrase "filled with insight.

Takakura's consistent use of someone's particular expression, despite a change in overall attitude toward the thought of that person, is classically exemplified in Takakura's use of Schleiermacher's "eternal youth." To understand this embracing and holding onto a notion in the midst of long-term change, one can first imagine Uemura and others there at the young seminary in Tokyo overjoyed over the

---

245Cf. Part III, p.309.
246Takakura uses this expression in reference both to Jesus and to Uemura. Cf. Part III, pp.304(n.128),356(n.387).
247Cf. Part III, p.313.
248Cf. Part III, p.303(n.120), above, Part IV, p.409.
250"Maboroshi no Chikara" ("The Strength of Vision"), in Oncho no Okoku, p.100; Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.47.
252"eien no seinen"
presence of Takakura, a bright, German-reading student in 1908 (Meiji 41). Takakura’s teachers thus get him to research, in the original German, the life and thought of "the great pioneer of modern theologians, Schleiermacher." Not only does Takakura "attract attention" with his carefully researched and written thesis, he also gives lectures on Schleiermacher at the seminary years later. But by the time he writes FK, Takakura consistently and fundamentally criticises Schleiermacher on several fronts. Even so, throughout his preaching career, the phrase "eternal youth" keeps popping up. Takakura had found a phrase that embodied the religious life and vigour he strongly embraced, and the fact that someone who would be placed on a much different spot on most theological spectra than he himself would be in no sense prevented Takakura from utilising such a vital expression of faith.

Relative to Luther and Calvin, Takakura draws upon their respective "sola fide" and "sola Deo gloria" as essential condensations of their thought, rather than blindly adopting either "Lutheran’-ism’" or "Calvin’-ism’." This point is critical in light

---

253 This is Takakura’s own description in FK. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.203, Part III, p.291.

254 Oshio, pp.48-49.

255 Takakura gave these lectures in early 1919 (Taisho 8), after moving back to Tokyo from Sapporo. Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," p.92.


258 It is pertinent to note that Takakura’s earlier interest in Catholicism for input into Christianity’s overall relationship with civilisation continued into later years as well. Cf. his 28 May 1931 (Showa 6) letter, Zenshu, Vol.10, "Shokan," p.123.

259 Cf. Part III, p.288. In his commentary-type lectures on Galatians, Takakura naturally refers frequently to Luther. Within those lectures, Takakura points out Luther’s and Calvin’s distinguishing emphases on salvation with the terms "personal" ("shiji") and "public" ("koji"), or subjective and objective. Zenshu, Vol.7, p.86.
of the fact that Takakura became known as the person who introduced Calvinism to Japan.\textsuperscript{260} It is thus important to note that Takakura did not seriously deal with Calvin until going to Britain, which was \textit{after} he had first grasped Luther’s “fundamental thought.”\textsuperscript{261} Moreover, even while in Britain and directly admiring Calvinism’s “incomparable power” for transforming daily life, Takakura expressed his doubts about its application to Japan.\textsuperscript{262} Furthermore, after returning to Japan, Takakura specifically distanced himself from the perception that he was "unconditionally even madly in love"\textsuperscript{263} with Calvin, or that he was a "Calvinist.” Rather, his expressed intent was to offer Christ as expressed by the Reformers within the continuing stream of the prophetic, evangelical religion of the Bible.\textsuperscript{264}

Insofar as Takakura saw himself as swimming in that same stream, he thus also flowed to and past Mackintosh, Paterson, von Hügel, Troeltsch, and Oman during his British sojourn. But on his continuing journey, Takakura selectively retained these men’s respective emphases on the "general idea of theology," "Calvinistic Evangelicalism," grace, "historical intuition," and "piety of the Old Testament prophets."\textsuperscript{265} Perhaps it was the speed of his journey that would not allow

\textsuperscript{260}Sato, 1992, p.73.

\textsuperscript{261}Cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.204,206ff. It was while he was still in Sapporo that Takakura wrote in 1917 (Taisho 6) his "Luta no Konpon Shiso" ("Luther’s Fundamental Thought"). This has been reproduced in Chosakushu, Vol.3, pp.267-276. The essay begins, "The kernel of all of Luther’s religious thought is exhausted in the one verse, ‘justified through faith alone’." Emphases original.

\textsuperscript{262}Takakura makes these remarks within his series on Catholicism. "Katorishizumu ni kansuru Kyomi" Fukun Shinpo No.1460, 21 June 1923 (Taisho 12), p.4; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.232-234.

\textsuperscript{263}“mujoken...maitte shimatte de mo iru"

\textsuperscript{264}Oncho to Shomei--Oncho to Shomei Hashigaki," in Oncho to Shomei, p.2; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.36. Cf. Sato, 1992, p.73.

\textsuperscript{265}Cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.208,211,223,226,228,231,244-248; Part III, pp.361-362. Takakura’s consonant attraction to Oman’s "Personal Idealism" should not be missed here as another distinct possibility of an important, retained emphasis. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.246(n.217), above, Part IV, p.405(n.173).

Relative to Troeltsch--any criticism of whom we have yet to encounter--
Takakura much time to stay with any one thinker for too long. Certainly, barriers of language and culture were critical in preventing Takakura from adopting whatever systems his Western counterparts might have embraced. Nevertheless, Takakura’s intuitive sense of what he shared with these thinkers in their common searches for authority and for helpful philosophical assumptions enabled him to make meaningful selections.

Before moving to consider Takakura’s thought in relation to certain theological topics, we first must address his relationship to two thinkers with whom he frequently has been linked, Karl Barth and P.T. Forsyth. As for Barth, it has already been pointed out how Takakura in no uncertain terms resisted being classified as Barthian. Moreover, the clear evidence of Takakura’s reading and writing is that he recognised Barth as a leader amongst crisis theologians, yet personally drew from him no more than any of the others. In fact, not only is Takakura’s early preference

Takakura did not uncritically accept just everything. For example, with regard to "Grundprobleme der Ethik," Takakura expressed his personal preference for Schweitzer’s handling of "the problem of religion and culture." Referring generally to Philosophy of Civilisation, Takakura cites Schweitzer’s advocacy of an "ethical mysticism" and a "spirit of self-sacrifice" as civilisation’s only adequate foundation. Takakura explains how in his "solution to the problem of civilisation" Schweitzer takes after Calvinism, which has its own "ethical mysticism" by way of "ethicising, through the idea of vocation, electing grace." Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.18-19; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.21. Reproduced in Oshio, p.121.

As to the importance of Schweitzer’s works to Takakura, there is some difference of opinion. On the one hand, Oshio remarks that Takakura read Schweitzer (in English) to much benefit over the next three years. Charles Germany as well argues for Schweitzer’s importance, placing him alongside Calvin as the "influences...central in keeping Takakura’s mind open to the issue of Christianity’s responsibility to the world around him." Sato, however, claims that Schweitzer’s input was not that significant for Takakura’s "intellectual journey." Oshio, pp.144-145; Germany, pp.113-114; Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.462. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.260(n.271).

266 Cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.248-259.

267 To add to evidence already cited--and to confirm that Takakura did not change in his later years--in May, 1933 (Showa 8), Takakura writes to one of his students that he is praying fervently that the student will study Luther and Calvin as opposed to Barth: "After all, as a theology I think that Barth is unhealthy in terms of its faith content." 22 May 1933 letter, Zenshu, Vol.10, "Shokan," p.111.
for Brunner unequivocal, but citations in both FK and Takakura’s dogmatics lectures suggest a stronger, more direct "influence" from the relatively anonymous Vollrath than from Barth.268

Just as Forsyth came to be termed a "Barthian before Barth" only after Barth’s influence had begun to permeate the mid-twentieth century theological world,269 so has Takakura been classified by that same phrase.270 Yet if the connection with Barth were as strong as such a label suggests, not only would Takakura’s students not have left him in the early 1930’s (from around Showa 7) for Barthian theology, they also would not have criticised him so severely from their newly-embraced Barthian perspectives.271 Their example, coupled with the extensive evidence cited earlier, leads this thesis to take the position that Takakura’s thought should not be categorised from within a Barthian theological framework that can only see through its own spectacles.

Instead, we should believe Takakura when he says he has received help from a

268Cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.263-266; Part III, 361-364. In Takakura’s dogmatics lectures, K. Barth is mentioned twice (both times in reference to the same quotation), whereas P. Barth and T. Barth are each mentioned once; Vollrath is mentioned four times. As to number of works included in the numerous bibliographies, K. Barth’s writings appear four times, Vollrath’s five. Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.19,53,71,72,125,162, 177,184,185, Vol.9, pp.678,785,857,859,864,877,1017,1019.

269Sato, Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.464. Apparently, the phrase "Barthian before Barth" was coined in 1933, and in reference to Forsyth. A recent analyst begins his article, which considers the validity of the label, by asserting that both Barth and Forsyth would have immediately rejected "the allegation contained in it." John Thompson, "Was Forsyth Really a Barthian Before Barth?," in Trevor Hart, ed., Justice the True and Only Mercy: Essays on the Life and Theology of Peter Taylor Forsyth. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995, p.237(n.1).

270Cf., e.g., Lande’s uses of the descriptive phrase "pre-Barthian Takakura," as well as the statement, "...Takakura Tokutaro developed a Protestant Reformed theology of a Barthian type...." Lande, 1989, pp.99,101,115.

number of different contemporary German thinkers, of whom Karl Barth was just one relatively minor figure.\textsuperscript{272} Moreover, we should understand him doing so in a way similar to his selectively utilising Western theologians' key insights 	extit{for his own purposes} and 	extit{within his own non-Western tradition}. Thus Takakura can pick up on Vollrath's, Brunner's, and Holl's respective emphases on "Word," "crisis," and "conscience," because those ideas find some consonance with his own thoughts on the gospel, self-denial, and duty.\textsuperscript{273} However, just because Takakura encountered some of these terms not long before writing \textit{FK}, we should not therefore conclude that their appearance in that work shows an overwhelming influence by crisis theology—and therefore by Barth.\textsuperscript{274} Rather, an interpretation consistent with the pattern of his use of other writers points in the direction of Takakura's "passing through" Vollrath and others for the sake of his own "Evangelical Christianity."\textsuperscript{275}

\textsuperscript{272}Barth's name sometimes pops up within Takakura's casual lists of contemporary Swiss and German thinkers, but at other times Barth's name does not appear at all. For example, in a 1932 (Showa 7) magazine article on crisis theology, the only name mentioned is Brunner's, in connection with the translation of his writings. "Kinki Shingaku ni tsuite" ("Concerning Crisis Theology") 	extit{Fukuin to Gendai} No.15, June, 1932 (Showa 7), p.1; 	extit{Chosakushu}, Vol.3, pp.394-396. Cf. Part III, p.291(n.78).

\textsuperscript{273}Cf. Part III, p.361(n.416). How these ideas might have fit into Takakura's development will be pointed out as the discussion ensues.

\textsuperscript{274}Sato Shigehiko's blistering criticism of \textit{FK} attempts to link Takakura with Barth through the phrase "Wholly Other." However, Takakura had been using that expression for years, apparently before he had ever encountered dialectical theology. Thus not only does the attempt to classify Takakura as "Barthian" through word association fail due to Takakura's typical use of others' expressions: he had termed God as "das ganz Andere" via some other German "influence." Cf. Takakura's 1923 (Taisho 12) "Oncho to Kito" ("Grace and Prayer"), in \textit{Oncho to Shinsjitsu}, p.179; 	extit{Chosakushu}, Vol.1, p.148. Cf. Part III, p.363, above, Part IV, pp.397(n.136),407.

\textsuperscript{275}One analyst states, "The emerging neo-orthodox theology in Europe under the influence of which he spent his formative years was an appropriate vehicle for expressing Takakura's own 'evangelical Christian thought' in Japan." Matsuoka, 1978, p.68. The thesis can accept the view that Takakura used neo-orthodox theology as a vehicle for expressing his own thought; however, in no sense did Takakura spend "his formative years" under crisis theology's influence.

Similarly, Germany's emphasis on the "influence" of Western thinkers on Takakura must be criticised. Rather than seeing a "dominant and lasting influence" of Forsyth, for example, the thesis prefers Germany's occasional references to the
With the understanding that some of FK’s ideas are common to Barth as well, this discussion can thus tolerate the following type of statement: "As he said things about Christian revelation similar to statements by Karl Barth, he is called a ‘pre-Barthian’."\(^{276}\) Preferable is one contemporary’s observation that Takakura was not converted by dialectical theology, but that he "discovered...a comrade-in-arms."\(^{277}\) But in any case, to proceed to classify Takakura in an unqualified way as "pre-Barthian"\(^{278}\) is both misleading and unfair to Takakura himself.

Takakura’s relationship with Forsyth undoubtedly was more extensive than with Barth; indeed, Takakura had more affinity with Forsyth than with any other single Western theologian. Examining how Takakura drew upon Forsyth’s thought will thus necessarily spill over into the following sections, but here we can at least sketch some of the reasons for why Takakura found Forsyth to be "filled with insight that has conviction, and burning with evangelical faith."\(^{279}\)

Uemura is the first place to look for a connecting link between Takakura and Forsyth: he directed his students towards such Scottish thinkers as Forsyth, Denney, and Dale.\(^{280}\) Also, Forsyth’s and Takakura’s similar experiences of family bereavement and personal illness may have contributed to an intangible feeling of consonance. A mutual interest in things German—particularly theology expressed in the German language—points to another well from which the two men both

\(^{276}\)Lande, 1989, p.87.

\(^{277}\)"...senyu...o hakkensareta...." Fukuda, 1934 (Showa 9), p.154.

\(^{278}\)Regrettably, this leap is taken by Lande and other second-hand analysts within their otherwise helpful survey works. Cf. above, Part IV, p.424(n.270).

\(^{279}\)Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.231.

drank.\textsuperscript{281} More than focusing on these supporting factors, however, we must see the gist of the affinity Takakura sensed for Forsyth in the \textit{life, certainty, and vitality} in the fiery Scotsman's firm grasp of "the core of biblical, evangelical Christianity." In Forsyth, Takakura found a kindred heart aflame with passion, "filled with positive faith."\textsuperscript{282}

Related to the mutual stress on a "\textit{healthy, strong, and true} Evangelical Christianity"\textsuperscript{283} is a similarity in style of presentation. Both Forsyth and Takakura were preachers, and their writings--many of which are transcribed sermons or lectures--make particular appeal to the reader's heart. Moreover, both men's styles of argument share a "distrust of the ultimate viability of the rational for theology, as well as an emphasis on the ethical-personal."\textsuperscript{284} One can therefore see Takakura's "faith logic" and "antirational" consciousness in the following type of statement by Forsyth:

Christian faith is a mass of contradictions and a glorious tissue of harmony. It is easy to make it seem ridiculous to common sense. But it is fatal for religion to appeal to common sense.

Our faith is faith in a Christ who is and who is not, in a dead man who is our living God, in the living God who died, in one who was humiliated into eternal exaltation, who in extremest weakness realized and revealed the supreme power of heaven and earth.\textsuperscript{285}

This sort of remark and warning to "beware of clearness, consistency, and simplicity, especially about Christ"\textsuperscript{286} appears throughout Forsyth's writings, as we have also

\textsuperscript{281}Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.250.


\textsuperscript{283}Cf. Part III, p 343.

\textsuperscript{284}Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.256.


\textsuperscript{286}Forsyth, \textit{The Person and Place of Jesus Christ}, 1909, p.71.
seen with Takakura. The summary reflection of FK which sees it employing a "'focused attack' type of presentation" can be said of Forsyth's style as well.

Finally, both thinkers' passing through Ritschl is an important point to be noted. For one thing, this suggests a similar metaphysical and epistemological matrix within which Takakura could meet Forsyth and other theologians he encountered in Britain. But the crucial factor of timing for Takakura's meeting with Forsyth's writings while he was in Oxford comes to the fore here. Takakura was just coming out of his passage through Ritschl's elliptical kingdom of God, so he naturally would have found an echo in Forsyth's words uniting the two foci in the Cross:

The doctrine of Christianity as an ellipse, with its two centres of the Kingdom and the Cross, will not hold good. If we speak of two centres they must represent the two great categories for interpreting the Cross--Reconciliation and Redemption, which pass but do not fade into each other. We have but the one centre of the Cross for the Kingdom, for the new humanity, and for its ethic.

Moreover, Takakura must have been further amazed upon reading his own retained-from-Ritschl emphasis on the "historic Christ" in Forsyth. To state the matter within the thesis' running theological posture, God brought Forsyth at a point where Takakura was ready to have his "Eastern way of seeing [further] renewed by Western


288 In light of the thesis' recognition of the importance of Mahayana thought patterns for Takakura, it is intriguing at least to note Forsyth's occasional references to Buddhism in his writings. Cf., e.g., Forsyth, 1910, p.171; Forsyth, Principle of Authority, 1912, pp.27,205,233.

289 Cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.252-256.

290 It is interesting to recall here Takakura's purchasing several books concerned with the kingdom of God during his summer, 1922 (Taisho 11), trip to Germany. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.215(n.91).

291 Forsyth, 1907, p.223.

292 Cf., e.g., Forsyth, 1957, pp.83ff., above, Part IV, p.419.
Having thus scanned Takakura’s interaction with a variety of Western theologians, and with the mention of Christological and soteriological themes, it is now time to consider some central theological topics.

2. Takakura and Selected Theological Topics

The thesis’ frequent use of a description of Nishida Kitaro’s thought in order to characterise Takakura’s "Eastern way of seeing renewed by Western thought" must not be allowed to overshadow the similar applicability of the second part of that quotation, namely a "Western way of thinking renewed by an Eastern way of seeing...."294 That is, just as for Nishida, Ogai, and countless other Japanese thinkers of Meiji and Taisho Japan, Takakura’s own thinking undoubtedly took on some of the qualities of Western thought--albeit in "renewed" form. Hence just as the thesis has disavowed any a priori commitment to an underlying, religious experience that was causally determinative for Takakura’s thought, the correlative importance of Western "concepts, grammatical rules, and linguistic practices" must be given their due weight.295 For Takakura, there was a very real infiltration into his Japanese cultural and linguistic thought of both English and German theological ideas. The challenges presented to him thus were not restricted to phoneticisation of foreign words:296 the very fabric of his thought increasingly came to have different types of interwoven thread, to the point of at least challenging the base pattern of his ever-developing, *Japanese Christian* identity.

The intensity of that challenge increased when Takakura went to Britain. To be sure, Britain and the rest of Europe were reeling from the Great War, and much of the Church was groping for authority and intellectual stability. Nevertheless, the Scottish

---

293 Cf. above, Part IV, p.418.


295 Cf. above, Part IV, p.369.

and English versions of European Christendom with which Takakura linguistically and culturally "collided" first-hand still gave a powerful, intellectual punch to any outsider seeking to penetrate its defences. As even P.T. Forsyth, Takakura’s theological kinsman, asserted just before the turn of the century:

There is a Europe, there is a Christendom which does not appear in the newspapers, even in the religious press.... It is of vast, silent, spreading influence. It is the Europe, the Christendom of Faith—the civilization of the Spirit, the true Church of the heart and soul. That is the Europe, the America, that makes the real difference from the past, the real promise for the future. It is the Europe that most directly owns the influence of Christ in its heart, its conduct, its faith, and its hope, in life private and public.²⁹⁷

For Takakura to enter that mutually assumed "Christendom of Faith" meant exposure to the threat of self-capitulation in terms of any viable, non-Western theological expression.

It is not surprising, then, that Takakura’s readings in Western theology before leaving Japan would be seen as the "sprout of a leaning towards writings of theology proper."²⁹⁸ It is also no wonder that Takakura recognises Mackintosh--the first Western theologian under whom he studied--as having taught him the "general idea of theology."²⁹⁹ Also, as Sato describes Takakura’s "growth" while in Britain, "He changed from Takakura as an individual seeker to Takakura as a theologian."³⁰⁰

As the particular, developing Japanese theologian that he was,³⁰¹ then, how did

²⁹⁷Forsyth, 1957, p.83; cf. above, Part IV, p.423(n.266).
²⁹⁸Emphasis mine. Oshio, p.60.
²⁹⁹Cf. above, Part IV, p.422.
³⁰¹Or, in his own words concerning reconciling the immanent-present and the transcendent-eschatological sides of the kingdom of God, "I have an interest not as a so-called problem of theology, but as it comes with its important relationship to one’s [or ‘the self’s’] faith problems." "Kami no Kuni ni Kansuru Kosatsu sono Ta" Fukui Shinpo No.1390, 16 February 1922 (Taisho 11), p.7; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.198.
Takakura articulate certain theological topics? The fact that his first "proper" theological mentor was Mackintosh suggests beginning our considerations with Christology: this was Mackintosh's particular area of expertise, as well as an area in Takakura's theology recognised to carry Mackintosh's influence.\footnote{Cf. Part II. ch.2, p.208, Part III, p.362.}

\textbf{a. Christology}

The overall outlines of Takakura's chapter on Christology in \textit{FK} and of Mackintosh's \textit{The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ} follow a similar three-stage progression from New Testament to doctrinal history to a suggested, "Reconstructive" Christology.\footnote{Mackintosh, 1913, "Contents"; cf. Part III, p.303. Takakura's dogmatics lectures on Christology follow a similar pattern, although they divide the historical theology section into early church and modern. \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.8, pp.5-6, Vol.9, p.1.} There are common emphases as well, for example the pitfalls of philosophical speculation, and Christ's \textit{historical} nature.\footnote{Mackintosh, 1913, pp.2,130-132,140,187,223,226,237,298-300, Ch.II of the "Reconstructive Statement," "Christology and the Historic Christ", pp.306-320; cf. Part III, pp.304,309-310. The meaning for Takakura of \textit{historical} Christ should become clearer as the discussion ensues.} But within such shared emphases there are striking differences, too. Thus while distancing their Christological formulations from rationalist tendencies, both Takakura and Mackintosh still dare to throw their metaphysical hats--but into different rings. For Takakura, the ultimate Christological reality to which we "must trace back" our faith is Jesus' "matchless Self-awareness of being the Son";\footnote{Cf. Part III, pp.305,310.} in Mackintosh's case, "Between the ethical and the metaphysical view of Christ...there is no final antagonism. The ethical, when taken as ultimately true, is the metaphysical...."\footnote{Emphasis original. Interestingly, Mackintosh explicitly refers to Forsyth both as having demonstrated the essential "moralising of dogma," and as having written of Christ's "Self-Realisation" in "deeply suggestive" words. Mackintosh, 1913, pp.302-304,502.} As to the common stress on Christ's historical nature, their respective enemies, and thus supporting arguments, are different. For Takakura, the combatants to be
overcome are static-fatalistic views of reality and a vague subjectivism;\textsuperscript{307} for Mackintosh, the history of Christological formulation demonstrates that focusing on Christ as a historical figure helps ward off errant speculative ventures.\textsuperscript{308}

Traditionally, "the real problem of Christology" has been explaining the relationship between Christ's humanity and divinity.\textsuperscript{309} Mackintosh tackles the issue by arguing that the Chalcedonian theory of Christ's two natures is no longer adequate, and he suggests the union of divine and human will in Christ as a more suitable, modern ethical route to pursue.\textsuperscript{310} Takakura explicitly follows Mackintosh's lead in defining and approaching the traditional problem, but he does so relatively briefly and almost as an appendix to the more central parts of his Christological arguments. That is, to the extent that he seeks to explain the "superrational, deep mystery"\textsuperscript{311} of the relationship of Christ's divinity and humanity, he does so by tracing some of Forsyth's kenotic ideas, and then ending up at Jesus' Self-awareness of His Sonship\textsuperscript{312}--the ultimate Christological reality. But Takakura had already arrived at the same destination via his own "renewed" thinking path of "faith logic," and within a "religious attitude" towards Jesus. Beginning with the central, objective, historical fact of Christ, and coupled with the recognition of Jesus' "musical" personality whereby He combined/combines contrasting pairs of characteristics, Takakura could concur from the heart with the early disciples' distinguishing

\textsuperscript{307}Cf. Part III, pp.304,309-310. Earlier in his thinking as a Christian, Takakura stresses the Christ of experience over the Christ of history to combat what he sees as Ritschlian and deistic tendencies towards a static Christology. How this fits into his developing theology will be addressed later. "Shukyo ni Okeru Keni" Fukuin Shinpo No.910, 5 December 1912 (Taisho 1), p.5; Zenshu, Vol.4, pp.54-55.

\textsuperscript{308}op.cit., pp.130 132,226,236.

\textsuperscript{309}Emphasis mine. Hagglund, 1966, p.89.

\textsuperscript{310}op.cit., pp.292ff.

\textsuperscript{311}FK, p.83; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.363.

\textsuperscript{312}Cf. Part III, pp.310-311; Zenshu, Vol.9, pp.613-632.
It is helpful here to speak in a more overall fashion about Takakura's Christology. Just as in working through Ritschl's idea of the kingdom of God, Takakura personally had to take on as a genuine, real problem the relationship between Christ's two natures. But just as he had "subjugated" Ritschl's two foci model, so too was Takakura able intuitively to "submerge [Christological] distinctions between subjectivity and objectivity" which had arisen within the history of Western doctrinal formulations. Dealing with the "superrational mystery" of Christ's two natures had become important to Takakura the theologian. But Takakura the Christian thinker had already been articulating the harmonious, musical Christ Whom he worshipped. Moreover, for years Takakura had been wrestling with his inner, sinful self: "colliding" in mutual self-/Self-awareness with the sinless Son of God had thus given hope and encouragement. Takakura's amalgamation of concerns thus may not have resulted in a Christology articulated as neatly as we might like. Nevertheless, because of who Takakura was—and because he was travelling on his "Road of Necessity"--both Mahayana harmonising and finding relief from his sinful self had to enter into Takakura's Christological teachings which he articulated on behalf of the Church.

---

313Cf. Part III, pp.303-305.
314Cf. above, Part IV, p.419.
315This is the main theme of Takakura's 1918 (Taisho 7) "Iesu no Jinkaku niokeru Kaicho" ("Harmony in Jesus' Personality"), in Oncho no Okoku, pp.40-61. This message begins with a brief acknowledgement of the importance of intellectually formulated Christology. However, Takakura then stresses the more critical need to know Jesus' personality in our spirits, just as Mary of Bethany knew Him (pp.40-42).
316Emphasis mine. Ibid., pp.57-60.
318Noting here Takakura's comments on Romans 1:4 is instructive. He first lists three possible interpretations for "according to the spirit of holiness": [1] the Holy Spirit; [2] Christ's divinity, according to a "metaphysical" meaning; and, [3] Christ's perfect ethical spirit as a human. Takakura opts for the third interpretation: "Jesus as a human, while having the same feelings and desires as us, was sinless." Takakura
b. Justification and Sanctification

The discussion just completed leads us to consider two areas in which Takakura’s thought has been charged as having been "unsettled," namely ecclesiology and the relationship between justification and sanctification.\(^{319}\) To take up the second topic first, it is enlightening to note that the theologian who has written about Takakura’s justification-sanctification problem, Yamamoto Kano,\(^{320}\) is one of the students who left Takakura for Barth in the early 1930’s,\(^{321}\) and then later came to be characterised as a "consistent Barthian."\(^{322}\) Mentioning such is not intended to dismiss the alleged problem with an ad hominem argument; rather, it is to help understand the glasses through which Takakura’s thought has been viewed.

In his article revealingly entitled "From Takakura Tokutarō to Barth,"\(^{323}\) Yamamoto summarises "the unsolved problem of Takakura Theology" as follows: "Only through faith alone, sanctification was dissolved within 'justification'. Justification automatically, naturally and necessarily manufactures a holy moral will and good works." Yet the continuing struggle with sin testifies otherwise, and hence

also stresses the meaning of Christ’s sinlessness in verse four’s phrase, "the Son of God." Chosakushu, Vol.5, pp.62-63.

Thus instead of seeing in the contrasting parallels between verses three and four what "has been most frequently interpreted as referring to the differing aspects of or elements in the constitution of the person of the Saviour," Takakura is driven by his personal struggle with the sinful self to read Paul as emphasising Christ’s sinlessness. John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. One vol. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1968, p.6.

\(^{319}\) Cf. above, Part IV, pp.393-394(n.123).


\(^{321}\) Cf. above, Part IV, p.424.


\(^{323}\) Yamamoto Kano, "Takakura Tokutarō kara Baruto he" Fukuin to Sekai No.5, 1956, pp.61-62. Note that this brief piece was written eight years after Yamamoto’s more lengthy series of articles on Takakura’s theology of sanctification. Cf. n.320 above.
Takakura’s position in the end becomes an illusion. Further summary of Takakura’s difficulty shows an accompanying problem in his having had to posit a "continual justification or regeneration" when he recognised "the continuation of sin in earthly life." 

Yamamoto’s own testimony is that Barth’s theology gave him the "conquest of the paradox hidden within Takakura’s theology." In particular, Barth taught him "theology’s Christological substance, character, and method," namely "the unique secret of [theology’s] dual character, ‘true God and true human’." Yamamoto could then understand, "Sanctification is not a gradual progress of becoming holy, but the same sinner increasingly sinks deeply into, and is seized into the depth of, God’s claiming authority.

Citing Yamamoto here is not in order to interact with his understanding of sanctification, but instead to illuminate Takakura’s thought by contrast. Basically, a "justification and sanctification" paradigm is not a major one for Takakura. To be sure, just as with other theological concerns, Takakura has to take on these categories within his own thought. And he in fact deals with them in terms accurately represented by Yamamoto’s descriptions. But what a closer examination shows is that Takakura’s more basic, underlying categories are "faith and morality" rather than "justification and sanctification." This helps to explain why Yamamoto cannot quote from any of Takakura’s writings on justification or sanctification--because there are none! Instead, Yamamoto has to cite some of Takakura’s works dealing with the "self," "grace," "morality," and "Calvin," as well as FK, which itself has sections on "faith and morality" and "faith and love," but on neither justification nor

---

324 Ibid., p.62.
325 Germany, pp.119-120.
326 Emphasis original. op.cit.
sanctification.327

One can see how the "justification and sanctification" scheme had to fit into more fundamental "faith and morality" categories upon considering Takakura's long, running struggle with the self/Self.338 As noted earlier, on the background of studies in Kant and other Western ethics,329 there was a progression from questions of identity to wrestlings with sin.330 There then followed an interest in "Christianity's objective, ethical side," i.e., civilisation.331 In breaking through to the Cross of the historic Christ-Self, Takakura encountered both the objective solution to his tragic inner dualism, as well as the subjective certainty of the solution to the


328 This point is evident in Takakura's comments on Romans 6-8, a section he labels in his commentary the "Doctrine of Sanctification." For example, Takakura's basic "faith-morality" distinction is seen in his calling justification the "religious side of Christ's work of salvation," and sanctification its "ethical side" (emphases mine). He notes the "difficult problem" of the nature of the "fundamental relationship" between justification and sanctification. Nevertheless, he appeals to Paul's (and thus to his own) "self's experience" ("jiko no keiken") as foundational. Moreover, in offering his own interpretation of Paul's understanding of the relationship between justification and sanctification, Takakura notes that one must not separate them "abstractly, logically." In their "intimate, organic relationship," the "first step of sanctification is already contained within justification." In his own concrete, experiential faith logic, Takakura also asserts that the two are "both sides of the same experience." Chosakushu, Vol.5, pp.198-201,207.


331 Cf. above, Part IV, p.404.
world's ethical dilemma. All along, it was religious faith in the musical Christ that was submerging differences between objective and subjective, holy and sinful, and more recently acquired ideas of one-time and continuing justification and sanctification.332

In sum, it is apparent that in Yamamoto’s case, a Barthian divine-human Christology granted him the "conquest of the paradox hidden within Takakura’s theology." Takakura, however, was harmonising paradoxical distinctions as he was "compelled by the soul’s logic of necessity."333

c. Ecclesiology

This leads us to Takakura’s other alleged "unsettled" theological area, namely ecclesiology. To enter this topic, it is helpful to keep in mind the previous discussion’s summation concerning contrasting logics, as well as to bring Forsyth back into the picture. As noted earlier, it was as Takakura was submerging the Ritschlian distinction between God’s kingdom and the atonement that Forsyth came to Takakura with his similar emphases on the Cross and the historic Christ.334 Together with those confirming ideas, Forsyth brought to Takakura some powerful notions of the Church.335 Thus as it turned out, even though Takakura was unable

332It is here that Unuma’s focus on taking an ethical, rather than an explicitly theological, approach serves her and us well. She mentions the problem of justification and sanctification that Takakura encountered as a Protestant thinker, but she then goes on to describe how Takakura dealt with the difficulty in his own terms and categories. Unuma, 1988, pp.202ff.

333Cf. above, Part IV, p.389-390. A criticism of another alleged "fundamental problem" in Takakura’s thought--not unlike Yamamoto’s both in terms of type and Takakura’s "submerging conquest" of it--is made by Kato Tsuneaki. Professor Kato notes Takakura’s equation of inner necessity and true freedom, expressed for example in the work just cited, "Road of Necessity." Kato, 1972, p.341. As would be expected, however, Takakura notes that true freedom comes only with the "necessity" that occurs "when grasped by God’s love." "Kami no Ai to Kami he no Ai," in Kami no Ai to Kami he no Ai, p.45; Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.191.

334Cf. above, Part IV, p.428.

335Takakura describes this as the second area in which Forsyth taught him deeply. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.238.
to continue to develop his "problem of culture" after returning to Japan, he did have a replacement interest in the world beyond himself, which was the Church.336

Before allowing Forsyth all the way into the foreground of Takakura’s thought, however, we must look at Takakura’s own developing ideas of the Church. At the outset, it is pertinent to recall Kumano Yoshitaka’s criticism of Takakura’s ecclesiology as being "unsettled." The opinion of this thesis writer is that, insofar as Professor Kumano neglects Takakura’s "soul [Mahayana] logic" and thought development, the counter-criticism of "unkindness" is justified.337 Kumano’s characterisation of Takakura’s notion of the Church is that of a holy fellowship, the purpose of which is to overcome egoism. Kumano’s two-fold critique then is that [1] calling the Church a fellowship "is no more than a ‘tautology’ as a theological theory," and [2] such an ecclesiology is actually "pre-ecclesiology."

Clearly, this criticism views Takakura from within a later, more "theologically developed" position. Moreover, Kumano fails to account for either the dynamic of Takakura’s struggle with the self/Self reviewed earlier, or the corresponding development in Takakura’s ecclesiological articulations. This failure will become apparent as we now consider Takakura’s developing ecclesiology.

Within Takakura’s entire corpus of writings, ecclesiology does not make up a sizeable portion.339 Yet the explicit treatments of the subject that he does offer extend over a wide time period, including most stages of Takakura’s ministerial


337 Cf. above, Part IV, p.393(n.120).


Moreover, the importance of the Church for his thought only begins to unfold upon examining these writings. In this regard, keeping in mind Takakura’s correlative venture with the self/Self is important: the eventual coming together of Takakura’s ecclesiology and struggle with the self/Self is critical.

During his pre-Britain Christian years, Takakura speaks rather tentatively about the Church, more or less trying to articulate its meaning and component parts. It is as if he is wanting to understand, along with his parishioners in Sapporo, what they as a church are doing, and why they are doing it. Hence Takakura first takes up their most obvious activity, public worship. Besides listing the different, concrete activities in a worship service, Takakura describes worship’s basic meaning as [1] man’s deepest longing to ascribe worth to the one true Creator God; plus, [2] in that it has the dual aspects of God’s Self-revelation and of man’s attitude, worshipping the one true God has an "important relationship" to God’s Self-revelation in His only Son, the incarnate Christ. Takakura then describes the Church in a more all-encompassing way, i.e., as centred and founded on Christ, as a fellowshipping family-type of body, a worshipping body, a place for nourishing believers’ faith, and a body


341 This is what the earlier examination of Takakura’s thought development classified as his second period; cf. above, Part IV, pp.385-399.

342 "Reihai no Igi" Fukuin Shinpo Nos.995,996, 23,30 July 1914 (Taisho 3), pp.6,3-5 (quotation from No.996, p.3); Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.297-309 (quotation from p.301).
called to serve the rest of society, particularly by preaching the gospel.343

By his later years, however, Takakura is no longer tentative but emphatic in his declarations on the Church’s "meaning" and "essence":

What is Christ’s Church? It is the body of believers created by the Word, that is the gospel, of God the Father, the Lord of heaven and earth... The Church is the historical body of believers created by the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that which bears the calling to realise God’s kingdom.344

There is no doubt now for Takakura about what the Church is, what it is to do, and why. He has come to know with conviction that "The Church is not simply an organisation, nor a vague, religious body. It is the body realised within history through God’s will revealed in the gospel."345 He still senses the need to mention and describe component parts of worship and overall activity.346 But these are now based on the conviction of the Church’s relationship with the gospel, its holy fellowship, and its nature as God’s chosen people.347

What has happened, of course, to move Takakura from uncertainty to certainty, from surface-level observation to insightful conviction, is the crystallisation of his


344Emphases original. These are the respective beginnings of Takakura’s 1929 (Showa 4) and 1932 (Showa 7) articles. "Kyokai no Igi," in Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.247; "Kyokai no Honshitsu" Fukuin to Gendai No.16, July, 1932, p.70 (Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.262).


347These are the three sections of the bulk of "Kyokai no Honshitsu" Fukuin to Gendai No.16, July, 1932 (Showa 7), pp.70-79; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.262-275.
"Evangelical Christianity" soon after his return to Japan from Britain. It was together with the newly-formed Toyama Church that this significant change occurred; remembering that fact should help us ground Takakura's ecclesiology in his concrete church experience. At the same time, noting what he wrote towards the beginning of his second year in Britain, i.e., shortly after settling into a solitary life of reading and reflection in Oxford, gives us an important insight into Takakura's developing ecclesiology.

What is particularly striking about Takakura's 1922 (Taisho 11) essay on "The History of the Idea of the Church and its Meaning"—especially in comparison to his previous, shorter pieces composed in Sapporo—is suggested by the title, particularly the word history. The most obvious way this interest in things historical, or his "historical intuition," manifests itself is the survey Takakura gives of the idea of the Church as it developed from the Old Testament prophets through Luther and Calvin. After suggesting that his readers would then be able to perceive from that survey the essence of the Church, Takakura gives his own ecclesiological summary: "Christ's Church is the body of believers built through the fellowship of faith in Christ as the head and centre; the preserver of the gospel; the organ of performing Christ's will." His ensuing comments include stressing the organic unity of the Church's fellowship as a "body which has taken on Christ's name"; Takakura also notes the process of believers coming into the Church, which was itself created by God's gracious revelation and continually bears the calling to proclaim


349Using the phrase "historical intuition" suggests Troeltsch's eventual input; cf. Part III, p.226. Takakura finished the essay in early December. His diary entry at the end of the year lists some books that he had found particularly helpful throughout 1922 (Taisho 11). Neither von Hügel, Troeltsch, nor Forsyth appears, suggesting that their important works came later and--insofar as they dealt with historical matters at least--in more confirming and clarifying ways rather than instructing or "influencing." Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.195-196.


351"kirisuto no na o obita dantai"
that same revelation to later generations.352

In the midst of making this latter, cumbersome comment, Takakura remarks, "There really is an intimate relationship between the gospel and the Church." This type of remark is Takakura's budding formulation of what is crucial and new in terms of his "historical ecclesiological intuition." Earlier in his thinking, Takakura has stressed the Christ of experience in the Church.353 He also has noted the central importance of the historical uniqueness of God's revelation in Christ, thus setting apart Christianity from Buddhism, and in particular Jesus from Amida-Buddha.355 But here in late 1922 (Taisho 11), there is a submerging of his distinctions between the Church's experience and history into a new sense of God's gracious revelation, i.e., the gospel, both within and throughout history, i.e., in the Church. To follow Takakura's "faith logic" to the essay's conclusion, this extension--into all of history--of revelation356 thus becomes the motive for ecumenical efforts: "There must be the perception that the Church is the forerunner and root of the cooperative unity of all things in the world."357 To borrow Takakura's later words, the Church is the

---


353 To say that this intuition is "new" does not discount the fact that the seeds for this "budding formulation" were sown much earlier, e.g., in his research and writing on historical Christian thinkers. Cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.201-204.

354 Cf. above, Part IV, p.433(n.315).

355 E.g., Takakura uses this argument in the essay he wrote en route to Britain in 1921 (Taisho 10) and in his English essay written in Edinburgh. "Omoidazuru Mama" Fukuin Shinpo No.1369, 22 September 1921 (Taisho 10), pp.4-5 (Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.33); cf. above, Part IV, p.375(n.27).

356 According to Takakura's "faith logic," one could perhaps use the word "intuition" just as well as "revelation." This type of correlative pair of ideas will be considered below.

357 "Kyokai ha sekai no subete no mono no kyoryoku itchi no saigiagake, mata hongentaru kakugo ga nakereba naranu." This "cooperative unity of all things in the world" holds the possibility of being an instance of both "The central idea in Buddhist teaching...[i.e.,...the gospel of universal salvation based on the idea of the fundamental oneness of all being] and, as Takakura comments elsewhere, Paul's
"stronghold" or "centre" of God's kingdom.\textsuperscript{358} Thus, relative to Shin Buddhism, not only is Christianity unique because of Jesus' historical status as compared to Amida-Butsu. Now Takakura can say as well that "Christianity's idea of the kingdom of God is fundamentally different from Shin Buddhism's type of Pure Land thought."\textsuperscript{359}

Earlier in the essay there are indications of the direction Takakura's thinking is taking, particularly in regards to revelation throughout history. Towards the beginning of his historical survey, Takakura writes of Jesus' calling and saving the disciples both as individuals and as a body, or as the Church. Next, Takakura explores how the Church as the "holy remnant" and the "new Israel" was the background "secret" of God's revelation to the prophets. "But God's revelation reached its climax in the perfect prophet Jesus, and God calls together the 'new, chosen people' in and through Him." The Church, redeemed by Christ's blood and bound together by His Spirit, then continues the propagation of the message, i.e., the Church "continues" the Incarnation. But even Takakura finds this progression too much to sort out at that time, calling it "a thing of profoundly deep meaning" before getting back to his survey.\textsuperscript{360}

Perhaps we can take some solace amidst our perplexity relative to this "soul logic," or "submerging of distinctions," by remembering that things were not clear to Takakura himself at the time, either. What is clear at least is that Takakura was dealing simultaneously with a number of issues, including his ongoing "interreligious

\textsuperscript{358} Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.9, p.718; cf. Part III, p.324(n.229).

\textsuperscript{359} Emphasis mine. "Kyokai Kannen no Enkaku to sono Igi" Seisho no Kensan No.77, April, 1923 (Taisho 12), pp.29-30; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.340.

dialogue" between Christianity and Buddhism.361 There is also his own handling of the intellectual relationships of pairs of "structural elements," e.g., corporate and individual, objective and subjective,362 divine-revelation and prophetic-intuition, eternity and history.363 Of course, all of this is happening within the massive clash of linguistic-cultural, "philosophicotheological" presuppositions which the Japanese Takakura is experiencing in Britain.

At the very least, what Takakura’s developing ecclesiology shows is that Kumano’s criticism of Takakura’s theology as "unsettled" shoots at a totally different target than what our quest to understand Takakura sees as worthy of our aim. The notion of the Church as *revelation within and throughout history* was an essential step in Takakura’s transition from tentatively suggesting in Sapporo, "worshipping the one true God has [only] an ‘important relationship’ to God’s Self-revelation in His only Son, the incarnate Christ," to his *proclaiming* in his later years, "[The Church] is the body realised within history through God’s will revealed in the gospel."364 It was the bridge of *history* that took Takakura from vague uncertainty to insightful conviction concerning the Church’s importance. Apart from examining that transition, not only Takakura’s ecclesiology, but his entire thought as well, will remain a mystery.365

Takakura himself went across the bridge of history; but, it was Forsyth who helped

361We should recall here Takakura’s related self/Self struggle.


363Whether or not Takakura himself actually was "handling" such intellectual relationships does not seem to alter the fact that dealing with them is important for this thesis to explain how he was thinking. The pairs listed here, and other such "structural elements," will be examined in the next section of the thesis, i.e., Part IV-C. Cf. Part III, p.345.


365The importance of Takakura’s notion of history will be further considered below.
him step off onto solid ground. Moreover, Forsyth not only gave Takakura a helping ecclesiological hand: Takakura simultaneously took Forsyth’s guidance in the matter of the atonement as well.\textsuperscript{366} To expand on the imagery, there was the bridge of history connecting Takakura’s earlier and later ecclesiologies. There was a similar bridge connecting Takakura’s earlier and later understandings of the atonement. Moreover, right before their respective ends, these two bridges merged; and, Forsyth was standing just beyond the point of merger to guide Takakura the rest of the way across. Therefore, having traversed Takakura’s ecclesiological bridge to the junction point, we cannot fully understand how Takakura began to bring the Church and the atonement together--and then followed Forsyth’s lead to the other side--without examining the path across the bridge of Takakura’s atonement thinking. We must therefore continue to keep Forsyth in the background of our view and trace the development of Takakura’s view of the atonement.

d. Atonement

Just as an extensive treatment of Takakura’s ecclesiological development would have included the emphasis on the Church modeled for him by Uemura, so too would a complete and thorough analysis of Takakura’s understanding of the atonement include how he heard Uemura’s preaching on the Cross.\textsuperscript{367} Such an analysis would also have to explore what Takakura means when he writes, during his early days as a Christian, of a central concern for the Cross: "The Cross of Christ is none other than the crystallisation of God’s love."\textsuperscript{368} Our present limitations, however, direct us to follow Takakura’s own testimony in looking to what he says was the time of his heightened "experience of the atonement" during his latter years in Sapporo, i.e.,

\textsuperscript{366}Takakura remarks how he learned from Forsyth lessons on "the essence of evangelicalism" and the Church. Cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.231,238.


\textsuperscript{368}Takakura writes this in a letter to a friend during his seminary days, in 1909 (Meiji 42). \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.10, "Shokan," p.104.
from 1917 (Taisho 6).\textsuperscript{369}

In his July sermon entitled "Kami no Omote" ("The Face of God"), Takakura speaks of God's holiness and glory, as seen in the Old Testament descriptions of God's face and in Jesus' Transfiguration. At the time of his conversion, Takakura had wrestled primarily with God's personality and love.\textsuperscript{370} Hence surely it is in self-description of his development that Takakura comments, "This intuition [of God's holy glory], a special characteristic of Christianity, is the place most lacking in the religious consciousness of Japanese people." As a developing Christian thinker, Takakura is finding his true life by confronting God's holiness, leading to an awareness of sin and repentance.\textsuperscript{371}

By the spring of 1918 (Taisho 7),\textsuperscript{372} Takakura's emphases are more on God's grace, the Cross, and salvation by faith as opposed to works.\textsuperscript{373} Takakura here

\textsuperscript{369}Cf. above, Part IV, p.389. In mid-1918 (Taisho 7), Takakura writes to his close friend Saito Takeshi (cf. Part I, p.24(n.58)): "I notice that the soul's light actually has been given a little.... [Before this year] my experience of Christ's atonement was extremely vague.... I am praying that I will more and more deeply want to have an experience of the atonement." ("...jitsu ni sukoshiku reikon no hikari o ataherarakaketa yo na ki ga itashimasu.... [W]atashi ha kirisuto no shokuzai no keiken ha hanahada bakuzentaru mono no deshita.... Watashi ha motto motto shokuzai no keiken ga fukaku aritai to inotte orimaru.") Zenshu, Vol.10, "Shokan," p.42. Literally, Takakura's Japanese here concerning the "experience of the atonement" could be translated into English not as Takakura "having" or "possessing" the experience, but as "being" the experience. Nishida's subjectivity-only/ontological stress on "experience" can be recalled as a pertinent explanation. Cf. above, Part IV, p.389.

\textsuperscript{370}Cf. Part I, pp.89-90.

\textsuperscript{371}"Kami no Omote," in Oncho no Okoku, pp.330-332 (quotation from p.332); Zenshu, Vol.1, pp.165-166 (quotation from p.166).

\textsuperscript{372}Takakura's own testimony is that his experience of the atonement accelerated in 1918 (Taisho 7), after beginning to deepen during the previous year. Cf. above, Part IV, pp.445-446(n.369).

\textsuperscript{373}These emphases comprise the outline of Takakura's April sermon, "Shokuzai no Igi" ("The Meaning of the Atonement"), in Oncho no Okoku, pp.195-210; Chosakushu, Vol.4, pp.49-59. This is one of the sermons he mentions three years
explicitly notes how a theory of the atonement is "troublesome, and perhaps unfathomable. Yet we are not saved by an atonement theory: only by Christ's Cross, by this living fact are we saved." Even so, Takakura does begin to articulate what salvation by the Cross involves.

First, notes Takakura, we must recognise that God's holiness and righteousness required Christ's suffering the penalty of death for human sin. However,

We must not think only of Christ's death of the Cross as only receiving the punishment of humanity's sin. Together with God's righteousness being objectively manifested in Christ's Cross, Christ subjectively was made to feel acutely God's righteousness. In other words, over and above sadly thinking of Christ's bodily death on the Cross, we must infiltrate and sympathise with the heart of Christ's bearing human sin and standing before a holy God on the Cross.

Takakura's use of the phrase "in other words" shows how his "faith logic" bridges any alleged chasm between an "objective" historical fact and a "subjective," acute sympathy with Christ's suffering the penalty of our sin: "Christ's Cross is in no way something of the past, but a present, secret fact. God's Lamb even now stands before God bearing our sin."374 In light of Part IV's analysis so far, the suggested interpretation here is that, in April, 1918 (Taisho 7), Takakura is wrestling with the self/Self in terms of his subjectivity-only thought adjusting to a collision with Paul's words in Romans chapter three.

Over the course of the following thirteen months, Takakura preaches on "The Blessings of the Christian" and "The Forgiveness of Sin and Human Life".375 The


374 "Shokuzai no Igi," in Oncho no Okoku, pp.208,203-204,205; Chosakushu, Vol.4, pp.58,55,56.

375 "Kirisutosha no Shukufuku" and "Shazai to Jinsei," reproduced in Oncho no Okoku, pp.221-230 (Chosakushu, Vol.4, pp.60-66) and Oncho no Okoku, pp.211-220 (Chosakushu, Vol.4, pp.66-73), respectively.

These are the other two sermons Takakura mentions by name in his 1921 (Taisho 10) reflection on his experience of the atonement. They were preached in November, 1918 (Taisho 7) and May, 1919 (Taisho 8), after moving to Tokyo from
former--"A Consideration of Romans 5:1,2"--speaks of the Christian's "experience" of three types of "awareness,"376 namely "Reconciliation with God," "Introduction to Grace," and "Anticipating God's Glory." The latter sermon spells out how "being forgiven of sin is the fundamental problem of human life, and the fundamental solution of the self." First, "The self becomes reconciled with the self" in the "crushing" or "extinguishing" of "Paul's so-called...my flesh.... [Thus] through the experience of the self's sin being forgiven by God, [and] my being able to be reconciled with God, this paradox-conflict of the self's interior begins to be solved."377 At this point for Takakura, his problem of the conflict within his self/Self is beginning to find a genuinely Nishida-type of religious solution378 in conjunction with Paul's words in Romans chapter seven.

The second and third ways in which Takakura describes how being forgiven of sin solves the fundamental human problem involve becoming reconciled to one's calling


376These two important terms are "keiken" and "jikaku." "Kirisutosha no Shukufuku," in Oncho no Okoku, p.224; Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.62.


Moreover, a difference from Polanyi's thought is evident here. Takakura and Nishida "submerge" the subjective and objective in the self's abolition, giving rise to the religious problem. Polanyi, on the other hand, "transcends the disjunction" between the subjective and objective by "personal" commitment; and, God is "apprehended" not by the self's "eternal death," but by the self's serving God. Emphasis original. Polanyi, 1962, pp.279,300; cf. above, Part IV, p.383(n.68).
and to one's circumstances. That is, instead of shirking life's duty to reveal God's glory and slipping into despair over the tragedy of life's experience, the awareness of God's grace in the Cross is to have the 'conviction' of the 'absolute trust' and love God has placed upon us: "When I am aware of this grand confidence, sincerity, and grace of God towards us, my sins are forgiven and I am saved." Here, the central place of 'awareness' relative to the self/Self continues; the conviction of God's confidence and love is new.

In January, 1921 (Taisho 10), Takakura elucidates more his idea of God's absolute confidence and love towards us in the atonement:

We can recognise God's universal confidence towards us in the Cross of Christ. When I look up to the Cross, I experience the power of grace, the power of love, the power trusting me which nothing can resist. This is not escaping from the self and trying to seize God. God on the Cross seizes the head of us who are trying to escape, and He will never let go. It is not that we ourselves solve the spirit-flesh paradox, and come near to God after becoming good and pure. This inconsistent life, this soul wearing rags is believed and loved as it is by God. Here is the grace of the Lord's Cross.

Leading up to these remarks, Takakura explains the "forgiveness of sin" as God's loving and believing in humanity in the midst of the "soul's being deadlocked by sin"; moreover, God "securely grasps the centre of my soul."

What we see here is the confluence of several strands of Takakura's developing thinking regarding the atonement:

---

379 op.cit., in Oncho no Okoku, pp.218-220; Chosakushu, Vol.4, pp.71-72.

380 It is this sense of "duty" that leads Takakura to adopt Holl's notion of "conscience." Cf. above, Part IV, p.425.

381 "jikaku suru toki"


383 "tamashi ha tsumi de yukizumatte iru"

1. the inner flesh-spirit paradox, i.e., the (sinful) self/ (holy loving) Self struggle;

2. self-denial, or abandonment of the self's own efforts to God's grace for the resolution of life's fundamental problem, i.e., trust in "Other power";

3. Self-acceptance, i.e., coming to a settled actualization of the Self in the midst of the self's judgement and death.

Moreover, Takakura has gone "beyond" or "through" the self to grace not in "theological" justification-sanctification categories, but by "colliding" with Paul's words of forgiveness of sin in the Cross poured into the wineskins of the self/Self struggle. For Takakura here in early 1921 (Taisho 10), his sinful "self" and the holy "Self" have been "reconciled."

---

385 Here is the background for Takakura's adopting Brunner's idea of "crisis," in which the distinction between the subject and object of faith is overcome. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.266, above, Part IV, p.425.

386 Noting Yagi's description again is helpful:

The event of enlightenment or the 'revelation of the Son of God' is the event in which the Self is revealed in and to the ego, or it is the event in which the ego becomes aware of the Self that was hidden to it. To speak more strictly, in this event the Self (which was formerly hidden and not actual, potential and nonexistent) becomes 'real' not only in itself but also in and to the ego.


387 The middle word of the essay's title, "Jiko o Toshite Oncho he," can be translated either way. Cf. above, Part IV, p.436(n.327).

388 Earlier in this same essay, Takakura praises Gautama's original teaching on the self, or "Atman," as "a grand penetration, and in fact thoroughgoing as a solution to the self." However, Takakura remarks how it is impossible to follow Gautama's route to denying both the existence and personal characteristics of the self. "Jiko o Toshite Oncho he," in Oncho no Okoku, pp.172-174; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.113-114.

From the perspective of this thesis writer, Takakura's subjectivity-only logic did in fact enable him to follow a path at least similar to Gautama's. However, Takakura's conscious theorising categories in 1921 (Taisho 10) would not allow him to formulate his thinking as such. For example, Takakura is operating with a basic notion of Christian-Buddhist incompatibility. Also, when Takakura denies being able to go along with Gautama's notion of the self's non-existence, he writes, "In a certain meaning, one can say that the most certain reality in the universe is the self." Here,
As we travel with Takakura to Britain, it is here that his two bridges of ecclesiology and atonement theory merge. The former bridge was built of history; the latter of the religio-ethical pair of sin and holiness. Having submerged the Ritschlian objective-subjective distinction between the kingdom of God and the atonement, Takakura can now bring together his ecclesiological and atonement thinking.

To pick back up with Takakura's late 1922 (Taisho 11) essay on the development of the idea of the Church, we can see initial signs of his merging the Church and the atonement: Jesus saves his disciples both individually and corporately; Christianity is both a religion of the atonement and of God's kingdom—of which the Church is the forerunner. Although the bud is not yet open, what Takakura would later term as the "complete miracle" and "mysterious thing" of uniting "external historical fact" and "spiritual interiority" is starting to sprout in his thinking.

Takakura is not yet prepared either consciously to identify a distinction between the "self" and "Self," or similarly to explore "existence" and "non-existence." However, five years later (1926; Taisho 15), Takakura can point to Gautama as having first been enlightened upon "colliding with the fact of death." Besides sounding of Nishida's notion of religion, this sort of statement shows how Takakura was uniting the different strands of input into his self/Self struggle. "Seimei Yokyu to shite no Kirisutokyo," in Seimei Yokyu to shite no Kirisutokyo, p.75; Zenshu, Vol.5, p.489. Cf. above, Part IV, pp.443-444(n.361).


Cf. Part III, p.327. Again, the timing of Takakura's thought development is important here. He is writing in December, early in his time in Oxford. One of the books he mentions later at the end of the year as having helped him is Forrest's The Christ of History and of Experience. Earlier in April (while still in Edinburgh), Takakura notes reading the book: he appreciates the help that this "extremely 'sharp' [written in English] thinker" has given him in attacking Ritschl via the idea of the "living Christ" (also written in English). Zenshu, Vol.10, "Nikki," pp.186,195.

The pertinence here is how Forrest's book must have helped Takakura in "submerging" the distinctions between the historical and spiritual. As noted earlier, Takakura on his own had no problem with this in relation to "historic fact" of the Cross (cf. above, Part IV, p.447). However, the combined effect of expanding his ecclesiological interests historically and of entering a theological world where there was a basic distinction between the "objective, historical" and "subjective, spiritual"
By the end of his year in Oxford, i.e., in August, 1923 (Taisho 12), Takakura has had more time for reflection. He also has been able to develop further his ideas on Christianity and civilisation through reading von Hügel, his "historical intuition" via Troeltsch, and his notions of grace through these two plus Forsyth. He thus writes the following about the Christian faith's absolute authority in an essay on the supernatural:

God appears in the 'real'\(^{391}\) in...the history of Israel, [He] makes the matchless revelation in Christ's Cross and His Resurrection, and [He] continues living and working within the Church down through the ages; I believe that here in this gospel of grace is the supernatural basis of our faith. God's historical, supernatural revelation, namely the gospel, is the 'final absolute fact'\(^{392}\) of our faith. Christ's Church is created, and is continuing to be created, by this gospel of grace.\(^{393}\)

One can see here an intertwining of ecclesiological and soteriological strands: God graciously reveals Himself within and through the Church and the gospel. What Takakura eventually weaves together emerges as a single rope of certainty of the authoritative Christ. He continues:

One can say that the Church stands on the 'solidarity of positive supernatural experience'\(^{394}\) responding to, and created by, this gospel.... But it is inadequate only to say that the Church is simply something *joined* and solidified through the Spirit of the living Christ.... The spiritual Christ and the gospel (revelation as historical, supernatural grace) should necessarily be bound together. The dead brought new challenges. Thus the following type of comments by Forrest surely found an echo in Takakura's "faith logic": "It is a distinctive mark of the Christian religion that it blends together inseparably the historical and spiritual"; and, "My purpose in these lectures is to discuss the relations between the historical and spiritual in Christianity with special reference to their alleged incongruity...." David W. Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*. 6th ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1908, pp.3,5.

\(^{391}\)This is written only in the phoneticised "riaru."

\(^{392}\)This is written only in English.


\(^{394}\)This expression is written in the characters, "sekkyokuteki na choshizenteki na keiken no rentai," followed by the English wording in parentheses.
and risen Christ living within Paul, within Augustine, within Luther, within Calvin, namely within the Church of the ages is the absolute authority of our faith. Saying this in different words, the Church, by the meaning 'church solidarity of positive supernatural experience',\(^{395}\) becomes our authority of faith.\(^{396}\)

Here we see even more clearly a submerging of distinctions between "objective" ecclesiology and "subjective" atonement. "The spiritual Christ and the gospel" have been "bound together" in the corporate, subjectivity-only "real," universal humanity. The Self of Takakura’s corporate-experience has grasped him in grace, so that he is reconciled to the God of Paul and of the rest of the Church. This forerunner of the unity of the universe is Takakura’s certain, absolute authority.

Even so, Takakura still has not yet reached his eventual solid ground of "Evangelical Christianity." Having brought together his thinking on ecclesiology and the atonement, he still needs to step off of his newly-merged bridge. The use of his English phraseology in August, 1923 (Taisho 12), shows that Takakura has taken both of Forsyth’s helping hands.\(^{397}\) Looking at a work which Takakura later notes owes a great deal to Forsyth’s "spirit and thought,"\(^{398}\) which is an essay Takakura writes after returning to Japan,\(^{399}\) should help us see how Forsyth assists in the next step.

---

\(^{395}\)Here, the phrase is written only in English.

\(^{396}\)"Kirisutokyo no Tokushoku to shite no Choshizen" Fukuin Shinpo No.1473, 25 October 1923 (Taisho 12), p.3; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.269.


\(^{398}\)Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.21; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.23.

\(^{399}\)This work is "Osodokushi oyobi Fukuin Shugi no Honshitsu" ("The Essence of Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism"), in Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.201-221; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.47-63. Takakura records in a letter dated 5 October 1924 (Taisho 13) that he had completed the essay, thus helping to confirm the date. Zenshu, Vol.10, p.70. The essay is mistakenly noted in Germany’s book to have been written in 1922. Germany, p.98.
Takakura begins by asserting that, in order firmly to grasp the essence of Christianity in thought and in experience, "there must be keen spiritual insight and healthy, theological discipline." Accordingly, he sums up the living core of the orthodox faith as, "God Himself lived and worked in history, within Christ, in order to save the sin of humanity." Takakura then goes on to point out how this essence consists both of fact and interpretation: that "God himself once, in history was manifested in a matchless manner in Christ and His Cross" is the "objective, unmoving historical revelation." Yet the "centre of gravity" of orthodox, Christian faith is "at the point of asking how one interprets that historical fact." Hence "according to that deep meaning, theology lies across the foundation of the faith of orthodoxy."  

What Takakura's "keen insight" thus leads him to interpret theologically as the practical test of orthodox, evangelical faith is that of attitude relative to Jesus Christ: true Christianity assumes a "religious" posture of worship and confession of Christ's divinity. Because this attitude is consciously confessed by the corporate Church, evangelical faith is distinguished from the mere intellectual assent of Catholicism, the "ambiguous," humanistic admiration which liberal Protestantism shows towards Jesus, and all sorts of "subjective mysticism." Insofar as the nine-point doctrinal formulation of the 1848 Evangelical Alliance expresses the religious attitude toward the Christ of Paul and the Reformers, it provides a guide to the healthy stream of gospel experience in which Takakura wants to swim. Thus in closing his essay with an expression of anticipatory interest in "Calvinistic Evangelicalism," Takakura affirms his ecclesiastical place within the larger Christian world--specifically the Uemura-led NKK.  

What this essay shows first is Forsyth's crucial assistance for Takakura's theological
clarification. Forsyth clearly has aided Takakura in articulating theologically his emphases on salvation by faith as opposed to works, as well as the priority of authority over freedom.\(^{403}\) While not explicitly mentioned, Forsyth’s ideas of the Church’s corporate "solidarity" with Christ are evident. Perhaps most critically, Forsyth’s clarifications for Takakura’s ecclesiology and theory of the atonement have helped him bring these together with his Christology. Years earlier, Takakura’s separation of the Christ of experience from the Christ of history had led to his doubting Christ’s divinity.\(^{404}\) Now that Forsyth has shown him that confessing Christ’s divinity was tantamount to the Church’s corporate "subjectivity-only" religious attitude, Takakura can unwaveringly "concur from the heart with the early disciples’ distinguishing confession."\(^{405}\) Faith logic has persisted in submerging all sorts of differentiating categories.\(^{406}\)

In a practical, concrete way, Forsyth’s two-fold stress on [1] the importance of conscious, theological formulations for the Church’s faith in the gospel, and [2] the corresponding theological viability of organised evangelicalism has helped Takakura with his heartfelt commitment career-wise. With these two helping hands from a respected theological kinsman, Takakura can thus, with "anticipatory interest," assume his specific role of theological spokesman within the primary, "evangelical" stream

\(^{403}\)Ibid., in Oncho to Shinjitsu, pp.206,211,214-216; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.51,55,58-59. It is important to remember the inherent presence of the solution to the problem of the self/Self for Takakura in these two Protestant-Forsythian notions of faith (self-abandonment) and authority (Self-initiative). Neglecting this basic aspect of Takakura’s thought leads to one analyst’s labelling of Takakura’s handling of the "freedom-authority" issue passed down from Uemura and Ebina as a "radicalisation," instead of a "subjectivity-only" submerging. Matsuoka, 1978, pp.59-61,70-74,161,235-236,240-241. Cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.165-166.

\(^{404}\)Cf. above, Part IV, p.387.

\(^{405}\)Cf. above, Part IV, pp.432-433.

\(^{406}\)In his dogmatics lectures on ecclesiology, Takakura speaks of several merged elements in the same sentence: "Necessarily, the Church stands on the absolute Word of Christ’s gospel, i.e., the solidarity relationship ['rentai kankei'] of apostolic tradition, and when this solidarity of historic faith is removed, the gospel loses its foundation for existence." Zenshu, Vol.9, p.729.
of Japanese Protestantism. After Uemura's sudden death in January, 1925 (Taisho 14), Takakura's position as theological pacesetter within the NKK is heightened. Moreover, Takakura continues to develop together with the Toyama Church which he had helped to found in June, 1924 (Taisho 13). Having settled into those concrete roles, Takakura comes to his own certain "Evangelical Christianity." By his own testimony, and according to his writings of the time, Takakura's faith crystallises together with his Toyama Church in mid- to late-1925 (Taisho 14). Jesus Christ has led Takakura into a posture of conviction as "the first Japanese theologian who could think and express himself in his own terms." However, as seen both in overviewing FK in Part III and in examining Takakura's developing theology here in Part IV, Takakura's "own terms" have not always been clear—at least within this English-language analysis. Thus in order to understand as cogently as possible that which Takakura came to speak with full conviction and apparent clarity, we must move into a separate, conscious examination of some of the structural, methodological aspects of his thinking.

C. Structural Elements in Takakura's Thought

The thesis' posture of seeing Jesus Christ at work in all aspects of Takakura's multi-faceted "problem of the self/Self" has demanded that several facets of that struggle be highlighted: Takakura's personality, educational background, contemporary social and intellectual currents, Mahayana religious heritage, and Christian-theological

---


408E.g., Takakura became president of "Uemura's" seminary. Cf. Part I, p.96.


410Cf. above, Part IV, pp.414,418.


412Cf. above, Part IV, pp.443-444.
factors. Furthermore, approaching Takakura’s thought as a translation of Christianity has also directed the thesis’ attention towards multi-generational and multi-cultural issues. As a result of this theological posture and translation approach, a certain measure of linguistic and philosophicotheological confusion has arisen relative to Takakura’s intellectual venture.

Much of this confusion is due to Takakura’s "logic" or "consciousness," noted to be at least radically different from deductive reasoning.413 Takakura himself terms his logic as that of "faith" and "conscience," or "superrational" and even "antirational." Our examination has seen that such additional descriptions as "intuitive" and "subjectivity-only"414 are just as helpful in representing the directions Takakura thought takes. Within its overall attempt to translate Takakura’s thought into a systematically-organised English-language form, the thesis’ preference for following Takakura’s intuitive logic, at the possible expense of a more rational progression, has thus left many "logical gaps" unfilled.

Similarly, except for Takakura’s own "systematic" presentation of his theology in FK, the thesis has sought to avoid "artificially" organising Takakura’s thought.415 The overall structure of his thought is of course the correlation of the logic running through it. Hence the nature of Takakura’s "Evangelical Christianity" as something "subjectively experienced" resists systematisation into more traditional theological categories. Moreover, Takakura’s intuitive logic carries as its partner multiple ways of expressing the place of conviction at which Takakura eventually arrives: "sola fide and sola Deo gloria,"416 "Ich nichts, Du alles,"417 "shinjin,"418 or "Christ-

413 Cf. Part III, pp.344-345.
414 Cf. above, Part IV, p.378.
415 In addition to FK, Takakura’s dogmatics lectures provide a rather extensive, "traditional theological" scheme of organisation. However, despite a "progression" through prolegomena, theology proper, worldview, anthropology, Christology, soteriology, ecclesiology, sacraments, pneumatology, and eschatology, the operating logic is the same as that of FK. Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.1-6, Vol.9, pp.1-6.
A certain measure of confusion is inevitable in the face of such "philosophicotheologico-linguistic" pluralism.

Insofar, then, as the present consideration is attempting systematically to represent a multi-faceted diamond that seems to change its shape in unpredictable ways, crystal-clear labelling will remain illusory. Even so, being familiar with Takakura's use of certain pairs of terms and of mental categories can at least clarify his overall thought. Indeed, just identifying that quality of his thinking which moves him within, between, and beyond pairs in itself helps to indicate the harmonising, integrating, dialectical, and non-discriminating nature of his thought. Furthermore, in the midst of his linguistic and intellectual couplets are some crucial notions which particularly glisten out of Takakura's diamond-like thought. The remainder of this analysis will thus seek to explain some of these important pairs of ideas, and then examine some of the fundamentally critical issues for Takakura.

1. Conceptual Pairs

---


418This is Shinran's term, rendering into English as "faith," "entrusting," "awakening," or the "central religious...experience in the Pure Land path." Cf. above, Part IV, p.377(n.37).

419Cf. above, Part IV, pp.395-396.

420In continuation of an approach which operates within of an amalgamation of philosophy and theology—an approach consciously taken earlier with the adoption of Yagi Seiichi's term--there is no "-" between "philosophico" and "theological." Cf. above, Part IV, p.371(n.15).


422This term carries the same "ontological awareness" that submerges all distinctions--including subject and object--also implied in "jikaku" ("self-awareness") and "shutaiteki" ("subjectivity-only"). Abe, 1988, p.357(n.10); Ueda and Hirota, 1989, pp.60ff.
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One type of conceptual pair which Takakura uses has to do with "worldview." There are first antithetical ways of understanding the world: a scientific, materialism versus a view embracing freedom and value; a cultured, Epicureanism as opposed to a more noble aim to realise the will of the One surpassing the self; a Buddhist, atheistic, pessimistic fatalism versus a spirit of responsibility and self-sacrifice. In each case, the latter is the exclusive, preferred option. Also, Takakura uses more complementary pairs for describing contrasting aspects of the world, or of reality. Reality is either transcendent or immanent, supernatural or natural, dynamic or static, Hebraic or Hellenistic. Takakura speaks of the visible and the

423 Although these types of opposing worldviews appear throughout Takakura's works, he specifically describes them in his 1927 (Showa 2) "Kirisutokyo Sekaikan" ("Christian Worldview") Seisho no Kansen No.131, November, 1927 (Showa 2), pp.2-8; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.102-109.


426 Cf. Part III, p.304. Takakura also contrasts the consciousness of Buddhist salvation as static and Christianity's active salvation. Also, he describes freedom as something dynamic, not static. Moreover, God's righteousness is dynamic, not static. Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.261, 383; comments on Romans 3:21, in Chosakushu, Vol.5, p.130.

Takakura's use of this pair is one example among several of how his thought is difficult to represent with consistency and clarity. In addition to the instances just listed, Takakura comments in 1926 (Taisho 15) that John's teaching on "eternal life" represents it as "not something static given through meditation such as in Greek thought, nor something which develops out of something dynamic, but something incomplete" (emphasis mine). Within the same year, Takakura describes Paul's religious experience as dynamic—not static as in a "pantheistic lifestyle"—and hence incomplete. One can conclude that Takakura means that John's eternal life and Paul's religion therefore differ in some way; but, one would wish for a similarity in Takakura's explanations of the relationship between dynamic and incompleteness. "Yohane Den oyobi sono Chushin Shiso," in Chosakushu, Vol.3, p.171; "Pauro no Shukyo" ("Paul's Religion"), in Chosakushu, Vol.3, p.209.

459
invisible worlds,\textsuperscript{428} as well as the absolute, unchanging, eternal world as opposed to relative, fluctuating time-bound history.\textsuperscript{429} While this type of pair does not necessarily force a mutually exclusive choice for Takakura, one or the other is either preferable\textsuperscript{430} or in some way "ontologically prior"-particularly in cases where the divine is more aligned with one of the two categories.\textsuperscript{431}

Along with the eternity-history construct, Takakura uses several pairs of ideas in

\textsuperscript{427}E.g., Paul’s conversion experience was "not something Hellenistic, but completely Hebraic." "Pauro no Shukyo," in \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.3, p.199; cf. above, Part IV, p.402. Takakura’s overall notion of "reality" will be further examined below.

\textsuperscript{428}E.g., Takakura speaks of the visible and invisible Church. Dogmatics lectures, in \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.9, 736. Also, if we only stop at the visible world, and fail to believe in "the reality of the eternal world in the depths of the seen world," pain and sadness will leave us disappointed. 7 September 1928 (Showa 3) letter, \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.10, "Shokan," p.134.


\textsuperscript{430}Takakura consistently asserts that reality is dynamic, not static, for example. Cf. Part III, p.304.

\textsuperscript{431}Use of the phrase "ontologically prior" is \textit{not} meant to imply any sort of metaphysical dualism for Takakura. For one thing, he expressly denies such a worldview, citing Greek dualism as that which tainted early Christianity. Also, as seen by his use of such "epistemological" terms as "jikaku" ("self-awareness"), Takakura’s thought resists Western, ontological classification. "Pauro no Shukyo," in \textit{Chosakushu}, Vol.3, p.183. Cf. Part III, p.333-334, above, Part IV, p.385(n.75).

What this phrase does intend to convey is a sense that one of the two aspects of reality takes some sort of precedence. However, both the type and extent of precedence must be considered case-by-case, as well as within the development of Takakura’s thought. Thus, the invisible world is more basic in that it is to be realised in visible form; yet, the final unity of the universe eliminates any sort of ultimate difference. Increasingly for Takakura, God is the transcendent Other Who bridges the multi-faceted barrier with humanity, and thus "becomes" the immanent One. Similarly, God is absolute, unchanging, and eternal, yet in Christ enters the relative, fluctuating world of time; this theme grows stronger with Takakura’s increasing "historical intuition," e.g., ecclesiologically.

Clearly each of these pairs is closely connected with Takakura’s notions of time and history, which will be considered next.
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attempting to deal with time-related issues. These explicit and implicit wrestlings are extensive and of critical importance for Takakura’s thought; indeed, the complexity of his explanations of time and history have already appeared regularly in our analysis. In order to clarify some of that complexity, we must make several distinctions. [1] As in his eternity-history pair, Takakura often speaks of time and history as essential components of life in this world of limitation and sin; hence, to live in time and history means to be in solidarity with a changing, painful, and idol-worshipping system. Takakura can thus sometimes use "time" as representative of life at enmity with God, and as true humanity’s strongest enemy. Nevertheless, history is something redeemed by Christ, as well as the meaningful stage of God’s redeeming acts. The contrasting element in this pair is thus Buddhist, fatalistic history that lacks purpose and meaning. [3] As components of the world in opposition to God’s absolute eternity, yet given meaning and purpose by God’s redemption, time and history encompass human beings who also in turn experience certain correlative, supertemporal and superhistorical aspects of redemption. Takakura’s time/history and super-time/history pair can thus give rise to peace, joy, and victory, as well as to a "prophetic optimism."


435 Cf. Part III, p.301. Takakura seems to use this history-superhistory distinction with a similar meaning to his sparing use of Religionsgeschichte and Heilsgeschichte. Cf. Part III, p.310(n.154).
There are other distinctions among pairs of ideas in Takakura’s thinking on time and history, thus further showing the importance and complexity of this area of his thought. [4] Time and space characterise the present order of things; yet, God’s reign is better understood in temporal rather than spatial terms. [5] Modern thought demands that some sort of evolutionary progression be seen in the world, Takakura accepts this view of nature, of humanity, of revelation, and—at least in his “pre-FK” thinking—even of God to a certain extent. Yet in contrast to evolutionary progression is eschatological transformation, and it is the latter which characterises the realisation of God’s kingdom. [6] Takakura also utilises a


437 This is also a view of P.T. Forsyth. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.237(n.177).

438 Cf. his message “Seimei to Oncho,” outlined above. Also, in the midst of coupling an acknowledgment of the world’s evolution with the belief in God as Creator, Takakura twice uses the phrase, “humanity, the apex of the universe’s evolution” (“uchu shinka no chotennaru ningen”). Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, p.279. Cf. above, Part IV, pp.408-409.

In regards to revelation, Takakura notes, for example, how the prophets linked religion and ethics, and thus the idea of sin "became deeply thought of." In an overall way, Takakura accepts the development of biblical faith and morals. Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, p.309. Cf. Part III, p.295.

Of particular note, in light of the interreligious encounter this thesis has seen within Takakura, is a relatively early (1917; Taisho 6) assertion of Christianity’s "most advanced" stage of evolution in comparison to other religions; thus, Christianity "has the largest amount of religious truth." These remarks were made in reply to an article in the local Hokkaido newspaper which had criticised Takakura’s recent funeral sermon. “Bokushi no Kotoba o Kikite’ o Yomu” ("Reading ‘Hearing the Pastor’s Words’"), reproduced in Zenshu, Vol.6, pp.488-490.

439 Cf. Part III, p.338. At the time of his breaking through the Ritschlian subjective-objective distinction (December, 1921; Taisho 10), Takakura uses the word "deadlocked" ("yukizumari") about both the subjective individual and the objective world. In his later years, e.g., in an August, 1932 (Showa 7) sermon, Takakura refers to such a condition as that of unrest and worry from the sin of unbelief. Takakura seems to be referring here to the problem of a "deadlocked" evolution being eschatologically solved in the moment of faith, or in the Cross. "Kami no Kuni ni Kansuru Kosatsu sono Ta" Fukuin Shinpo Nos.1389,1390, 9,16 February 1922 (Taisho 11), pp.6,7 (Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.194,201); "Hiroki Kokoro" ("Wide Heart") Fukuin to Gendai No.18, September, 1932 (Showa 7), pp.3,4,5,7 (Zenshu, Vol.2, pp.585,586,587,589). Cf. above, Part IV, p.449(n.383).

Another interesting twist which Takakura gives to the idea of the evolutionary
development of "personal life" (not just individual, but as opposed to "impersonal") is the "stimulus" and "discipline" which time provides: "Past actuality was something having the 'now' of its own time, so the present 'now' is deepened and disciplined through the past 'now'." As further implied by Takakura's ensuing sentence, in which he notes how this idea is clear "at the time one thinks" (emphasis mine) this way, there are strong existential elements here. Takakura adds human responsibility to the picture when he states, "We are able to enliven the present now through knowing the past now (history), and being stimulated by it." These statements are in his dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.56,397 (cf. p.177).

Moreover, particularly in connection with Takakura's continuing remarks on how God's being eternal suggests that "in Him" ("kare ni oite ha") all things are simultaneously known and experienced, this thesis writer sees a strong parallel with the following comments on Shinran's concept of time:

The 'now' of Shinran and the 'now' of the present-day person, while separated by more than 700 years, are the identical present. Here, historical before and after are simultaneous. Time before and time after are, without losing their relationship of succession, non-succeeding; they make a succession which conforms with non-succession. That temporal before and after are simultaneous is paradoxical, but in religious existence such paradoxical 'time' is realized as 'now'.

Nishitani Keiji, "The Problem of Time in Shinran" The Eastern Buddhist Translated by Dennis Hirota. 11, No.1, May, 1978, p.17. Both Takakura's existential stress and his merging of the present and past will be further considered below.

Besides using a one- and two-dimensional pair of geometrical images, Takakura also uses a two- and three-dimensional pair to describe the corporate solidarity of sin throughout the human race. Cf. Part III, p.315(n.184).


"A cross" and "The cross" are written in English. "Warera no Shinko Kokuhaku," 1925 (Taisho 14) church lecture, in Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.69; cf. Part III, p.320,323. Takakura also uses what he terms "Althaus' so-called third history" to distinguish the Cross' eternal side from its relative, exterior historical side: "By means of its being a problem of conscience, when we are led by the Holy Spirit and
The Cross is of critical importance to Takakura’s thought, so he employs yet another pair of temporal ideas to ensure its applicability to human life, namely [7] the completed past and the continuing present. As his thought on the atonement is developing, Takakura disregards the past historicity of the Cross-event, calling it instead a "present, secret fact." But his converging ecclesiological and atonement understandings simultaneously spread out along the line of history and concentrate on the unique point of the Cross. What Takakura seems to do, then, is submerge the historical gap between the past event (the Cross) and the present (faith) by participating in the Church’s faith in the crucified and risen Christ. Christ’s gift of faith to the Church both surpasses and stretches through history; Takakura’s subjectivity-only mindset, with its "total practical or existential standpoint," can by the soul’s necessity do no other than confess his crucified Lord. He thus directly face the Cross from the inside, the Cross is a truth standing at the centre of the third history.” "Fukuin to Gendai," in Zenshu, Vol.6, p.558.

In one sense, what is being emphasised here is more the kind of action rather than the time, similar to the distinction in biblical Greek between the perfect and present tenses. Thus, technically speaking Takakura’s distinction here is more on types of action rather than a temporal pair. The time and historical element is involved, however, so for simplicity of the continuing discussion the temporal aspect will be used. The same could be said for the previous, sixth pair, with respect to punctiliar versus linear action. H.E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. Toronto, Ontario: The MacMillan Company, 1927, pp.178-179.

Cf. above, Part IV, p.447.

Cf. above, Part IV, pp.442-444,451,454.

One way Takakura describes this merging in the extreme, relative to the Church’s faith recorded in the Bible, is in noting how with Augustine, Francis of Assisi, and Luther, in their understanding of certain biblical texts the "historical gap between the reader and the Bible was completed abolished." Specifically about Luther’s Christology, Takakura writes: "He flew over Christian history and was able directly to participate in the first apostles’ Christology." Cf. Part III, p.296; dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, p.518.

understands Christ's Crucifixion as both completed and continuing. In the midst of the "historical actuality" of vibrant fellowship in the young Toyama Church, Takakura experiences "existential simultaneity" with Christ and His Cross.

Takakura's conceptual couplets with respect to the Cross range beyond temporal ideas, of course. He also employs such contrasting pairs as holiness and love, denial and affirmation, judgement and salvation, God's distance and proximity. Moreover, just as Paul's atonement theology was based on his experience of having been saved within his flesh-spirit struggle, so too does Takakura's understanding develop within the framework of his "problem of the self/Self." Thus the self's "religious attitude" of confessing Christ's deity is the experience of utter self-denial, of judgement, and of the Self as distant. But like Paul knowing the indwelling nearness of the One Who loved him, Takakura finds "in the depths" of his own soul/Soul the "deep, eternal things" of Christ's affirmation and binding love. The


449Nishitani, 1978, p.26. In the spring of 1926 (Taisho 15)--just a few months after settling into his "Evangelical Christianity"--Takakura lectured on Ephesians. This is how he described at that time his and his audience's co-experience, with the early Church, of the atonement: "The people of the early Church touched God's revelation in Jesus Christ, our Lord, our Saviour. At the same time, they experienced the atonement of our soul[s] in Jesus Christ." "Epesosho ni okeru Kyuyo Shiso" ("Salvation Thoughts in Ephesians") Seisho no Kansen No.113, May, 1926 (Taisho 15), p.4; Chosakushu, Vol.3, p.225.

450Related but not restricted to temporal ideas are the ways in which Takakura regularly notes the fundamental place of an "awakened conscience and life," and of confronting the self's and world's "dualism" of the problem of sin. It is to this faith-consciousness that "the historic Christ breaks through the grave of the world of relative experience's past history, and presses upon us as eternal reality." ("...shiteki kirisuto ha sotaitekitaru keiken sekai no kako no rekishi no haka o tsukitabutte, eikyu no genjitsu to shite gojin ni semari kuru no de aru.") Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, p.63.

objective, historic Christ of Paul’s experience has confronted and arisen in Takakura’s own similar subjectivity, moving Takakura "through the self to grace."\[452\]

This leads us to consider Takakura’s somewhat puzzling use of the complementary pair, "objective" and "subjective."\[453\] In a 1932 (Showa 7) letter, Takakura asks how it would be to send an offering for a particular evangelist "objectively" through the NKK finance office to the evangelism office.\[454\] This rather mundane usage is indicative of what Takakura normally means by this pair of "objective-subjective": "public" or "corporate" versus "private" or "individual." Such expected English meanings as "exterior" versus "interior" are not necessarily excluded;\[455\] it is just that the "public-corporate" and "private-individual" paradigm is primary.\[456\]

\[452\]Cf., e.g., above, Part IV, pp.389-391,448-450.

\[453\]The terms are "kyakkanteki" and "shukanteki." cf. Part III, pp.317-319(n.206), 320(n.210).


\[455\]This is especially true of Takakura’s writings before he left for Britain, i.e., before he combined his ecclesiological and atonement notions. In one of his earliest sermons—preached in 1909 (Meiji 42), while he was a seminary student—Takakura speaks simply of the inner, subjective Christ and the outer, objective Christ. "Kirisuto to Ware" ("Christ and I"), in Zenshu, Vol.1, pp.7-12. Also, ten years later Takakura writes of God objectively forgiving sin apart from repentance, and the subjective, human experience of repentance before receiving forgiveness. "Iesu no Kyokun ni okeru Kyujo Shiso" ("Salvation Thought in Jesus’ Teaching") Fukuin Shinpo. No.1278, 25 December 1919 (Taisho 8), p.3; Chosakushu, Vol.3, pp.143-144.

\[456\]Just as Part III’s analysis of FK suggests, Takakura’s intended meanings of "corporate" and "individual" are present in most of his uses of "kyakkanteki" and "shukanteki." Moreover, this seems to be consistent with his overall thought. To cite just a few examples from his dogmatics lectures, Takakura criticises the Anabaptists for neglecting Christianity’s "objective, corporate side." God does not simply rule individual souls, but objectively over society, the state, and the whole world. God’s "objective actuality" is guaranteed in the Church’s "corporate" sacraments. The Holy Spirit’s falling at Pentecost was not simply an "individual, subjective" religious experience, but a "corporate, objective" experience. Zenshu, Vol.9, p.727,742,757-758,812.
Several important points arise in connection with Takakura's usage here. One is that "objective" therefore does not imply a lack of association with the "subject": sending an offering "objectively" makes it more corporate and public, but no less from the donor. Also, a mindset of "subjectivity-only" operates "prior to" the "subject-object" distinction which is made so naturally, for example, in the English language.\(^457\)

Thus to be in the Church means to share in the corporate "awareness" of Christ, including His own "Self-awareness" to which we must "trace back" our own faith.\(^458\) Such a Self-awareness "signifies a fundamental, ontological-awareness which is beyond the self-and-other-duality, and hence also beyond self-consciousness in the psychological sense."\(^459\) Hence there really is no historical, ontological, psychological, or epistemological gap for Takakura between the Cross and his own faith, or between Paul's experience and his own.\(^460\) Furthermore, Takakura's usage of this "corporate-individual" construct in explaining the atonement\(^461\) is consistent with his merging of that notion with ecclesiology: faith in Christ's atonement \textit{equals} the same intuitive awareness experienced by the prophets, the apostles, and the Church of the ages.\(^462\)

\(^457\)"Especially in English, there is a strong tendency to objectify...." Abe Nobuhiko, 1992, p.64. Thus, for example, if someone "believes" something or someone, the content of that "belief" is the object of the subject's act of believing.

\(^458\)Cf. Part III, pp.305,308,310.

\(^459\)Abe, 1988, p.356(n.7).

\(^460\)Put differently, the "Trans-Individual" Self is not separate from the "church solidarity of positive supernatural experience." Cf. above, Part IV, pp.397,452-453.

\(^461\)Cf. Part III, pp.317-320.

\(^462\)In the words of Part III's analysis of \textit{FK}, we see here "Takakura's coupling of 'the faith' and 'the Church' with the latch of 'history'." Cf. Part III, p.335.

Moreover, a second difference from Polanyi emerges here. Polanyi's description of "objective" knowledge as "establishing contact with a hidden reality" sounds similar to Takakura's corporate notion; but, Polanyi's focus on objectivity's "inherent quality deserving universal acceptance by rational creatures" is distinctly different from Takakura's sense of "corporate experience." Polanyi, 1962, pp.vii,4; cf. Part III, pp.383(n.68),448(n.378).
In light of Takakura’s use of the "objective-subjective" pair in a "corporate-individual" sense, it is interesting to note his use of two other pairs: inner-outer, and quality-quantity. In both cases, Takakura consistently favours the former over the latter. The inner, qualitative life of faith--both individually and corporately--is incomparably superior to outward circumstances, such as the quantity of church members or of money.

These two pairs are thus quite similar to each other in the way Takakura uses them; but, a significant difference also appears when Forsyth’s correlative use is compared. As to the quality-quantity distinction, Forsyth’s use resembles Takakura’s, particularly in reference to doctrine. Both stress that "quantified," codified formulae are

463 These two respectively correspond to Protestantism and Catholicism, for example. "Kyokai Kannen no Enkaku to sono Igi," in Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.244ff; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.328ff.

Also, in the midst of his tragic, outward circumstances, Job’s real struggle was an interior one, within the soul. "Yobu Ki no Shukyo" ("The Religion of the Book of Job") Fukui to Gendai No.2, April, 1931 (Showa 6), p.21; Chosakushu, Vol.3, p.34.

464 For example, Takakura terms God’s kingdom as qualitatively the same as the Church; but, quantitatively the Church is of a more "narrow scope." "Kyokai Kannen no Enkaku to sono Igi," in Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.243; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.328.

Moreover, the kingdom of God is not so much a quantitative "realm" (written in the characters "ryobun," with the phoneticised "rellumu") as it is a qualitative "cosmopolitanism" (written in the characters "sekai doho shugi," with the phoneticised "kosumoporitanizumu"), i.e., an entity of "principle" and "spirit." "Kami no Kuni no Seishin to Genri" Fukui Shinpo No.1359, 14 July 1921 (Taisho 10), p.6; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.174

Also, we become "aware ['jikaku'] of the self’s imperfection" in terms of faith and ethics "at the time we directly face, with an awakened conscience, Jesus’ person in the gospels." We thus must realise that the difference between us and Jesus "is not quantitative, but qualitative...." ("...ryoteki ni de naku, shitsuteki....") Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, p.179.

465 More than quantitative society and public opinion, a qualitative, "pure life before eternity" is to be valued. "Kirisuto ni yoru Kachi no Sozo" ("Creation of Value through Christ"), 1921 (Taisho 10), in Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.287; cf. Part III, pp.105-106.
secondary to the "quality" or true nature of faith. At the same time, Takakura and Forsyth can both emphasise that the "quality" of faith is directly associated with the intellectual content of that faith: subjective religiosity is of no value apart from the true object of religious devotion and confession of allegiance. However, what "the true object" of faith entails differs upon shifting to the inner-outer dichotomy. Forsyth holds inward and outward matters of faith in tension in much the same way that he does the quality of faith and that faith's intellectual, "quantified" object. Not only are the "outer" facts of faith, i.e., the "objective" acts of God, primary for "inner," "subjective" religious devotion; outward concerns such as art and politics receive Forsyth's attention just as do matters of inner piety. For Takakura, however, "inner" interpretation becomes, if not primary, at least on equal footing in comparison to "outer" fact; and, what takes place in the inner "kingdom of grace" takes precedence over outward circumstances, whether

466 In his dogmatics lectures, Takakura notes, "Faith necessarily recognises God not quantitatively, but qualitatively." Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.218-219.

Forsyth warns against the Church becoming the "custodian of a creed which has ceased to be the living expression of its corporate life." Dogma should not be a "quantitatively 'reduced'" statement, but something that is "qualitatively 'compressed'". Forsyth, Principle of Authority, 1912, p.34. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.239.

467 Forsyth, Principle of Authority, 1912, pp.29-30. Takakura agrees with Denney and Anderson Scott in noting that the simplest confession of faith of the early Church, and of the Church throughout history, has been, "Jesus is Lord." "Osodokushi oyobi Fukuin Shugi noHonshitsu," in Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.208; Chosakushu, Vol.2, p.53.

468 Forsyth explicitly states, "...the real objectivity is that which is objective to the whole human race, over against it... The real objective element in the atonement...is that God made it and gave it finished to man, not that it was made to God by man. Any atonement made by man would be subjective...." That is, Forsyth draws the objective-subjective distinction along divine-human lines, not corporate-individual. Forsyth, 1910, p.93.


470 Cf. above, Part IV, p.454.
personal or social. Thus Takakura can hold a "quantified" theological articulation in subservient tension with the "quality" of faith; "outer" concerns, however, are not nearly as important to Takakura as spiritual interiority.

Different religious traditions and socio-political circumstances can at least partially account for Takakura’s and Forsyth’s contrasting postures towards wider society. Japanese religiosity and an all-powerful imperial state pushed Takakura inward, whereas the framework of Christendom and Congregationalism’s public freedom encouraged Forsyth’s interests in wider British and European concerns. But it was the two men’s differing philosophicotheological matrices that were foundational. To be sure, Takakura and Forsyth shared a common interest in life and vitality over bare theological conformity, an ultimate mistrust of rational clarity, and even "a similar metaphysical and epistemological matrix" as evidenced by their ventures with Ritschlian thought. Nevertheless, Takakura’s Mahayana, subjectivity-only mind meant a fundamental, ontological-awareness of reality; Forsyth’s Western, Latin-English heritage included an ingrained, subject-object distinguishing mindset.

It is helpful here to recall Takakura’s developing thought relative to the "problem of culture," or the "kingdom of God." First, his dual sense of "the ultimate unity of the self and the universe," and of a "total practical or existential standpoint" demanding the "transformation of the world at its roots," propels him "outward." Takakura then subsequently submerges individual and corporate salvation in the "awareness" of the Cross. As it turns out in relation to the Cross, then, Takakura’s and

\[471\] Takakura thus applauds Jesus’s superior, inner view of sin, the kingdom of God, and repentance as compared to the more exterior views of both the Pharisees and John the Baptist. Moreover, he notes that John’s use of "logos" for the Incarnation not only shows how he sees the eternal and absolute in the temporal and relative, but also the internal in the external as well. "Yohane Den oyobi sono Chushin Shiso," 1926 (Taisho 15), in Chosakushu, Vol.3, pp.132-135,153-154; cf. above, Part IV, pp.398(n.143).

\[472\] Cf. above, Part IV, p.428.

\[473\] Cf. above, Part IV, p.405.

\[474\] Cf. above, Part IV, pp.431-432,467.
Forsyth's similar emphases on the divine versus the human side have different implications. For Forsyth, his subject-object discrimination focuses on God's versus man's action: "When Christ did what He did, it was not human nature doing it, it was God doing it."\textsuperscript{475} For Takakura, however, the same emphasis points to the "recognition of God's being King" within those who "experience the forgiveness of sin in the Cross." The inner "attitude of worship" incorporates an "outer" action, i.e., allegedly external to the self.\textsuperscript{476} This subjectivity-only mentality similarly understands John's statement, "In the beginning was the Word...," not as speaking of the Son's existence from eternity past, but of the experience of the "Christ of the Cross" as the recognition of the Word's "absolute authority."\textsuperscript{477} As a result, Takakura on the one hand avoids solipsism—one of FK's consistently targeted enemies in the form of "subjectivism"\textsuperscript{478}—because "experience is more fundamental than individual differences."\textsuperscript{479} On the other, he is able to emphasise the eschatological, existential urgency of "choice, of resolution."\textsuperscript{480}

\textsuperscript{475}Forsyth, 1910, p.24; cf. pp.55,81-82,92-93.

\textsuperscript{476}Emphases mine; cf. Part III, p.372. Kumano's failure to recognise Takakura's primary focus here on the believer's attitude explains how he can interpret Takakura's understanding of the atonement as close to substitutionary. Kumano, 1976, p.19.

\textsuperscript{477}Cf. Part III, p.339. This does not mean that Takakura cannot and does not speak along the lines of the Son's eternal existence. As he states concerning the gospel of John's teaching on the fellowship of the Son and the Father, "...Jesus, from eternity past is in the bosom of God." ("...Iesu ha eien no ko yori kami no futokoro ni imaseshi mono naru koto.") "Yohane Den oyobi sono Chushin Shiso," 1926 (Taisho 15), in Chosakushu, Vol.3, p.163.

\textsuperscript{478}Cf. Part III, pp.292,297,309.

\textsuperscript{479}This is Nishida's position in Zen no Kenkyu. Cf. above, Part IV, p.382.

\textsuperscript{480}This is implied in such phraseology as, "When I am aware..." of the Cross ("...jikaku suru toki..."). Cf. above, Part IV, p.449(n.381). As he states more directly elsewhere, "Each moment, one directly faces the judgement and resurrection of the last day." Having the conviction, faith, and belief of God's judgement and atonement of the individual and of the world means being faced with the continuing crisis of Christ or self. Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.9, pp.886-892 (quotation from p.892).
Takakura’s thinking here becomes clearer—or perhaps more personal—by recalling some of his notions of time and history. The third pair of ideas mentioned above deals with history and "superhistory."\[^{481}\] In FK, Takakura speaks of Christ, the Incarnation, and biblical revelation as "superhistorical reality coming into historical, human reality," and thus as something "experienced as eternal reality."\[^{482}\] Similar in terms of religious meaning, "the story of Adam’s fall is not a historical fact, but a superhistorical truth," and Christ’s Second Coming is not a "coming historical fact," but "something...hoped for as a superhistorical reality."\[^{483}\] Takakura does not need to define here what "superhistory" might "be": the point is to experience reality. By doing so within the change and uncertainty of human life, the deep conflict of flesh versus spirit has a certain resolution now in Christ and His kingdom.\[^{484}\]

Moreover, what we have listed above as Takakura’s fifth and sixth pairs of temporal ideas, which deal respectively with the eschatological character of God’s reign and the punctiliar act of God in Christ as history’s "condensation" or "centre,"\[^{485}\] come into play here. Takakura himself harmonises and personalises God’s gracious Cross-centred reign in the existential implications of resolution and choice in the sinful

---

\[^{481}\]Cf. above, Part IV, p.461.

\[^{482}\]Cf. Part III, pp.296,299,308.

\[^{483}\]Takakura’s use of "endgeschichtlich" as the equivalent of "superhistorical" accentuates the eschatological urgency he intends to convey. Cf. Part III, pp.314-315,334-335(ns.287,288).

\[^{484}\]Thus in "present faith" one "directly faces in the conscience the last judgement-the Lord’s Second Coming." Or in other words, "To the person in the Lord Christ in particular, presently, the surpassing power to be able to overcome sin, the flesh, and this world is given. While expectantly waiting for the Lord’s Second Coming, we must labour to pray with open eyes and be in the Lord of the Cross now." That is, "For the person who believingly looks up to it, the Lord’s Cross causes firmly and keenly to experience now the last judgement as an eternal reality." Emphases original. Takakura’s July, 1931 (Showa 6) sermon, "Shumatsu to Seiketsu" ("The Eschaton and Holiness") Fukuin to Gendai No.5, July, 1931 (Showa 6), pp.6-8; Zenshu, Vol.2, pp.466-469.

\[^{485}\]Cf. above, Part IV, p.463.
self's co-judgement and co-death with Christ.\footnote{Takakura's certainty of God's eternal affirmation and love is bound to his co-awareness with Paul and Luther of the self's crisis of death accompanied by the Self's actualization.\footnote{Put differently, the "power to crush Satan's head" comes only from "God's certain grace which believes, forgives, and saves people like us."\footnote{Christ's Cross is thus the Cross in that the corporate certainty of the inner, sinful self's ultimate demise is experienced existentially at God's gracious initiative. Because this experience involves the encounter with eternal "reality," it is not only subjectively psychological, but "true."}}

\footnote{Cf. Part III, p.338.}

\footnote{Even before his ecclesiology-atonement-christology merger, Takakura speaks in September, 1915 (Taisho 4), of being "aware" ("jikaku") of the "spiritual self while being deeply engrossed in the self," so that one "hears the prophet Elijah's so-called 'still, small voice'," or the "true life" of God as the Psalmist's "'deep calling to deep'." Moreover, by May, 1917 (Taisho 6), and after colliding more with Paul, Takakura follows the Apostle's words on the Holy Spirit in Romans 8:15 and preaches, "Potentially anyone is God's child, but there also must be a falling of the Holy Spirit to reach an awareness ['jikaku'] of being God's child, and to realise an appropriate life." "Seis\text{\textsho} no Mokus\text{\texto}" ("Meditation of the Holy Place"), in \textit{Oncho no Okoku}, p.36 (Zenshu, Vol.1, p.81); "Kami no Yotsugi," 1917 (Taisho 6) sermon, in \textit{Zenshu}, Vol.1, p.135.}

\footnote{This is how Takakura applies Romans 16:20 in his February, 1932 (Showa 7) sermon, "Heian to Shori" ("Peace and Victory"), in \textit{Onkei to Eiko}, p.122. This "subjective experience" of God's grace is fully compatible with his earlier (November, 1926; Taisho 15) description of Romans 16:20, given Takakura's subjectivity-only mindset:}

When we look up to Christ and the Cross, and see there eternal holy power, using symbolic words we crushed the head of Satan in Christ and His Cross ['Warera ha..., kirisuto to sono jujika ni oite..., satan no atama o kudaita no de aru']. More than in any [other] place, we can experience in Christ and His Cross the most thorough, eternal bankruptcy of evil and victory of God.


\footnote{Takakura remarks in April, 1932 (Showa 7), that without the Holy Spirit, the Cross would not press in upon us, and thus the Cross would simply stop at a}
What we see here again in Takakura is his submerging of historical and "objective-subjective" distinctions. He does this in dealing with the problem of the self/Self, and according to his subjectivity-only mindset. It is the failure to see Takakura's thought as operating in this contextualised manner that seems to hinder some otherwise helpful analyses of his thought, such as Charles Germany's. Thus while carefully noting the theological "influences" on Takakura, Germany is left with at least two areas of dissatisfaction with Takakura: [1] "He was unable, Oshio says, to resolve satisfactorily within his own mind and experience the relation of forgiveness, justification, and sanctification within the context of the problem of self." [2] "In his concept of the Atonement Takakura's usual objectivity was eaten into by elements of subjectivity." Takakura would resist such critiques by appealing to the Cross, as described in the preceding paragraph.

Moreover, Germany can only go so far in attempting to solve the "interpretative problem" of what Takakura means by God's kingdom being realised in history. The conclusion offered is that Takakura's "present, immanent, realization of the Kingdom...does not differ from the now familiar view of 'realized eschatology' found in the writings of C.H. Dodd and others." Furthermore, the "future, ultimate, "psychological reality as a historical recollection" ("rekishiteki kaiso to shite no shin ['kokoro'] riteki genjitsu"). Through the Holy Spirit, however, the Cross confronts us as an "actual reality" ("jitsuzaiteki genjitsu"). Emphases original. "Karubari yori Pentekosute he" ("From Calvary to Pentecost") Fukuin to Gendai No.13, April, 1932, p.1; Zenshu, Vol.6, pp.435-436. Perhaps such a distinction helps clarify the confusing distinction which Takakura makes between "psychological" and "truth" problems in FK. Cf. Part III, p.341(n.317). Takakura's notions of "reality" and "truth" will be further examined below.

As in dealing with other previous analyses of Takakura as well, the thesis writer wants to remember here the words of another author about the importance of "kindness" in criticising someone who wrote within the perspectives of a different era. Cf. above, Part IV, p.393(n.120).

Germany, p.92(n.13). Germany refers to Oshio, pp.153ff.

Germany, p.106. It should be pointed out that the negative language in such an evaluation is within a relatively positive explanation of Takakura's "impact in Japan...in his deeply personal explication" of the atonement.
realization to follow or to accompany the eschatological coming of Christ" is noted to "present interesting ideas," as well as to answer "in part...the question of the relation of the Kingdom to history in his thought." To this thesis writer, following Takakura's thinking along harmonising and personalising paths provides a more satisfactory interpretation of what he intends when he speaks of God's kingdom in history.

Briefly considering two more types of conceptual pairs should suffice in attempting to spin Takakura’s diamond while looking for such pairs. One type includes such pairs as faith and the Holy Spirit, faith and revelation, intuition and revelation. In each of these examples, there is a human-divine dynamic

---

493Ibid., pp.102-103. At certain places in his biography, Oshio offers accounts of Takakura's theological development. Within a section entitled "The Germination of Theology" ("Shingaku no Hoga"), Oshio analyses what he considers the heart of Takakura’s study and thought in Britain. His discussion remains within Takakura’s wrestlings over predestination and the kingdom of God; and, alas, Oshio ends with a quotation from Barth's Church Dogmatics—which (sadly) "Takakura had not been able to read in his lifetime." Oshio, pp.108-115.

494To add an example of Takakura’s corporate, co-awareness also described just above, dealing with God’s kingdom in history and culture is aided by making the effort to "touch the thought of Troeltsch." Emphasis Takakura’s. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.231.

495E.g., Takakura states in his dogmatics lectures, "That which firmly recognises God’s Word in the Bible is not natural reason, but the Holy Spirit or faith." ("...seirai moshiku ha shinko de aru.") Zenshu, Vol.8, p.78.

496In his dogmatics lectures, Takakura describes the relationship between faith and revelation as a "cycle" ("jukan"), reminiscent of his description of the Reformer's "circle" of the Word and Spirit. Moreover, he couples "objective revelation" with "objective faith" in the Church's creeds and confessions. Takakura’s intertwined Christology comes into view in that Jesus Christ is both faith's "object" and "subject" ("taisho" and "shutai"). Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.44,85,104; cf. Part III, p.295.

497This pair comes up often in Takakura’s descriptions of the Old Testament prophets’ deep, keen “intuition” or “insight” (“chokkan,” “dosatsu”). In commenting on "God’s Word" in Romans 3:2, Takakura notes that this refers to "the content of revelation from God to people," and that more than the law portion of the Old Testament, Paul is pointing to the prophets. Takakura also can link human “intuition” of sin arising from being "shined upon by the light of revelation in Jesus Christ" or, interchangeably, "by the light of a typical experience of the nature of sin." Cf. his
involving passive reception and active initiative. Western systematic theology draws a clear line between the elements of these pairs, and thus Takakura the theologian distinguishes them as well. At the same time, Takakura the Christian thinker can speak of these pairs as if they were simply two sides of the same coin, or "no more than names for viewing the same truth from differing perspectives." As we are looking into Takakura's diamond, evidently we are seeing reflections of Takakura's self/Self interaction, which are "one while at the same time remaining two."

This leads to a second type of couplet, namely those explicitly involving divine-human contrasts: Creator-creature, authority-freedom, holy-sinful. We must hear Takakura's strong insistence in FK of the fundamental necessity of keeping a line of demarcation between God the Creator and His creatures. Similarly, Takakura's message is clear about divine authority over human freedom, and the corresponding basic characteristic of the Christian life involving duty, obedience, calling, and conscience versus utilitarianism and pragmatism. Moreover, the reality of sin and human separation from a holy God is central to FK. The charge that Takakura advocates a merger of the soul and God is valid for his earlier years; he himself makes such a self-accusation. But he absolutely and vehemently attacks such a notion later on.

---

498 Cf. Part III, pp.298-300,326.
500 Cf. Part III, pp.300-301.
503 In 1921 (Taisho 10), Takakura notes how earlier he had "led a monstrous life of mixing together God and the self." Emphasis mine. Cf. above, Part IV, p.387(n.89).
504 This development in his thought is the necessary qualification to any blanket evaluation of Takakura's thought as advocating a "union-like" divine-human relationship. Cf. Part III, p.357(n.396).
Nevertheless, we must also hear Takakura’s *interpretation* of what it means for God to be the Creator. On this point, Takakura consistently stresses that first and foremost, the truth of God as Creator means that He is the most *certain* reality.\textsuperscript{505} Just as the story of the fall tells of "superhistorical reality," so does God’s creation of the world speak of the truths that God is the universe’s almighty source and absolute ruler, and that the world’s "meaning...relative to God is to display His glory."\textsuperscript{506} Similarly, obeying God means living in reconciliation with one’s necessary calling, an *attitude* wrapped in the same package as experiencing the forgiveness of sin and self-abandonment to service. *Inner religious attitude* is the constant element relative to all of these truths.

From what has been seen of Takakura’s subjectivity-only faith logic, it can be claimed that all of these divine-human pairs refer to the problem of the self/\textsuperscript{5}Self and its resolution. Being reconciled to the most certain, inner reality is God’s final solution to the enduring, human problem. The self and Self are two, but they are also one. Viewed in this way, Takakura’s struggle with the self/\textsuperscript{5}Self makes the contrasting interpretations of his theology each insightfully correct in its own way: Takakura did come to a point of certainty; yet, his dealings with the self/\textsuperscript{5}Self never ceased. The self’s judgement and salvation in the Cross displayed for Takakura the Self’s righteousness and love. This was his dynamic place of rest and conviction.

2. **Fundamental Notions**

It can be misleading and unfair to reduce a person’s thought to a small, manageable number of basic notions. Nevertheless, to understand someone is to know what moves that person’s thinking in specific directions. Thus at the risk of oversimplification, but for the sake of our understanding, we will seek to discern a handful of fundamental concerns that seem to steer Takakura’s overall thought along certain paths.

\textsuperscript{505} Cf. Part III, p.300.

\textsuperscript{506} Cf. Part III, p.300.
A reasonable place to begin is to identify Takakura's notion of reality, or his ontology. One must note, however, that due to the fundamental ontological-awareness of his subjectivity-only mindset, Takakura's ontology cannot in fact be separated from his epistemology. In that sense, "reality" is "truth" for Takakura. Moreover, approaching his thought through such philosophical categories as "metaphysics" and "epistemology" requires a self-critical caution. His "renewed" thinking demands our "renewed" interpretation. Thus for example, and speaking in negative terms, not only is the real world for Takakura neither fixed Platonic forms nor some sort of material substance: the very possibilities of idealism or materialism do not fit Takakura's sense of reality.507 Similarly, for him to know reality is categorically different from either a method via rational propositions or as ineffable sensory-experience. Hence rationalism or empiricism, for example, are not even adequate options for classifying Takakura's notion of truth.

To attempt to state the matter positively, then, what is real and true for Takakura is dynamic, intuited, deep, encountered, personal, met, and living.508 The "most certain reality" is the experience of God's grace in Jesus Christ; the analysis here

507Therefore one must not jump to hasty philosophicotheological conclusions based on Takakura's "tantalising" interest in Personal Idealist writers, for example, in connection with John Oman. Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.246(n.217), above, Part IV, p.422(n.265).

508E.g., Christ is not just static like a picture, but is "dynamic reality" (written in the characters "doteki na jitsuzai," with "doteki" accompanied by the phoneticised "dainamikku"). "Kibo ni yoru Sku" ("Salvation according to Hope") Seisho no Kensan No.135, March, 1928 (Showa 3), p.3; Zenshu, Vol.2, p.132.

Also, regardless of our circumstances, ultimately we are in the hands of "God's holy, gracious will. The final, responsible person for our life is not fate, matter, or atoms. It is the Lord Creator of heaven and earth, God the Father." "Sozo no Kami" Seisho no Kensan No.145, January, 1929 (Showa 4), p.5; Zenshu, Vol.2, p.200.

Moreover, the Old Testament prophets "touched" God in the "solemn experience called 'The reality of God'." Emphasis original; "The reality of God" is written in English. "Kirisutokyo no Tokushoku to shite no Choshizen" Fukuin Shinpo No.1470, 30 August 1923 (Taisho 12), p.5; Chosakushu, Vol.1, pp.261-262.

suggests that this can be described equally as well for Takakura as the Self's actualization, and the self's attitude of worship or abolition. Takakura uses John's words to express his having found "shinjitsu"—reality and truth—in Christ, by God's grace. Seen in terms of the progression of Takakura's published works, God's grace comes as God's rule, Jesus Christ, and Christ's Spirit; or, as the self's denial, worship, and service. In that the redeeming, incarnate Christ is the personal embodiment of reality, "Christ in me" becomes the ultimate Christological

509 As Takakura comments about Isaiah’s "atonement experience" recorded in Isaiah six, "He experienced the death of the self before God's holy judgement." "Yogensha Izaya no Shinko" ("The Faith of the Prophet Isaiah") Fukuin to Gendai No.4, June, 1931 (Showa 6), p.24; Chosakushu, Vol.3, p.104. Cf. above, Part IV, pp.448(n.378),450,465.

Takakura’s use of the word "nothing" ("mu") for what the self is realised to be can be interpreted to carry connotations of mysticism. To rebut this misunderstanding, he says his meaning of the word "is not the mystic's so-called negative mu, but [that] having the most positive thing and creative power." Although offering any further analysis is beyond this thesis' scope, it can be suggested here that Takakura's "mu," while avoiding what he would call mysticism, nevertheless does have Mahayana Buddhist overtones. "Oncho no Fukami," in Oncho to Shomei, p.13 (Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.130); dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, p.368; cf. Part III, p.326(n.242).


Thus in later years Takakura interchangeably pairs the words "shinri" ("truth") and "shinjitsu" ("truth" or "faithfulness") with "grace." Cf., e.g., "Karubari yori Pentekosute he" Fukuin to Gendai No.13, April, 1932 (Showa 7), p.1 (Zenshu, Vol.6, p.434); "Kurisumasu no Danso" ("Thoughts on Christmas") Fukuin to Gendai No.21, December, 1932 (Showa 7), p.1 (Zenshu, Vol.6, p.449).

511 I.e., Oncho no Okoku (Kingdom of Grace), 1921 (Taisho 10); Oncho to Shinjitsu (Grace and Truth), 1925 (Taisho 14); Oncho to Shomei (Grace and Calling), 1926 (Taisho 15); Sato recommends seeing Takakura's theological development in terms of these three successive works. Sato, 1992, p.71. (Within this reference, Oncho no Okoku is mistakenly noted to have been published in 1925.)
reality, or true self/Self-awareness. Experiencing Christ and His Cross is truth and reality; thus Takakura claims, "I earnestly pray that we simply have no 'boasting place other than the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ'."

The dual, combined "ontological-epistemological" role of Takakura's notions of "experience" ("keiken," "taiken") and "awareness" ("jikaku") is of fundamental importance here. Takakura consistently employs these Nishidan terms in reference both to Jesus' "Self-awareness," and to faith's "self-awareness." To cite a common example which refers particularly to "self-awareness," but by implication to Jesus' "Self-awareness" and "experience" as well:

There is the thought [in Paul's boasting in the Cross alone] that we are judged in the awareness ['jikaku'] of oneself being a Christian.... Bearing the Cross is first fighting daily the self. That which overcomes the self's passions, flesh, and character is the Cross.... We must perceive ['kakugo'] the matter of bearing the Cross.

As noted earlier, Takakura's ultimate Christological reality is Jesus' own "Self-awareness of being the Son." He also suggests this is the fountainhead of our own belief, the place to which we must "trace back" our faith. The correlative notion of Christ as "the true Self"--the same as "I" but distinguishable from "ego"--pushes Christology and self/Self-identity together. This is not surprising, of course, in light of Takakura's bringing together of Christology, ecclesiology, and soteriology. Cf. above, Part IV, pp.396,431,453.

Cf. Part III, p.324. It is intriguing to note here another author's comments explicitly comparing the central foci of Christianity and Buddhism: "The Christian symbol complex of cross-resurrection and the Buddhist doctrine of no-self may be pointing to a similar reality from opposite directions. That is to say, the authentic 'I' as the Holy Spirit seems to be related to the synthesis of active love and dependent love." Abe Nobuhiko, 1992, p.263.

One suspects that Takakura would have vehemently denied the first sentence, pointing for example to the "objective," "historical" reality of the Cross-Resurrection, as well as the incomprehensibility of the Buddhist "no-self." At the same time, given some of his representative "FK" ideas such as "first person' God" and salvation-affirmation coming with judgement-denial, Takakura likely would have affirmed the second statement, if it stood apart from the first.

"Shu Iesu no In o Oburu Mono" ("The Person Bearing the Marks of the Lord Jesus") Seisho no Kansen No.168, December, 1930 (Showa 5), pp.4,6; Zenshu, Vol.2, pp.374,377. The characters for "awareness" ("jikaku") and "perceive" ("kakugo") overlap, so to speak: the "kaku" in each term is the same character. Interestingly--although by itself this fact cannot offer any sort of conclusive evidence--the "go" of
"Awareness" submerges what "really happened" on the Cross and what "really happens" in the self-Self struggle.515

God's grace and human faith in the Cross indicates a second fundamental notion for Takakura: the necessity of mediation or intervention for the experience of reality and truth.516 As Takakura sees himself/Self in Job, he notes that "Job's most acute distress lies in the experience of having been thrust away from Yahweh. He could not be reconciled with God." In that condition, Job moves a step ahead in "self-consciousness" as he becomes "aware"517 both of his own "weakness, foolishness, and deep sin" and of the "dignity of his life which must not be snatched away." Then the "intuitive, creative side of his faith" is seen in Job's "leap of thought," enabling him to be "given inspiration in a certain moment, uttering words such as those which suggest a high, future world." These words are none other than Job's well-known expression of faith in his living Redeemer, Whom one day he shall see.518 In addressing the ultimate solution to the fundamental need for mediation, Job's thought has thus "reached the highwater mark."519

As with Job, the necessity for mediation in Takakura's heart and mind is two-fold, due to two basic barriers. One is the "deep, human dualism" of indwelling sin. For Takakura, this is the ultimate problem, the "mysterious abyss," for individuals and

515This package of ideas has arisen regularly throughout Part IV's analysis of Takakura's thought. Cf. e.g., above, Part IV, pp.446(n.369),472-473.

516Subjectivity's "ontological-awareness" suggests a more precise wording for "experience of reality and truth" as "real, true experience."

517"Self-consciousness" is "jiga ishiki"; "aware," used twice, is "jikaku." This important distinction has been pointed out earlier; cf. above, Part IV, p.385(n.75).


519"Yobu Ki no Shukyo" ("The Religion of the book of Job") Fukuin to Gendai Nos.2,3, April, May, 1931 (Showa 6), pp.23,24,26,30; Chosakushu, Vol.3, pp.37,39, 42,44-45.
Takakura’s awareness of sin arises upon meeting Paul’s words in Romans three; as his thought on the atonement develops, reconciling the sinful self and the holy divine Other becomes his central theological concern. God’s intervention in the Cross emerges as the only solution: co-crucifixion with Christ alone brings sin’s judgement and salvation, self-denial and Self-affirmation. "Only faith alone, grace alone" is a sufficient solution to the ethico-religious problem of sin.

Takakura’s label for the second barrier requiring mediation is "external historical fact," which is separated from "spiritual interiority." Takakura’s calling the problem of sin a "bottomless riddle" indicates how fundamentally "real" that struggle is for him; in a similar way, his terming the overcoming of this second barrier a "complete miracle" and "mysterious thing" shows how "true" the need for mediation is here, too. Takakura attributes the solution to this barrier of "faith’s paradox," i.e., the historic Christ becoming the inner Christ, to the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit. This thesis, while of course concurring with Takakura, sees the crucial role of Takakura’s historical intuition in submerging the external-internal gap he encounters here.

Takakura’s drawing together of several separate areas of thought via the bridge of history has already been outlined. The net effect of his using that historical bridge is the ability to move away from "romanticism," "pantheism" and "mysticism": it is through the appeal to history that Takakura so vehemently attacks these aspects

---

523 Cf. Part III, p.327.
of his earlier years and of his indigenous religious context. Simultaneously, Takakura has been able to retain his continuing identity as a Mahayana thinker—arriving at what he interchangeably calls "Historic Mysticism" and "Evangelical Mysticism"—in being propelled outward from the self to transform the world.

While in one sense Takakura's subjectivity-only mind can unhesitatingly submerge historical and other gaps, this analysis sees two crucial factors as accentuating the challenge Takakura faces in dealing with his fundamental sense of the need for mediation via history. [1] Both his inherited religious tradition and his adopted faith of Christianity inherently embrace stories of soteriological, divine actions. Thus while Takakura's complicated notions of time and history—especially including his appeals to "superhistory" and "eternity"—do not solve the thorny problem of how to compare the Amida and Jesus stories historically, he cannot help but consider the importance of history in his thinking. [2] Along with God's holiness,

---

525 Cf. Part III, pp.299,301,304,312.

526 He refers to the former in his dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.54,131; cf. Part III, pp.297,327.

527 "Historically" here refers particularly to basic understandings of the nature of history. One recent attempt to compare critically Shin Buddhism and Christianity is made by Hee-Sung Keel, Understanding Shinran: A Dialogical Approach. Fremont, California: Asian Humanities Press, 1995, pp.155-182. An alternative to Keel's conclusion that neither Pure Land Buddhism nor Christianity absolutises the stories upon which each is based (p.181) is provided by Stephen T. Franklin's essay in Bruce J. Nicholls, ed., The Unique Christ in our Pluralist World. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1994, pp.263-272. Franklin includes as part of what he calls the "Christian a-priori" the "priority of the historical-factual over the existential-universal."

I am grateful to Paul Swanson for introducing me to the first book, and to Stephen T. Franklin for directing my attention to the latter work.

528 In concluding his advice to a friend about the goodness of marriage—and summarising his overall posture towards time and history—Takakura notes, "Christianity's fundamental special characteristic is in the fact that, in God and Christ, we enliven history and time." 3 January 1931 (Showa 6) letter, in Zenshu, Vol.10, "Shokan," p.20.

Further to justify what the thesis has seen as Takakura's Mahayana-type of thought, appeal can be made to Shinran's similar dealings with the "problem of time," as explained by Nishitani Keiji in his important article on the subject. Nishitani,
Christianity’s historical aspect is used consistently by Takakura as an argument to distinguish it from Buddhism.\(^{529}\) He also insists on the related necessity of indirect, mediated knowledge of God versus the alleged direct union with the divine espoused by Japan’s "Eastern pantheism," or Buddhist mysticism.\(^{530}\) Surely this is at least partly Takakura’s own struggle for identity. For one, there is an unconscious interreligious dialogue occurring.\(^{531}\) In addition, incorporating Western theology involves thinking in ways other than a more natural, immediately intuitive way. Rather than focusing on the "conceptual and propositional" aspects of Western theology as a help, Takakura utilises what could be considered as more compatible historical emphases.\(^{532}\)

Whether in overcoming barriers related to history or to sin, Takakura’s notion of the necessity of mediatory help is fundamental. One further aspect of this basic notion

---

\(^{529}\)This is a consistent theme in the references listed earlier in relation to Takakura’s comments on Buddhism. Cf. above, Part IV, pp.373-375(ns.24-27).

\(^{530}\)Takakura does this, for example, in his "Sato (Shigehiko) Kun ni Kotau" Fukuin Shinpo No.1685, 1 December 1927 (Showa 2), p.6; Zenshu, Vol.5, p.208. Takakura’s notion of knowing Christ as part of the Church throughout history is intimately related to the need for historical mediation: "Here is faith’s objectivity and certainty" ("...kyakkansei to kakujitsusei..."). Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.129-130. Cf. Part III, p.299.

\(^{531}\)The unconscious, ongoing nature of Takakura’s wrestlings with interreligious matters has appeared regularly in this analysis. Another of several examples is a relatively late (1929; Showa 4) reference to a certain religious scholar’s analysis of general, distinguishing marks of Shinto, Buddhism, and Christianity. The first looks outward at the self’s surroundings, the second looks inward, the third upward to God. While of course placing himself in the Christian, upward-looking category, this analysis has seen that Takakura must also be seen as an introspective thinker. "Gyobo yori Taibo he" Seisho no Kensan No.147, March, 1929, pp.1-2; Zenshu, Vol.2, p.209.

concerns grace, or divine initiative. Without God’s coming in Christ, there is no forgiveness of sin, no certainty of resolving the self/Self problem. This is the "road of necessity" which Jesus travelled, as well as the evolutionary longing of life culminating in Jesus Christ. In later disparaging this latter, "romantic" notion, Takakura appeals to the "supertemporal, eternal [human-divine] relationship" expressed by the theological idea of God’s electing grace. Moreover, true prayer only comes from the dynamic, personal God initiating the self/Self interaction. This divine initiative is what makes God not a dead third person partner in prayer, but the second person object, and indeed the first person subject. Hence the "most real world" of prayer is entered only by the Self’s actualization, and the self's corresponding passive abolition in faith.

This leads to what this examination would term to be Takakura’s third and most

533 "The true cause [of our faith] is in the hands of God’s grace... We should understand that the inner necessity of grace is working in our faith." "Oncho to Shimei" ("Grace and Mission"), 1923 (Taisho 12), in Oncho to Shinjitsu, p.191; Chosakushu, Vol.1, p.158. Cf. above, Part IV, p.433.

534 Takakura continues his comments on the "inner necessity of grace" by remarking on the importance of "Paul’s faith of election more powerfully living within us." Ibid. Cf. Part III, pp.327-328.


536 In preaching from Mark nine, Takakura contrasts the world of blessing and peace on the mount of Jesus’ Transfiguration with the world of debate and pain at the bottom. Jesus’ calling to realise the former world in the latter is fulfilled upon the believer’s prayer of faith and repentance, exemplified in the demon-possessed boy’s father’s cry, "I do believe; help my unbelief." The father "throws every bit of himself before the Lord Jesus" in "conscious-like decisiveness." In other words, Takakura’s Self-actualization and self-abolition is the realisation of Jesus’ calling in the Christian’s prayer. "Ketsudanteki Shinko" ("Decisive Faith") Seisho no Kansan No.160, April, 1930 (Showa 5), pp.1-7; Zenshu, Vol.2, pp.291-301. Cf. Part III, pp.329-330.

537 Although apparently more complex to do so, the choice here has been to keep the barriers of sin and history, along with the notion of grace, subservient to Takakura’s sense of a need for mediation; i.e., the notion of intervention for realising true and real experience is deemed to be Takakura’s second fundamental concern.
fundamental notion and concern, that of certainty. Repeatedly throughout Takakura’s works, certainty or conviction is emphasised.\textsuperscript{538} It is the ultimate criterion for evaluating attitudes and arguments; regardless of the subject, the basic concern of faith’s certainty eventually arises.\textsuperscript{539} In Takakura’s own words, "Faith is most sensitive to the certainty of its object." Moreover, "The most important thing for religious consciousness is God’s objective certainty."\textsuperscript{540}

The accompanying certainty is thus why the objective revelation and "Word" of the Bible is to be embraced,\textsuperscript{541} why God is the Creator,\textsuperscript{542} why the Cross is the final

Arranging the analysis in such a way is felt not only more accurately to represent Takakura’s thought: the final triad of basic notions--reality, need for mediation, and certainty--are deemed more understandable and coherent as a group as well.

\textsuperscript{538}For example, "tashikasa" is the only word emphasised in "Kami no Sangyo" ("God’s Industry") Fukuiin to Gendai No.10, December, 1931 (Showa 6), pp.2-8; Zenshu, Vol.2, pp.511-520. Cf. Part III, pp.296(n.95),298(n.106),311(n.160),312(n.163),324(n.226),327(n.248),339(n.308).

\textsuperscript{539}Thus, e.g., the debate between Sato Shigehiko and Takakura shifts from the person of Jesus to the concern for certainty. Kumano, 1968, p.391; cf. Part III, pp.362-363.

\textsuperscript{540}"Shinko ha sono taisho no tashikasa ni mottomo binkan naru mono de aru"; and, "Shukyo ishiki ni totte judainaru koto ha kami no kyakkanteki tashikasa de aru." Emphases mine. Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, p.57, Vol.9, p.588.

\textsuperscript{541}As explained above, the "Word" is the corporate solidarity of the Church’s intuitive experience; cf. Part III, p.339, above, Part IV, pp.452-453,463-464. Cf. too, Takakura’s dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.22,43,74,93,150. There Takakura reasons in the following type of way: [1] "That which truly, objectively can understand God’s Word in the Bible is the Church." [2] There is a unity between "objective revelation" and "objective faith" in the Church’s creedal confessions. [3] Schleiermacher’s stress on experience versus scholastic rationalism is commendable, but his "individual experience" leads to "subjectivism," which is "easily shaken and easily falls into superficiality." Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.95,104,108.

eschatological solution to sin, why God’s faithfulness to forgive and purify sin is to be seen in the Christ’s Cross and shed blood, why grace alone gives salvation, why the "faith of election" should be believed, why faith is God’s work, why God’s "eternal administration" is to be trusted, why speculative reason is inadequate, why the "inner necessity" of Jesus and Paul is to be treasured, why prayer is important, why prayer is to be done in faith

543 Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.9, p.886.

544 "God’s faithfulness is made certain not only in the forgiveness of sin through Christ’s Cross, but also in the purification of sin through the Lord’s blood." Emphasis mine. "Kami no Shinjitsu" ("God’s Faithfulness") Fukutin to Gendai No.2, April, 1930, pp.6-7; Zenshu, Vol.2, pp.436-437.


547 "When we are able to recognise faith as God’s work, the certainty of salvation is first able to stand." Emphasis original. "Kami no Fukami" ("The Depth of God"), in Oncho to Shomei, p.14; Chosakushu, Vol.4, p.132.

548 "Whatever we think subjectively, the Lord God’s eternal administration carries objective certainty, penetrates all things, and is realised." Emphasis original. "Jitsuseikatsu ni okeru Yushinsha" ("The Theist in Real Life") Seisho no Kensan No.139, July, 1928 (Showa 3), p.3; Zenshu, Vol.2, p.151.

549 For a few additional references in this area, cf. Takakura’s dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.177-180.


and with the help of the Holy Spirit. For Takakura, Reformation, evangelical, biblical Christianity stands apart from rationalistic, pietistic, and Roman Catholic Christianity in leading to "eschatological certainty," and in having "conviction." Takakura appeals to "eternal" reality because that is unmovable, "certain" reality. Even though Takakura's understanding of the "most certain reality" shifts within his developing thought from the "self" to "God," the very phrase "certain reality" indicates the union for Takakura of the "certain" and the

552“The certainty of our prayer exists...only in faith.” Emphasis original. Ibid. Seisho no Kensan No.162, June, 1930 (Showa 5), p.5; Zenshu, Vol.2, p.326.


554Similarly, seventeenth century orthodoxy’s use of rationalistic arguments are inadequate because they "cannot certify the absoluteness of the Bible." Emphasizes mine. Cf. Takakura’s dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.8, pp.24,76.


The main link here for Takakura is between "eternal" and "unchanging." In making that connection, he was simply being faithful to the heritage of his mother tongue. Upon etymologically studying the Japanese words for "eternity,” one analyst concludes: “The idea of eternity is symbolised by a stable, secure huge rock....” ("Eien no kannen ha kyoko na banjaku ni yotte shochosar...”) Ono Susumu, Nihongo o Sakanoboru (Tracing Back Japanese). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974, p.187.

556In 1921 (Taisho 10), Takakura points to the former. By the time his "Evangelical Christianity" has settled, God or the Self has become actualised, and is thus Takakura’s certain reality. "Even if the self is a phantom, only Jesus is ultimate reality." "Yohane Den oyobi sono Chushin Shiso," 1926 (Taisho 15), in Chosakushu, Vol.3, p.174. Cf. Part III, pp.32-33, above, Part IV, p.450(n.388).

The dynamic, non-discriminating subjectivity-only nature of Takakura’s thinking is shown by his calling other things related to his self/Self venture as the "most certain" or "ultimate" reality, e.g., faith, God’s purpose, prayer. Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.9, p.638; cf. Part III, p.334, above, Part IV, p.478.
"real." The conviction-experience of the awareness of God's grace in the Cross is the true and real certainty.

One can see this basic emphasis of Takakura on acquiring certainty as the combined effect of a number of factors: an embedded longing for Shinran's "shinjin," a volatile family life during childhood, the confusion of swimming amongst several swirling intellectual currents, rapid socio-economic changes, political authoritarianism, religious ferment, his discontent with Meiji Christianity, and the sometimes confusing stimulation brought by Western theology. Whatever the causes, Takakura's

557 With earlier qualifications about the applicability of philosophical categories, this indicates his ontological-epistemological unity: "reality" is "truth." Particularly in light of Takakura's notion of "reality" as something dynamic, deep, and intuited, the background of "conservative evangelical" criticism may be discerned. If indeed the epistemological foundation of "inerrancy" rests at least in part on Lockean, Cartesian context-independent "propositions which contain logically-correctly related determined ideas only," Takakura's sense of the "truth" of the Bible would be different. Schouls, 1990, pp.14ff.; cf. above, Part IV, pp.390-391(n.105).

Takakura himself adds a further qualification that "certainty" alone, apart from its content, is inadequate. True and real certainty is to be found in "Evangelical Christianity." Thus he commends the faith of German crisis theology for its "certainty and earnestness" ("tashikasa to shinkensa"), but he questions the presence amongst the crisis theologians of the piety, truth, and blessing of the Reformers' faith. "Kiki Shingaku ni tuite" Fukuin to Gendai. No.15, June, 1932 (Showa 7), p.1; Chosakushu, Vol.3, p.396.

558 Takakura's comments on the book of Revelation are instructive here. In that book, Takakura sees that the "ultimate, deepest world is that of the atonement." The recorded war between the Lamb and Satan is "none other than the objectification of Paul's so-called spirit and flesh." "Ultimate reality" then is mentioned to be the heavenly Jesus, worship of the slain Lamb, the Lamb slain before the world, or worship of the atoning, Creator God. The book's final vision of the new heavens and new earth is "made certain to us through the logic of faith and conscience." Dogmatics lectures, in Zenshu, Vol.9, pp.918-922.

559 Takakura's encountering much of theology in either English or German, i.e., in languages other than his mother tongue, undoubtedly accentuated his inner, "interreligious dialogue." This would have been particularly true in terms of any attempt at integrating the Christian faith with the religion of his childhood. In describing Sigmund Freud's case noted earlier, Vitz remarks, "For Sigmund, the world of the nanny would have been based on Czech (to some extent associated with Church Latin), while with his parents the language was German (and Yiddish). Language would have differentiated these two worlds rather sharply." Vitz, 1988,
emphasize on certainty is unmistakable throughout his writings.\textsuperscript{560}

This analysis sees Takakura as having wrestled with himself/Self throughout his life in order to come to that ultimate place of conviction. Moreover, as a part of the Toyama Church in late Taisho and early Showa, he/He indeed seems to have--together with Jacob--both experienced Bethel in the midst of Luz, as well as crossed the river Jabbok.\textsuperscript{561} In his "self's crisis," the Other had emerged as "the One sitting in this dark room of faith."\textsuperscript{562} Takakura had thus been gripped by "the mystery of the life of faith": having entered the "eternal fight," he had found "eternal peace."\textsuperscript{563}

\textsuperscript{560}Soon after Takakura's death, one close friend observed that Takakura had resembled Pascal, both in his experience of the atonement, as well as in the search for certainty. Fukuda, 1934 (Showa 9), pp.148-149.

\textsuperscript{561}"Jitsuseikatsu ni okeru Yushinsha" Seisho no Kansen No.139, July, 1928 (Showa 3), pp.1-8; Zenshu, Vol.2, pp.147-158. Takakura's submerging of completed and continuing action is seen even here, however: as late as July, 1933 (Showa 8), he can still say, "My inner man is fighting fiercely as if crossing the river Jabbok." Zenshu, Vol.10, "Shokan," p.92.

\textsuperscript{562}Cf. Part III, p.340.

\textsuperscript{563}Takakura writes of Paul, "Paul's life of faith is an eternal faith. If said from an absolute viewpoint, at any time it is absolute victory, absolute peace. Eternal fight, but also eternal victory is a special characteristic of Paul's faith...." Earlier in this same essay, Takakura refers to the "eternal problem" of the flesh-spirit dualism experienced "not only in Paul, but in Augustine, in Luther, and in us...." "Pauro no Shukyo," 1926 (Taisho 15), in Chosakushu, Vol.3, pp.192,209. Cf. Part III, p.336, above, Part IV, p.477.
Conclusion

Takakura Tokutaro exerted a powerful influence on the Japanese Protestant Church during the late 1920’s and early 1930’s (early Showa). His influence was focused on the NKK, particularly through his preaching and seminary teaching in Tokyo. However, Takakura’s ministry was by no means confined to the capital city, nor just to the NKK. His speaking took him to churches throughout Japan, and Takakura’s writing, most notably *FK*, had an impact far beyond his own denomination. It is no overstatement to say that "the contribution of Takakura to the church in his time was profound and far reaching," and that he carried Japanese theology "commandingly in a new direction."1

But whereas the importance of Takakura’s theology within the Church has been recognised, its *limitation* to the Church has been noted as well. Particularly in comparison to such an eclectic thinker as Uchimura Kanzo, Takakura’s writings seemingly do not address concerns beyond those of the Church; consequently, the general public has never known of Takakura or his thought.2 Moreover, even within the Church, most of Takakura’s students left their theological mentor for "the whole wealth of the dialectical view of faith" which they found in Barthian thought.3 Thus while the chapter Takakura helped to write in the history of Japanese Christian thought may have been an important one, it has been seen as relatively brief, limited in scope, as well as a *completed* chapter.4

---

1*Germany,* pp.89,106.


3Matsuoka, 1978, p.76.

4Ohki, in "Takakura Tokutaro to Nihon no Kyokai" panel discussion, 1964, p.42. Professor Ohki does note, however, that Takakura’s originality would have been developed had not Barthianism swept into Japanese theological circles. p.43.

Interestingly, it is Professor Unuma—standing apart from the other theologians by using her ethical approach—who understands Takakura to have left his successors with unfinished intellectual business. She contends that, in contrast to Uemura’s positive posture towards the "heart of Japanese people," Takakura’s attempt to "cross swords with" and "reform" the Japanese spirit with the Christian gospel is a matter
Such an understanding of Takakura’s thought and influence also sees him basically as having fulfilled Uemura Masahisa’s wishes to import contemporary Scottish theology into the Japanese Church. In so doing Takakura’s contribution consisted primarily of introducing Calvinism to the Christian community in Japan, and then unwittingly of creating an environment receptive to German dialectical theology. While thus recognised to have played a crucial role of transition, Takakura’s theology has been viewed as lacking in originality, as well as being out of touch with the indigenous "ethos and issues of the day."

If confined to a familiar theological framework of analysis, one would be hard-pressed to disagree with the above understanding of Takakura’s influence. Such a view can appreciate the intensity of the man, but it cannot help but see Takakura’s thought as something rather unattractive and bland. However, it is obvious that this thesis will not stand for such an anticlimactic conclusion. What has demanded our attention throughout this examination has been Takakura’s own particular identity as a Japanese Christian who lived when and where he did. Thus while certain familiar categories may enable satisfactory theological classification on some scales, this thesis sees Takakura’s own unique human Christian thought as exhibiting a complexity that resists quick and easy classification.

Unquestionably, from his earliest days as a Christian Takakura was spurred on in his theological development by interacting with Western theology. But better than seeing select Western theologians as having had a dominant influence on Takakura is the more panoramic view that comes by trying to think with Takakura within the span of history encompassing his life. Takakura studied Western science and learned German, for example, because of starting school in 1892 (Meiji 25) as opposed to one century earlier. Moreover, the Christian faith which Takakura encountered came both directly and indirectly through the West because of his learning of the faith in


5Quotation from Matsuoka, 1978, p.74 (cf. pp.75-76,235-239); Oshio, p.184, as cited by Germany, p.106; Germany, pp.88,95.
late nineteenth and early twentieth Japan (latter half of Meiji). If God had brought Christianity to him in first century Rome, Takakura would have thought as a Roman Christian, probably deciphering the Jewish code by which it was being transmitted. As it was, Takakura the Japanese dealt with the Christian faith as communicated by Western symbols. And seeing his dealings with Western Christianity as something inherently tied to his historical context helps one indeed to see him and thus more faithfully to understand his thinking.

What viewing Takakura as a unique human being living within unique circumstances opens up is an appreciation of the power of his thought. It was within his own historical context that he searched desperately until coming to a place of conviction concerning the truth of the gospel. Because it was Protestantism into which Takakura in fact entered, he received for one the particular theological, socio-political, and organisational expression of the Christian faith which was embodied in Uemura and the NKK. Takakura was then directed to Western Protestant theologians, and it was thus within those thinkers’ categories that Takakura often had to work out his own programme as a Christian thinker. Moreover, it has been due to the same kind of concrete connections that both Takakura and those of us who are still in relatively close historical proximity to him are a part of Western Protestantism. Part of the potency for us today of Takakura’s example of “thinking on his own terms” comes from realising that it has therefore in fact been largely within the categories of Western Protestantism that Takakura has been understood and evaluated.

Heretofore, Western Protestantism has seemed largely incapable of recognising the religio-cultural ground onto which it has seen itself flowing, sweeping away everything in its allegedly pre-determined path. Quite naturally, then, Protestant theological evaluations of Takakura have sought to gather up his thought into their

---

6 Obviously this illustration requires imagination to overcome its inherent impossibilities.
7 Cf. Part II, ch.1.
8 Cf. Part II, ch.2.
own frameworks of understanding the Christian faith. Nevertheless, what Takakura's example of Christianity's intercultural and interlingual translation has shown us here is the fundamental place of inherited religious heritage in his thought, along with all the other elements of his particular historical context. Takakura's new Christian identity gained at age twenty-one did not obliterate either the patterns or the content of thought ingrained since birth, learned as a child, and developed as a youth. Rather, Takakura's own wrestlings with Jesus Christ involved the problem of the self/Self, as it has been termed here. The soil in which Takakura's Christian thought grew was the language, religion, and overall life of his youth. Rather than sweeping over that ground like a relentless river, the Christian faith was planted as a seed, took root, and flourished there.

What we thus observe in Takakura's thought is not a clear stream of Swiss Alpine mountain water, but an oriental blossom which might appear strange because it is new to us. Because it is new, the tendency is to diminish our appreciation of the beauty of that blossom by hastily attaching a name from an out-of-date, and foreign, textbook on theological horticulture. To resist that tendency, those of us who have inherited those textbooks must make the attempt to see the particular historical contexts within which they were written. More personal—and more threatening—is the need to look at how we ourselves understand and articulate the Christian faith on the backdrop of our own particular traditions' historico-cultural and "philosophicotheological" heritages.

Part of the heritage of Western Christendom is the need to classify Christian thinking within an all-encompassing system. Thus while most would want to avoid a culturally-bound theological tunnel-vision, some still might feel compelled to move quickly from this thesis' posture of sympathetically understanding Takakura to

---

9The vast majority of research on Takakura has been conducted by theologians who have either held, or at least been trained under, a theological position sympathetic to Barthianism. The thesis has thus had to give undue attention to declassifying Takakura from that framework—which after all arose in a cultural and historical context far removed from the one in which Takakura's thought developed. Cf. Part II, ch.2, pp.262-266, Part III, pp.363-364, Part IV, pp.407,423-426.
carefully evaluating him. Hence, for example, the slippery question of "syncretism" might arise out of a sincere desire to guard the Christian gospel.

Speaking positively about this need to systematise and evaluate, one could say that there must be a legitimate place for evaluating any thinker as important as Takakura. If the Christian faith enables fellow followers of Jesus Christ to cross historical and cultural barriers in mutual understanding, mutual evaluation should be able to help sharpen the incomplete understandings of everyone involved. But as for a potential charge of "syncretism," the one who would cast the first stone must first appreciate the overall historical context of any present-day look at Takakura. Our missiological ears should be quick to hear, and our pronouncements must be quicker to speak judgement against ourselves and our own cultures than against either another thinker or the culture to which he or she is inextricably bound.

On a practical level this thesis’ desire to come to grips with Takakura’s thought and to explain it has been deemed more than enough to try and handle in one study. Moreover, at the thesis’ outset, the current "limited realisation" of the universalisation of theology was noted.10 One of the practical implications of this situation is the need to encourage all of God’s people—regardless of cultural context—to articulate their own understandings of the Christian gospel. Mutually corrective judgement surely will continue to be there: what is needed is the recognition of the freedom and responsibility which those outside Western Christendom have already been exercising to think, speak, and be heard by the entire Christian Church.

Another significant implication of the pluralistic, universal character of Christian theology is to continue to fan into flame the simmering desire to rediscover fresh points of contact between Christianity and contemporary Western culture. Over a millennium has passed since the Christian faith was received by most parts of the West, and we desperately need to look from the margins in order to see the central points of gospel critique within our own contexts. Particularly enlightening in this

---

10 Cf. Introduction, p.1(n.2).
regard is the careful, comparative examination of Christian thought from other contexts, one instance of which this thesis has attempted to carry out.

We must therefore conclude this particular study with a dual sense of closure and of beginning. On the one hand, although unable to summarise in one brief statement Takakura’s complex thought, we have come to an overall sense of what and how he thought. To try and verbalise that sense in a concise form: Takakura’s "Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo" was his understanding of the Meiji and Western forms of Christianity which God brought to him within his own place in Meiji, Taisho, and early Showa Japan. Furthermore, the Christian faith was addressed to him personally as well as to his "ontological" religious heritage. The "take-no-captives" character of the Western Christianity which came to him added to the difficulty of assimilation which Takakura already faced in having to disentangle the Christian faith from foreign cultures and languages. Nevertheless, our examination has seen both the resiliency of Takakura’s ingrained matrix of thought, along with the Christian faith’s adaptability to "re-entangle" itself into Takakura’s "Evangelical Christianity." With that "feel" for the man’s complex religious thought, the present examination can close with a sense of marvel after having looked cross-culturally and across history at this case of the Christian faith taking shape in the Japanese thinker, Takakura Tokutaro.

Together with such a closure comes new beginnings. There are ever new challenges facing non-Western Christians, and those of us directly haunted within our very makeups by the ghost of Western Christendom have to be recaptured by a flexible wonder and adventure in living as Christian people. More specifically related to this thesis are the new ways of exploring Takakura’s thought in relation to other thinkers and to various topics, as well as the new and fresh meaning which his whole era of Japanese Christianity can take on. While one can understand how Takakura has been viewed as a typical case of a Japanese theologian simply serving as a distributor

\footnote{Cf., e.g., Introduction, p.4, Part II, ch.2, pp.197-200, Part III, pp.286-287, Part IV, pp.429-430.}
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of Western theology, this thesis has demonstrated that Takakura was in fact a producer of new thought.\(^{13}\) Both within his historical context as well as in the midst of his own cultural-linguistic-religious background, Takakura reformulated what he received via the West and Uemura Masahisa. Whereas Takakura's creativity was cut short by his untimely death and the influx into Japan of dialectical theology, what has been said about Nishida Kitaro's career holds true for Takakura--and surely for other second generation Japanese Christian theologians as well:

The process of internalization of Western ideas and values by the Japanese was accompanied by equally vigorous introspection and criticism of those ideas and values. That Nishida ultimately returned to a radically Eastern and Japanese position seems to tell us something of the creative process of assimilation as a whole in the Japanese case.\(^{14}\)

This of course leads to looking at the whole nature and history of Christianity in Japan in creative ways, which in turn gives further glimpses of the overall work of Jesus Christ in our pluralistic and amazingly complex world. In casting our gaze across as much of Christian history as possible, we can see how even during the days of Jesus' Incarnation, the Jewish religious leaders were trying to seize Him, primarily in order to protect their own security. Try as they may, however, Jesus "eluded their grasp."\(^{15}\) No cultural or linguistic group since that time has been immune from

\(^{13}\)Kitamori Kazo is one who laments the lack of original production in Japanese theology--claiming instead a role of distributor of Western theology--in contrast to Japanese literature's and philosophy's recasting of Western thought. Kitamori Kazo, in Kuyama, ed., Taisho-Showa vol., 1956, p.77.


Interestingly, it is Kitamori who basks in the "blessing" of living within the "given [Japanese] 'boundaries of habitation'." This enables "proceed[ing] to the heart of the Biblical message," i.e., finding "the central motif of the 'theology of the Pain of God'." The basis of Kitamori's assertion is that the Japanese mindset is "emancipated from the substantialism of Greek objectivism and also from the existentialism of Greek subjectivism." Kitamori Kazo, "Is 'Japanese Theology' Possible?" *The Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* No.3, September, 1969, p.87.

\(^{15}\)John 10:39.
similarly attempting to confine Jesus Christ to its own understanding.16 Even so, He consistently resists such efforts to restrict His diversity and magnificence. God in Jesus Christ will not be known in strict uniformity: it is "the manifold wisdom of God" that is to be "made known through the church...."17

While barriers of culture and history might mean a lack of crystal-clear, definitive conclusions, the associated lack of comfort is far offset by a corresponding amazement and enthusiasm to pursue new beginnings. Hence at this particular resting place, one must say that it has been well worth the effort spent gazing into the rotating diamond of Takakura’s Christian thought. Moreover, such efforts must not stop. Continued risk, diligence, and flexibility will always be required to know Christ in all His diverse cultural and historical residences—especially the ones in which we ourselves live together with Him.

16"No one is beyond this error of assuming a built-in advantage for culture, especially when culture is underpinned by economic and political power.... For most of us it is difficult enough to respect those with whom we might disagree, to say nothing of those who might be different from us in culture, language, and tradition." Sanneh, 1991, p.27.

17Emphasis mine. I am indebted to Andrew Walls for this particular angle on thinking about Ephesians 3:10.
Appendix. Items for Further Research

There are several potentially fruitful lines of future investigation which branch out from this present study. Relative to the secondary materials written in English on Takakura, our placing him within his *Japanese* context opens up whole new avenues for understanding his thought. As to the extensive Japanese language analyses, taking seriously the *Mahayana*, subjectivity-only aspect of Takakura’s thinking adds a fundamentally new lens through which one can view him. With this new perspective, the large amount of material concerned with the intergenerational relationship of Takakura’s theology to that of Uemura is one important subject that could receive some fresh interpretation within ongoing Japanese theological research.

In addition to comparing Takakura to Uemura, the same type of comparison could be carried out in relation to any one of the legion of thinkers with whom he interacted. The thesis has looked at some of these to a limited degree, e.g., Forsyth, Mackintosh, Nishida. Besides taking these particular comparisons further, looking at such Christian Japanese thinkers as Hatano Seiichi, Uchimura Kanzo, and even Ebina Danjo could shed new light on Takakura in particular, and Christian thought in Japan in general. How Takakura shared the common struggles of Japanese intelligentsia in comparison to those not in the Church, e.g., Natsume Soseki or Mori Ogai, could teach us much about the generations they represented and about the contrasting cultures which many of them tried to bridge.

Similarly, Takakura’s relationships with such important Western figures as John Oman have only been skimmed, and how he dealt with Schweitzer, Edwards, and Otto, for example, has only been mentioned. Further study of these relationships

---

1Comparing how and why the thought of both Ebina and Takakura contrast with that of Uemura within indigenous, Japanese categories could prove to be particularly fruitful. Examples of areas to begin such a comparative study would be conceptions of Jesus’ Self-awareness and the place of "experience" in theology (for Ebina on these two matters, cf. Part II, ch.1, pp.158-160).

Among the several mentions of Hatano in relation to Takakura, cf. Part IV, pp.415-416.

would be especially revealing concerning the thought of the Western Christian thinkers involved. This would add to the small but growing movement of looking at Western Christianity with the help of non-Western Christianity, a desperately needed area of study.3

In terms of topics, the subject which the thesis has felt compelled to broach concerning the place of Mahayana thought--Shin Buddhism in particular--carries with it a whole array of research avenues associated with contemporary interreligious dialogue. Anything from examining the concept of sin to comparing predestination and karma would match Takakura's emphases, and lead to fruitful exploration. As for sin, how Takakura's focus on selfishness might relate to the Buddhist notion of "bonno" could open up deeper appreciations of the complexity of the Christian notion of the atonement, for example.4 Comparing Shinran's notion of karma both to Takakura's caricatures of it, as well as to Takakura's sense of predestination in Paul, again would hold much promise for further investigation.5 Takakura's emphasis on "duty," "calling," and "conscience" has received inadequate attention in the thesis.6

3For example, it was noted earlier that Jonathan Edwards repudiated the notion of a natural moral sense; also, he did not think in terms of the Scottish Common Sense philosophy characterising the Meiji Protestant missionaries. Thus, for instance, what might Takakura's affinity for Edwards tell us about North American Reformed theology? Furthermore, the thesis' running struggle with conducting a combined theological-scientific analysis could receive some fresh help. Cf. Part I, pp.78(n.301), 87(n.343), Part II, ch.2, p.205(n.43).


4The thesis writer again is indebted to Yagi Seiichi here. First, Professor Yagi suggested in a 14 April 1995 meeting the close parallel between the Buddhist "bonno" and Christian "sin," particularly in the notion of egotistical self-care. As to questions raised about what Yagi terms "traditional atonement theology," cf. Yagi, 1993, p.45(n.2).

5One helpful place to begin in an English-language study would be the article by Ueda Yoshifumi, "Freedom and Necessity in Shinran's Concept of Karma" The Eastern Buddhist Translated by Dennis Hirota. 19, No.1, Spring, 1986, pp.76-100. Along with an article by Nishitani Keiji on time, Ueda's essay remains an important, seminal study on Shinran. Hirota, 1982, p.10; cf. Part IV, p.483(527).

Its relationship to "eko, a central concept of Mahayana Buddhism" providing motivation for compassionate service could be investigated.7

There are many other promising possibilities for considering Takakura’s thought in relation to Shin Buddhism. One would be his ideas on God pressing in upon the believer in the revelatory Word, by which we experience "the first person God," particularly in "true prayer."8 There are strong parallels here with Shinran Shonin’s message of being "grasped" by Amida in the utterance of the Nenbutsu: "The saying of the Name is nothing other than the Name (call of Amida) working in man and awakening shinjin in him."9 Another topic of investigation would include Takakura’s curious, occasional use of such expressions as "the other shore" in describing faith in relation to religious psychology or philosophical speculation.10 How this compares with the Shin belief that "Amida must come from the other side to carry us on his boat of 'all-efficient vows'—that is by means of his hongan...['vow-prayer']"11 could prove to be quite enlightening. Another particularly attractive avenue of pursuit would be what one writer has termed "The Fascinations Of Being And Non-Being."12 This last possibility, which has presented a major challenge in recent years to the alliance between Christianity and Western metaphysics, could help

---


8Cf. Part III, pp.300-301,330(n.263). Please note once again that it was the writings of Vollrath and not Barth who helped supply the terminology and concepts which Takakura uses here.

9op.cit., pp.16,98.

10The equivalent term is "higan." Cf. Part III, p.328. Takakura uses the term three other times in FK, carrying the same meaning as the instance cited in Part III. FK, pp.31,37,162; Chosakushu, Vol.2, pp.311,317,443.


to explain Takakura’s related notions of the "Wholly Other" and of reality, for example, in some exciting and illuminating ways.

Outside the area of looking at Takakura’s thought in specific relation to Shin

13"Nothing is not an ordinary other, but the absolutely ‘pure Other’, the ‘Wholly Other’, the Other of others. This is what Rudolf Otto calls ‘mysterium tremendum’. This ‘pure Other’ is the essential secret of mythology, cosmology, metaphysics, religion, and the original thinking itself...." Kyung Jay Lee, "Difference and Nothingness," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Stonybrook, 1991, p.18.

14Specifically in relation to Shin Buddhism, note the following remarks by Shinran himself: "The realization attained in the Pure Land way is.... purity, reality, and no-birth (nirvana), ultimate and consummate." "The body of ultimate equality is tranquility. Tranquility is reality. Reality is dharma-nature. Dharma-nature is suchness. Suchness is oneness." In his "Hymn on the Nembutsu and True Shinjin," Shinran speaks mythologically of reality in terms of "being and non-being":

The Tathagata Sakyamuni, on Mount Lanka,
Prophesied to the multitudes that in south India
Bodhisattva Nagarjuna would appear in this world
To crush the one-sided views of being and of non-being....

Approaching Takakura from such a mindset could go a long way towards explaining what he means when he speaks of experiencing God (reality) in terms of being crushed in co-awareness with Christ on the Cross. Emphases mine. Ueda, gen. ed., 1982, pp.35,37,43.

15Two of the leading figures in recent Buddhist-Christian dialogue, Abe Masao and John Cobb, offer the following comments in a joint interview on this challenge of "non-being" to Christianity:

ABE: Father Hans Waldenfels, for instance,...insisted that we should compare ‘Being’ in Christianity and ‘Nothingness’ in Buddhism because they are the last words for the two religions, respectively.

COBB: The dialogue with Buddhism presses Christians to reconsider their efforts to identify God with Being Itself, for example.... [F]or the Christian Being Itself is not God:...we must ask what we do mean by God, can mean by God, both in the light of the biblical tradition and in the light of this penetrating Buddhist analysis— that Being is ‘nothingness’. [Emphases original.]

Buddhism lie countless other topics, for example socialism. What were the reasons, besides pressures of responsibility, that kept Takakura from pursuing further his interest in the British labour movement? Was Kagawa on the mark when he suggested that it was interest in Scottish theology that kept Takakura opposed to him?\textsuperscript{16} What about indigenous sociological factors,\textsuperscript{17} or the Japanese character of Takakura's religious thought suggested by this thesis?\textsuperscript{18} Besides this important socio-political matter, another multi-faceted topic needing further exploration involves different philosophical understandings of time and history. This thesis has had to devote considerable attention both to its own underlying assumptions here, as well as to Takakura's; even so, the present discussions have been limited and incomplete. Other topics holding promise of fruitful investigation would include such varied areas as the Japanese imperial ideology, evolution, and Christology.

In conducting further research on Takakura in these and other areas, other types of researchers are essential. The boundaries which a "conservative," white, English-speaking theologian—who was born and raised in the southern United States after World War II—is both unable and unwilling to cross are no more universally sacrosanct than anyone else's. Also, the particular emphasis on "philosophicotheological" aspects of Takakura's thought, while perhaps appropriate to the subject, surely has been inflated due to the thesis writer's own interests and training.

There is an obvious need for further research by native Japanese speakers; study by those outside the Christian Church, and within Shin Buddhism, might prove extremely helpful. Furthermore, investigations by those whose mother tongue is

\textsuperscript{16}"The cause of social disinterest in Japan is Scottish theology as introduced by Takakura. Takakura was strongly opposed to me." Quoted in Germany, p.112.

\textsuperscript{17}Sumiya Mikio suggests that Kagawa and Takakura represent the mutually-exclusive options for dealing with the individual and social problems which emerged simultaneously with modernisation in Japan. He argues that the options were mutually-exclusive by noting that Japan had no foundation for dealing with the individual. Sumiya, in Kuyama, ed., Taisho-Showa vol., 1956, pp.131-132.

German would add much which this thesis has been unable to see. Takakura's own reading ability of German exceeded both the capabilities and time limitations of the thesis writer. A researcher who not only could overcome those shortcomings, but who could feel and articulate the profundity of what Takakura sensed when he wrote of German theology's "contemplative and experiential power," could provide a valuable service. Besides researchers having different linguistic and cultural heritages, those in other academic disciplines could contribute a great deal. Perhaps they could help us theologians see more of how Takakura's thought does indeed speak to concerns outside the Church.

There is also a need for other contemporaries of Takakura to be examined in light of their religious heritages. It has puzzled this writer as to why so much attention has been given to the Confucian, bushido background of the Meiji Christian leaders, while very little attention has been paid to the religious backgrounds of Takakura and other second generation leaders. Perhaps research to date by necessity has had to be preoccupied with the volatile nature of the Meiji/Taisho context, as well as with how the new, first generation Meiji Christian traditions were passed along to the next set of preachers and teachers. While any consideration would in no way be adequate without including the critical matters of contemporary context and of Meiji Christianity, we have judged here that for Takakura, leaving out his Mahayana background cuts out at a similarly critical—and perhaps even more fundamental—aspect of his thought.

These are just some of the suggestions for the many possible avenues to pursue in investigating topics related to the thought of Takakura Tokutaro.

\[\text{19Cf. Part II, ch.2, p.210(n.65). Besides the "German factor" in the Christianity Takakura encountered in Britain, other significant distinctives of German thought and theology have arisen at certain points, and thus could use further research in relation to Takakura. Cf. Part I, p.31(n.91), Part II, ch.2, pp.199(n.17),249-252.}\]
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