The Communal Cult.
As in the religion of the household each individual was ruled in every aspect of domestic life, so, by the religion of the village or district, the family was ruled in all its relations to the outer world. Like the religion of the home, the religion of the commune was ancestor-worship. What the household shrine represented to the family, the Shinto parish temple represented to the community; and the deity there worshipped as a local god was called Ujigami, the god of the roof, which term originally signified the patriarchal family or gens, as well as the family-name.
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The common ancestor of it, it is believed,
though it is a general rule, these
mates may be found excepting in some
of the remote provinces. Most
probably, the god of the Uji was
first protected, worshiped, called
as the spirit of a former ruler,
or the patron god of a ruling family,
then as the spirit of a common
ancestor. It has been tolerably
well proved that the bulk of
the Japanese people, were in
a state of servitude from before
the beginning of the historic
period, and so remained until
within comparatively recent times.

The subject classes would not
have had at first a cult of
their own; their religion would
most likely have been that of
Their masters. In later times, the
razaal was certainly attached to
the cult of the lord. But it
is difficult as yet to venture
any general statement as to
the earliest phase of the com-
mon cult in Japan; for
the history of the Japanese nation
is not that of a single people
of one blood, but a history
of many clan-groups, of dif-
ferent origin, gradually brought
together to form one huge
patrarchical society.

However, it is quite some
I assume, with the best native
authorities, that the shogun
were originally clan-deities, and
that they were venerated, though not invariably, worshipped as clan ancestors. Some "ujigami" belong to the historic period. The war gods, Hadžinama, for example, – in whom parish temples are dedicated – are in almost every large city, in the apportioned spirit of the Formosan "Ujin", patron of the famous Minamoto clan. This is an example of "ujigami" worship in which the clan-god is not an ancestor. But in many instances, the "Ujigami" is really the ancestor of an "Uji"; – as in the case of the great deity of Kasuga, from whom the "Fujiwara" clan claimed descent. Altogether there were in ancient Japan, after the beginning of the historic era, 1,182 clans, great and small; and these appear to have established the same number of cults. We find,
as might be expected, that the temples
now called Hiji-gumi—which is to
say, Chū-To parish-temples in
general,—are always dedicated
to particular clans of divinities,
and never dedicated to certain
other gods. Also, it is significa-
cant that in every large town,
there are Chū-To temples
dedicated to the same Hiji-gumi,
proving the transfer of com-
munal worship from its place
of origin. Thus the Izumo wor-
shipper of Kasuga-Dōma can
find in Osaka, Kyōto, Tokyō,
parish-temples dedicated to
his patron: the Kyūshū
worshipper of Hachiman-Dōma
can place himself under the
protection of the same deity.
in Musashi guild as well as in Higo or Bungo. Another fact
worth observing is that the Ujigami
Temple is not necessary the most
important Omoro Temple in
the parish: it is the parish-
temple, and important to the
communal worship; but it
may be overshadowed by some adjacent
temple dedicated to higher
Omoro gods. Thus in Kitazuki
of Izumo, for example, the
great Izumo Temple is not the
Ujigami, but the parish-
temple; the local cult is
mainly centered at a much smaller
temple... Of the higher cult, I
shall speak further on: for
The present let us consider only the communal cult, in its relation to communal life. From the social conditions represented by the worship of the Ujigami today, much can be inferred as to its influence in past times.

Almost every Japanese village has its Ujigami; and each district of every large town or city also has its Ujigami. The worship of the Inukai, deity, is maintained by the whole body of parishioners, the Ujiko, or children of the Inukai god. Every such parish-temple has its holy days, when all Ujiko are expected to visit the temple, and
when, as a matter of fact, every house-
hold sends at least one representative
of the Nijigami. There are great
festival-days, and ordinary feasts-
days; there are processions, music,
dancing, and whatever in the way
of popular amusement can serve to
make the occasion attractive. The
people of adjacent districts vie
with each other in rendering their
respective temple-festivals (matsuri)
enjoyable: every household con-tributes according to its means.

The Shinto parish-temple
has an indissoluble relation to the life
of the community as a body, and
also to the individual existence
of every ujiko. As a baby
he or she is taken to the Nijigami
(at the expiration of thirty-one
days after birth, if a boy, or thirty-

- Three days after birth, if a girl — and placed under the protection of the god, in whose supposed presence the little one’s name is recorded. Then after the child is regularly taken to the temple on holy days, all of course to all the big festivals, which are made delightful to young fancy by the display of boys on sale in temporary booths, and by the amusing spectacles to be witnessed at the temple grounds, — artists forming pictures on the pavement with colored sands, — sweetmeats sellers moulding animals and monsters out of sugar paste, — con — jurors and dumbbells exhibiting their prize... Later, when the child becomes strong enough to run about, the temple gardens an
grounds serve for a playground. School-

top does not separate the ngi'sko
from the ngigami (unless the family
should permanently leave the district);
the visits to the temple are still
continued as a duty. Grown-up
and married, the ngi'sko regularly
visits the guardian-god, accompa-
nied by wife or husband, and
buries the children to pay obedience.
If he is to make a long journey,
or to quit the district for ever,
the ngi'sko pays a farewell visit
to the ngigami, as well as to
the tombs of the family ancestors;
and on returning to one's native
place after prolonged absence,
the first visit is to the god.

... I have more than once been
touched by the spectacle of soldiers
at prayer before some one little
temples or country places,—soldiers
but great returnees from Korea,
China, or Formosa: their first
deemph on returning home was
to utter their thanksgiving to the
god of their childhood, whom
they believed to have guarded
them in the hours of battle
and the season of pestilence.


The best authority on
the local customs and laws
of Old Japan, John Henry
Irving, remarks that the
Chinese court had few relations
with local administration. In
his opinion the Ujigami were the
descended ancestors of certain noble
families of early times; and their
temples continue to be in the
patronage of these families. The
office of the Ohia To priest, or
"god-master" (kanmushi) was,
and still is, hereditary; and
as a rule, any Kanmushi can
trace back his descent from
the family of which the Ujigami
was originally the patron-god.

But the Ohia To priest, with
some few exceptions, were neither
majors, daimyo, nor administrators;
and Professor Wigram claims
that this may have been "due
due to the lack of administrative
organization within the cult itself."
The vague character of the Chinese hierarchy is probably best explained by Mr. Spencer in chapter VIII of the third volume of "Principles of Sociology:

"The establishment of an ecclesiastical organization separate from the political organization, but akin to it in structure, appears to be largely determined by the rise of a decided distinction in thought between the affairs of this world and those of a supposed other world. When the two are conceived as existing in continuity, or as intimately related, the organizations appear parallel to their respective administrations. When they are not identical, or not perfectly distinguished..."

If the Chinese are remarkable for the complete absence of a priestly caste, it is because, along with their universal and active ancestor worship, they have preserved that inclusion of the duty of priest in the duty of ruler, which ancestor worship in its simple form shared as.

Mr. Spencer remarks in the same paragraph on the fact that in ancient Japan "religion and government were the same."  A distinct Chinese hierarchy was, therefore, not evolved.
This would be an adequate explanation. But in spite of the fact that
they exercised no civil function, I believe it can be shown that
their priests had, and still have, powers above the law.
Their relation to the community was of an extremely important
kind: their authority was not religious; but it was
heavy, and irresistible.

To understand this, we must remember that the
Oblate priests represented the
religious sentiment of his district.
The social bond of each com-
munity was identical with
the religious bond,—the cult of
the local skullejo.
The Ujigami was made for success in all communal undertakings, for protection against sickness, for the triumph of the Lord in time of war, for succour in the season of famine or epidemic. The Ujigami was the giver of all good things, the special helper and guardian of the people. That this belief still prevails everywhere may be verified by any one who studies the peasant life of Japan. It is not to the Buddhas that the farmer prays for bountiful harvests, or for rain in time of drought; it is not to the Buddhas that Chants are rendered...
for a plentiful rice crop — but to the ancient local god. And the one of the Njigami embodies the moral experience of the community, — represents all its cherished traditions and customs, its unwritten laws of conduct, its sentiment of duty. Now just as an offense against the ethics of the family, must, in such a society, be regarded as an impious towards the family — ancestor, so any breach of custom in the village or else must be considered as an act of disrespect to the Njigami. The prosperity of the family depends, it is thought, upon the observance of filial piety, which is identified with obedience to the
Traditional rules of household conduct; and, in like manner, the prosperity of the commune is supposed to depend upon the observance of ancestral custom, obedience to the unwritten laws of the district, which are taught to all from the time of their childhood. Custom are identical with morals. Any offense against the customs of the settlement is an offense against the gods who protected it, and therefore a menace to the public weal. The existence of the community is endangered by the crime of any of its members; every member is therefore held answerable by the community for his
conduct. Every action must conform to the traditional usages of the yūkoku: independent exception to conduct is a public offense.

What is the obligation of the individual to the community, signified in ancient times, may therefore be imagined. He had certainly no more right to himself than had the Greek citizen three thousand years ago,—probable not so much. Today, though laws have been greatly altered, he is practically in much the same condition. The mere idea of the right to do as one pleases (within such limits as are imposed on conduct by English and American societies, for example).
could not under his mind. Such freedom, if experienced in life, he would probably consider as a con-
dition morally comparable to that of birds and beasts. Among ourselves, the social regulations for ordinary people chiefly settle what not must be done. But what one must not do in Japan — though representing a very wide range of prohibitions — means much less than half of the common obligation: what one must do is still more necessary to learn... Let us briefly consider the restrictions which custom places upon the liberty of the individual.
First of all, be it observed that the communal will reinforces the will of the household, and compels the observance of filial piety. Even the conduct of a boy, who has passed the age of childhood, is regulated not only by his family, but by the public. He must obey the household; as he must also obey public opinion in regard to his domestic relations. Any marked act of disrespect, or conduct against filial piety, would be judged and rebuked by all. When old enough to begin work or study, a lad's daily conduct is observed and recorded; and at all the age when the household law first begins to feel the pressure of common opinion. On coming of age, he has to marry; and the idea of permitting heirs...
to choose a wife for himself is quite out of the question; he is expected to accept the companion selected for him. But should reasons be found for humouring him in the event of an irresistible aversion, then he must wait until another choice has been made by the family. The community would not tolerate insubordination in such matters; one example of filial revolt would constitute too dangerous a precedent. When the young man at last becomes the head of a household, and responsible for the conduct of its members, he is still constrained by public sentiment to accept advice in his direction of domestic
affair. He is not free to follow his own judgment, in certain contingencies. For example, he is bound by custom to furnish help to relatives; and he is also expected to accept arbitration in the event of trouble with them. He is not permitted to think of his own wife and children only, such conduct would be deemed inconsiderate and selfish: he must be able and act, and outwardly seem at least, as if uninfluenced by paternal or marital affection in his public conduct. Even supposing that, taken in life, he shone he appears like a dead wood in his position as village headman, his respect as acting and judgment were, he under just as much
restrictive as before. Indeed, the range of his personal freedom actually decreases in proportion to his ascent in the social scale. Nominal he rules as headman; practically his authority is only lent to him by the commune, and it will remain so long as the commune pleases. For he is elected to enforce the public will, not to impose his own, to serve the common interest, not to serve his own, to maintain and confirm custom, not to break with it. Thus, though appointed chief, he is only the public servant, and the least free man in his native place.
Various documents translated and published by Professor Wigmoe, in his "Notes on Land Tenure and Local Institutions in Old Japan," give a startling idea of the minute regulation of communal life in country districts during the period of the Tokugawa Shoguns. Much of the regulation was certainly imposed by higher authority, but it is likely that a considerable portion of the rules represented old local customs. Such documents were called Kumi-chō, or "Kumi-enactment": they established the rules of conduct to be observed by all the members of a village community, and their social interest is
Born in the close of the feudal period, the mass of the population throughout the country, in the great cities as well as in the villages, wasadministered by groups of families, called kumi, or companies. The general number of households in a kumi was five; but there were in some provinces kumi consisting of six or ten households. The heads of the households composing a kumi selected one of their members as chief, who became the responsible representative of all the members of the kumi.

The origin and history of the kumi-system is obscure. A similar system exists in China and in Korea. (Professor Higuchi's reasons for believing that the Japanese kumi-system had a millet origin, appears to be evident.) Certainly the system greatly facilitated administrative duty. To supervise activity, the kumi was responsible, not the single household.
very great. By personal enquiry I have learned that in various parts of the country, rules much like those recorded in the Kumi-dō are still enforced by village custom. I select a few examples from Professor Wigram's translation:

"If there be any of our members who are unkind to parents, or neglectful or disobedient, we will not conceal it or condone it, but will report it."

"We shall require children to respect their parents, servants to obey their masters, husbands and wives and brothers and sisters to live together in harmony, and the younger people to serve and cherish their elders. Each Kumi (group of five households) shall carefully watch over the conduct of its members, so as to prevent wrong-doing."
"If any member of a kurni, whether farmer, merchant, or artisan, is lazy, and does not attend properly to his business, the ban-gashira [chief officer] will advise him, warn him, and lead him to better ways. If the person does not listen to the advice, and becomes angry and obstinate, he is to be reported to the village elder.

"When men who are quarrel-some and who like to indulge in late hours away from home will not listen to admonition, we will report them. If any other kurni neglects to do this, it will be part of our duty to do it for them."

"But those who quarrel with their relatives, and refuse
I listen to their good advice, or disobey their parents, or are unkind to their fellow-villagers, shall be reported [to the village officers]...

"Dancing, wrestling, and other public shows shall be forbidden. Drunkenness and dancing-girls are prohibited, shall not be allowed to remain a single night in the mura [village]."

"Quarrels among the people shall be forbidden. In case of dispute the matter shall be reported. If this is not done, all parties shall be inordinately punished."

"Speaking of a peaceful thing of another man, or publicly passing him as a bad man, even if he is so, is forbidden."
"Filing polite and faithful service to a master should be a matter of course; but even where there is any one who is especially faithful and diligent in these things, we promise to report them... for recommendation to the government..."

"As members of a kumi we will cultivate friendship, feeling even more than with our relatives, and will promote each other's happiness, as well as share each other's grief. If there is an unprincipled or benighted person in a kumi, we will all share the responsibility for him."

*"

*"Some on Home Tenure and Local Institutions in Old Japan"

[TRANSACTIONS OF THE JAPAN, VOL. XXI, PART II. — I have chosen the quotations from different kumi-chi, and arranged them thus, giving..."
The above are samples of the moral regulations and there were even more minute regulations about all duties, for instance:

"When a fire occurs, the people shall immediately, when due to the spot, each bring a bucketful of water, and shall endeavour, under direction of the officer, to put the fire out... those who absent themselves shall be deemed culpable.

"When a stranger comes to reside here, inquiries shall be made as to the more whence he came, and a surety shall be furnished by him... All travellers shall lodge, even for a single night, in a house other than a public inn."
"Scenes of robberies and midnight attacks shall be given by the ringing of bells or otherwise; and all who hear shall join in pursuit until the offender is taken. Any one wilfully refraining shall, on investigation, be punished."

From these same Rumichō, it appears that no one could leave his village, even for a simple trip, without permission, or take service elsewhere, or marry in another province, or settle in another place. Punish. - Nearly were severe, - a terrible flogging being the common mode of chastisement by the higher authority.
... Today, there are no such punishments; and, legally, a man can go where he pleases. But as a matter of fact he can nowhere do as he pleases; for individual liberty is still largely restricted by the survival of communal sentiment and old-fashioned custom. In any un-purified community, it would be unwise to proclaim such a doctrine as that a man has the right to employ his leisure and his means as he may think proper. No man's time or money or effort can be considered to exclusively his own, even the body that his flesh inhabits. His right to live in the community rest solely upon his willingness to serve the
community sc and whoever may need his help or sympathy has the privilege of demanding it. That "a man is borne in his castle" cannot be asserted in Japan — except in the case of some close potential. No ordinary person can shut his doors day and look out the rest of the world. Everybody's house must be open to visitors — not closed at all by day would be regarded as an insult to the community, sickness affording no excuse. Only persons in very great authority have the right of making their homes inaccessible. And it do please the community to believe and live, especially if the community be a moral one, — is a serious matter when a community is displeased.
it acts as an individual. It may consist of five hundred, a thousand, or several thousand persons; but the thinking of all is the thinking of one. By a single serious resistance, a man may force his keep standing. placed at solitude, opposition to the common will, is isolated, and most effectively eradicated. The silence and the softness of the hostility only renders it all the more alarming. This is the ordinary form of punishment for a grave offense against our town: violence is rare, and when recorded is intended (except in some extraordinary cases previously to be noticed) as a mere correction, the punish-
ment of a blunder. In certain
tough communities, blunders endan-
gering life, are immediately punished
by physical chastisement—not in
anger, but on traditional principle.
Once I witnessed at a fishing-
settlement, a chastisement of
this kind. Men were killing
sharks in the surf; the work
was bloody and dangerous;
and in the midst of the excite-
ment, one of the fishermen
stuck his killing-spike in the
head of a boy. Everybody
knew that it was a pure acci-
dent; but accidents involving
danger & life are rarely dealt
with, and this blunderer
was instantly thwarted.
by the men nearest him, then dragged
out of the surf and flung down
on the sand to recover himself as
best he might. No word was
said about the matter; as he
killed went on as before. Young
fishermen, are roughly handled
by their fellows on board a
ship also, in the case of any
error involving risk to the vessel.
But, as I have already observed,
only stupidity is punished in
this fashion; and obstruction
is much more dreaded than
violence. There is, indeed, only
one yet heavier punishment
than obstruction, namely, banish-
ment, either for a term of
years or for life.
Punishment was in old feudal
rimes have been a very serious penalty;
it is a serious penalty even today,
under the new order of things.
In former years the man expelled
from his native place by the
communal will, cast out from
his home, his clan, his occupa-
tion, — found himself face to
face with misery absolute. No
another community there would be
no place for him, unless he
happened to have relatives there;
and these would be obliged to
consult with the local conduits,
and also write the officials of
the first of his native place, before
receiving him as a harbored man. No
stranger could suffer to settle
in another district than his own
without official permission. Old
documents are extant which record
the punishments inflicted upon
households for having given shelter
to a stranger under the presence
of a relationship. A banished man
was homeless and friendless. He
might be a skilled craftsman;
but he required to exercise his craft
depended upon the consent of
the guild representing that craft
in the place to which he wished
go; and banished men were
not received by the guilds. He
might by become a servant;
but the commune in which he
sought refuge would question
the right of any master to
employ a fugitive and a stranger.
His religious connections could
not serve him in the least:
The code of communal life was decided not by Brahmin, but by Hindu ethics. Since he was of the birthplace he had cast him out, and the gods of any other locality had nothing to do with his original cult, there was no religious help for him. Besides, the mere fact of his being a refugee was itself proof that he must have offended against his own cult. In any event no stranger could look for sympathy among strangers. Even now I take a wife from another province is condemned by local opinion—(it was forbidden in feudal times); one is still expected to live, work, and marry in the place where one was born, though, in certain cases, c.
with the public approval of one is own people, adoption in another community is tolerated. Under the feudal system there was no community less likelihood of sympathy for the stranger; and banishment signifies hunger, solitude, and privation unspeakable. For be it remembered, that the legal existence of the individual, at that period, ceased entirely outside of his relations to the family, and to the commune. Everybody lived and worked for some household; every household for some clan; outside of the household, and the relations, aggregate of households, there was at life to be lived, except the life of criminals, beggars, and pariahs.
Dare with official permission, he could not ever become a Buddhist monk. The very outcasts, such as the Eka classes, former self-governing communities, with their own, and would not voluntarily accept strangers. So the banished man was more often doomed to become a himin, one of that wretched class of wandering pariahs who were officially termed "not-men", and lived by begging, or by the exercise of some vulgar profession, such as that of ambulant musician, or money-banker. In more ancient days a banished man could have sold himself in to slavery; but even this poor privilege seems to have been withdrawn.
during the Tokugawa era.

We can scarcely misjudge today the condition of such banishment: it finds a Western parallel we must go back to ancient Greek and Roman times long preceding the Empire.

Banishment then signifies fixed religious excommunication, and practically expulsion from all society or solitude; since there yet existed no idea of human brotherhood, no conception of any claim upon kindness except the claim of kinship. The stranger was everywhere hungry. Now in Japan, as in the Greek city of old time, the religion of the deified god has always been the religion of a people, the cult of a community; it never became even the religion of a province. The higher calls, on the other hand, did not concern
themselves with the individual: his
religion was one of the household
and of the village or district; the
cults of other households and
districts were entirely distinct; one
could belong to them only by adopt-
tion, and strangers, as a rule,
were not adopted. Within a
household or a clan-cult, the
individual was morally and socially
dead; for other cults or clans
excluded him. When cast out
by the domestic cult that regu-
lated his private life, and by
the local cult that ordered
his life in relation to the
community, he practically ceased
to exist in relation to human
society, his moral being was prac-
tically suspended.
How small were the chances in past times for personality to develop and assert itself, may be adapted from the foregoing facts. The individual was completely and pitilessly sacrificed to the community. Even now the rigid rule of conduct in a Japanese settlement is to act in all things according to local custom; for the slightest divergence from rule will be observed with disfavour. Privacy does not exist; nothing can be hidden; everybody's views or virtues are known to everybody else. Unusual behaviour is prized as a departure from the standard of conduct; all oddities are condemned as
departures from custom; and tradition and custom still have the force of religious obligations. Indeed they really are religious and obligatory, not only by reason of their origin, but by reason of their relation also to the public culto, which signifies the worship of the past.

It is therefore easy I understand why China never had a written code of morals, and why its practical scholars have declared that a moral code is unnecessary. In that stage of religious evolution which ancestor-worship represented, there can be no distinction between religion and ethics,
new between ethics and custom. Government and religion are the same; custom and law are identified. The ethics of Hindu were all included in conformity of custom. The traditional rules of the household, the traditional laws of the commune—these were the morals of Hindu. To obey them was religion; to disobey them, impious. And, after all, the due significance of any religious code, written or unwritten, lies in its expression of social duty, its doctrine of the right and wrong of conduct, its embodiment of a people's moral experience. Really the difference between any modern
ideal of conduct, such as the Egyptian, and the patriarchal ideal, such as that of the early Greeks or of the Japanese, would be formed on examination to consist mainly in the minute extension of the older conception to all details of individual life. Assuredly the religion of China so needed no written commandments: it was taught to everybody from childhood by precept and example, and any person of ordinary intelligence could learn it. When a religion is capable of rendering it dangerous for anybody to act outside of rules, the framing of a code would be obviously superfluous. We ourselves have no written code of conduct as regards
The higher social life, the exclusive circles of civilized existence, which are not ruled merely by the ten commandments. The knowledge of what to do and where, and of how to do it, can come only by training, by experience, by observation, and by the intuitive recognition of the reason of things.

And now to return to the question of the authority of the divine priest as representative of communal sentiment, — the authority which I believe I have been always very great... Ominster proof that the punishment inflicted by a community upon its erring members...
were originally inflicted in the name of the idolatrous god, is furnished by the fact that manifestations of communal displeasure still assume, in various county districts, a religious character. I have witnessed such manifestations, and I am assured that they still occur in most of the provinces. But it is in remote county towns or isolated villages, where traditions have remained almost unchanged, that one can best observe these survivals of an obsolete custom. In such places the conduct of every resident is closely watched and rigidly judged by all the rest. Little, however, is said about minor demerits of a minor sort until the time of the great local festival, the annual festival of the idolatrous god. It is then that the community gives its warnings or inflicts its penalties: this at least in the case of conduct
offensive is local divinities. The god, on the occasion of this festival, is supposed to visit the dwellings of his ujiko; on his portable shrine, a weathered structure borne by thirty or forty men, is carried through the principal streets. The bearers are supposed to act according to the will of the god, as so ever his divine spirit directs them... I may describe the incidents of the procession as I saw it in a secluded village, not once, but several times.

Before the procession a band of young men advance, leaping and wildly dancing in circles; these young men clear the way; as it is understood to pass near them, for they whirl about as if moved by frenzy... When I first saw such a band of dancers, I could
imagine myself watching some old Dionysiac revel;—their furious gyration, certainly realized Greek accounts of the antique sacred frenzy. There were, indeed, no Greek heads; but the bronzed-like figures, naked save for loin-cloth and sandals, and more sculpturally muscled, might well have inspired some vase-design of dancing fauns.

After these god-possessed dancers,—whose passage swept the streets clear, scattering the crowd to right and left,—came the virgin priestess, white-robed on vela, riding upon a horse, and followed by several mounted priests in white garments and high black capes of ceremony. Behind
...then advanced the ponderous shrine, swaying above the heads of its bearers like a junk in a storm. Scores of brazen arms were pushing it to the right; others scores were pushing it to the left: behind and before, also, there was furious pulling and pushing; and the roar of voices uttered in vocables made it impossible to hear any thing else. By unmemorial custom the upper stories of all the dwellings had been tightly closed: woe to the keeping Tom who should be detected, on such a day, in the impious act of looking down upon the god! ...
Now the shrine-bearers, as I have said, are superstitious to be moved by the spirit of the god—(probably by his Rough Spirit; for the Athenian god is multiple)—and all this pushing and pulling and swaying signifies, only the deity's inspection of the dwellers on either hand. He is looking about to see whether the hearts of his worshipers are pure, and is deciding whether it will be necessary to give a warning, or to inflict a penalty. If the shrine-bearers will carry him whithersoever he chooses to go—through solid walls if necessary, if the shrine strike against any house—even against an owning only, that is a sign that the god is not pleased with the dwellers in that house. If the shrine breaks part of the house—that is a serious warning.
But it may happen that the foot
will enter a house—breaking
his way. Then even to the
inmates, unless they flee at once
down the back-door; or
the wild procession, then disorders
in, will wreck and rend and
smash a splendid evening
on the premises before the foot
consents to proceed upon this
round.

Upon enquiring into the
reasons of these ravings, which
I witnessed, the results, I learned
to engrave my heart, that, from
the communal point of view, both
aggressions were morally justifiable.
In one case a friend had been
practised; in the other, help had
been refused to the family of a drowned resident. Thus one offence had been legal; the other, not.
A county community will not have over its delinquents and police—except in cases of incendiarism, murder, theft or other serious crime; it has a honor of law, and never involves it when the matter can be settled by any other means. This was the rule also in ancient times; and the feudal government encouraged its maintenance. But when the feudal barons of it have been displeased, the insistence upon the punishment or as pain to the offender; or as the offender's whole family, as by feudal custom, are held responsible. The victim can invoke
The new law, if he dares, and bring the
wrongdoers of his home to court,
and recover damages, — for the
modern police courts are not ruled
by Him to. But only a very
rash man will invoke the new
law against the communal judg-
ment; — for that action in itself
would be condemned as a gross
breach of custom. The communi-
ty is always ready, through its council,
to do justice in cases where
innocence can be proved. But
if a man really guilt of the
fault is charged to his account,
should he 2 avenge himself by
appeal to a non-religious law,
then it were well for him to
remove himself and his family,
as soon as possible. Therefore,
to some far-away place.
We have seen that, in Old Japan, the life of the individual was under two kinds of religious control. All his acts were regulated according to the religious either of the domestic or of the communal cult; and these conditions probably began with the establishment of a settled civilization. We have also seen that the communal religion took upon itself to enforce the observance of the household religion. The fact will no longer seem strange if we remember that the underlying idea in either cult was the same, — the
idea that the welfare of the living depended upon the welfare of the dead. Neglect of the household rite would provoke, it was believed, the malevolence of the spirits; and their malevolence might bring about some public misfortune. The ghosts of the ancestors controlled nature; fire and flood, pestilence and famine, were at their disposal as means of vengeance. One act of neglect in a village might therefore bring about misfortune to all. And the community considered itself responsible for the maintenance of the rite in every home.