

The Japanese Family.

The great general idea, the fundamental idea, underlying every persistent ancestor-worship, is that the welfare of the living depends upon the welfare of the dead. Under the influence of this idea, and of the cult based upon it, were developed the early organization of the family, the laws regarding property and succession, the whole structure, in short, of ancient society, — whether in the Western or the Eastern world.

But before considering how the social structure in old

Japan was shaped by the ancestral cult, let me again remind the reader that there were at first no other gods than the dead. Even when Japanese ancestor-worship evolved a mythology, its gods were only trans-figured ghosts, — and this is the history of all mythology. The ideas of heaven and hell did not exist among the primitive Japanese, nor any notion of metempsychosis. The Buddhist doctrine of rebirth, — a late borrowing, — was totally inconsistent with the archaic Japanese beliefs, and required an elaborate metaphysical system to support it. But we may suppose the early ideas of the Japanese about the dead to have been much like those of the Greeks of the pre-Homeric era. There was an

underground world & which spirits
 descended; but they were supposed
 to haunt by preference their own
 graves, or their "ghost-houses". Only
 by slow degrees did the notion of
 their power of ubiquity become
 evolved. But even then they were
 thought to be particularly attached
 to their tombs, shrines, and home-
 -steads. Itirata wrote, even in
 the early part of the nineteenth
 century:—"The spirits of the dead
 continue to exist in the unseen
 world which is everywhere about us;
 and they all become gods of varying
 character and degree of influence.
 Some reside in temples built in their
 honour; others hover near their
 tombs;—and they continue to render
 service to their prince, parents, wives,
 and children, as when in the body."

Evidently "the unseen world" was thought
 to be in some sort a duplicate of
 the visible world, and dependent
 upon the help of the living for
 its prosperity. The dead and the
 living were mutually dependent.

The all-important necessity for
 the ghost was sacrificial worship
 ; the all-important necessity for
 the man was to provide for
 the future cult of his own spirit;—
 and to die without assurance of
 of a cult was the supreme
 calamity. . . . Remembering these
 facts we can understand better
 the organization of the patriarchal
 family, — shaped to maintain and
 to provide for the cult of its
 dead, any neglect of which cult
 was believed to involve misfortune.

Pope

#1/2

The reader is doubtless aware that in the old Aryan family the bond of union was not the bond of affection, but a bond of religion, & which national affection was altogether subordinate. This condition characterizes the patriarchal family whenever ancestor-worship exists. Now the Japanese family, like the ancient Greek or Roman family, was a religious society in the strictest sense of the term; and a religious society it yet remains. Its organization was primarily shaped in accordance with the requirements

of ancestor-worship; - its later imported doctrines of filial piety had been already developed in China to meet the needs of an older and similar religion. We might expect to find in the structure, the laws, and the customs of the Japanese family, many points of likeness to the structure and the traditional laws of the old Aryan household, - because the law of sociological evolution admits of only minor exceptions. And many such points of likeness are obvious. The materials for a serious comparative study have not yet been collected: very much remains to be learned regarding

the past history of the Japanese family. But, along certain general lines, the resemblances between domestic institutions in ancient Europe and domestic institutions in the Far East can be clearly established.

#364) Also in the early European and in the old Japanese civilization it was believed that the prosperity of the family depended upon the exact fulfilment of the duties of the ancestral cult; and, to a considerable degree, this belief rules the life of the Japanese family today. It is still thought that the good fortune of the household depends on the observance of its

cult, and that the greatest possible
 calamity is to die without leaving
 a male heir to perform the rites
 and to make the offerings. The
 paramount duty of filial piety
 among the early Greeks and Ro-
 -mans was to provide for
 the perpetuation of the family
 cult; and celibacy was therefore
 generally forbidden, - the obligation
 to marry being enforced by
 opinion where not enforced by
 legislation. Among the free
 classes of Old Japan, marriage
 was also, as a general rule,
 obligatory in the case of a male
 heir: otherwise, where celibacy
 was not condemned by law, it

was condemned by custom. To die without offspring was, in the case of a younger son, chiefly a personal misfortune; to die without leaving a male heir, in the case of an elder son and successor, was a crime against the ancestors, - the guilt being thereby threatened with excommunication. No excuse existed for remaining childless; the family law in Japan, precisely as in ancient Europe having amply provided against such a contingency. In case that a wife proved barren, she might be divorced. In case that there were reasons for not

divorcing her, a concubine might be taken for the purpose of obtaining an heir. Furthermore, every family representative was privileged to adopt an heir. An unworthy son, again, might be disinherited, and another young man adopted in his place. Finally, in case that a man had daughters, but no son, the succession and the continuance of the line could be assured by adopting a husband for the eldest daughter.

~~Daker~~ But, as in the antique European family, daughters could not inherit:

descent being in the male line, it was necessary I have a male heir. In old Japanese belief, as in old Greek and Roman belief, the father, not the mother, was the life-giver; the creative principle was masculine; the duty of maintaining the cult rested with the man, not with the woman.*

* Whenever, among ancestor-worshipping races, descent is in the male line, the cult follows the male line. But the reader is doubtless aware that a still more primitive form of society than the patriarchal, — the matriarchal, — is supposed to have had its ancestor-worship. Mr. Spencer observes: — "What has happened when descent in the female line obtains, is not clear. I have met with no statement showing that, in societies characterized by this usage, the duty of administering to the double of the dead man devolved on one of his children rather than on others." — Principles of Sociology, Vol. III. § 601

The woman shares the cult; but she could not maintain it. Besides, the daughters of the family, being destined, as a general rule, to marry in other households, could bear only a temporary relation to the house-cult. It was necessary that the religion of the wife should be the religion of the husband; and the Japanese, like the Greek woman, on marrying in another household, necessarily became attached to the cult of her husband's family. For this reason especially the females in the patriarchal family are not equal to the males;—

The sister cannot rank with the
 brother. It is true that the
 Japanese daughter, like the
 Greek daughter, could remain
 attached to her own family
 even after marriage, providing
 that a husband were adopted
 for her, — that is to say, taken
 into the family as a son.
 But even in this case, she
 could only share in the cult,
 which it then became the
 duty of the adopted hus-
 -band to maintain.

#1211)

border

The condition of the patriarchal family everywhere derives from its ancestral cult; and, before considering the subjects of marriage and adoption in Japan, it will be necessary to say something about the ancient family-organization.

The ancient family was called uji, - a word said to have originally signified the same thing as the modern term uchi, "interior", or "household", but certainly used from very early times in the sense of "name" - clan-name especially. There were two kinds of

uji : the ō-uji, or great families,
 and the ko-uji, or lesser families,
 - either term signifying a large
 body of persons united by kinship
 , and by the cult of a common
 ancestor. The ō-uji correspon-
 -ded in some degree to the
 Greek γένος or the Roman gens:
 the ko-uji were its branches,
 and subordinate to it. The
 unit of society was the uji.
 Each ō-uji, with its dependent
ko-uji represented something
 like a phratria or curia;-
 and all the larger groups making
 up the primitive Japanese society
 were but multiplications of
 the uji, - whether we call them

clans, tribes, or hordes. With
 the advent of a settled civi-
 -lization the greater groups
 necessarily divided and subdivi-
 -ded; but the smallest sub-
 -division still retained its
 primal organization. Even the
 modern Japanese family partly
 retains that organization. It
 does not mean only a household
 : it means rather what the
 Greek or Roman family became
 after the dissolution of the
 gens. With ourselves the
 family has been disintegrated:
 when we talk of a man's
 family, we mean his wife and
 children. But the Japanese

family is still a large group -
 As marriages take place early,
 it may consist, even as a house-
 hold, of great-grandparents,
 grandparents, parents, and
 children - sons and daughters
 of several generations; but
 it commonly extends much beyond
 the limits of one household.
 In former ^{early} times it might con-
 stitute the entire population
 of a village or town; and
 there are still in Japan large
 communities of persons all
 bearing the same family name.
 In some districts it was formerly
 the custom to keep all the
 children, as far as possible, within

the original family group — husbands
 being adopted for all the daughters.
 The group might thus consist of
 sixty or more persons, dwelling
 under the same roof; and the
 houses, were of course constructed,
 by successive extensions, so as
 to meet the requirement. (I am
 mentioning these curious facts
 only by way of illustration.)
 But it was inevitable that
 no family-group could be
 indefinitely kept together in
 this way; and although there
 are said to be house-communities,
 still in some remote districts
 of the country, the primal
 patriarchal groups must have
 been broken up almost everywhere

at some very early period. Thereafter,
 the main cult of the uji did
 not cease to be the cult also
 of its subdivisions: all members
 of the original gens continued
 to worship the common ancestor,
 or uji-no-kami, "the god of
 the uji." By degrees the
 ghost-house of the uji-no-
kami became transformed
 into the modern Shinto parish-
 temple; and the ancestral
 spirit became the local tutelary
 god, whose modern appellation,
ujigami, is but a shortened
 form of his ancient title,
uji-no-kami. Meanwhile,

after the general establishment of
 the domestic cult, each separate
 household maintained the special
 cult of its own dead, in addition
 to the communal cult. This religious
 condition still continues. The
 family may include several
 households; but each house-
 hold maintains the cult of
 its dead. And the family-
 group, whether large or small,
 preserves its ancient constitution
 and character: it is still
 a religious society, exacting
 obedience, on the part of
 all its members, to traditional
 custom.

1st line

7

Lilly

So much having been explained, the customs regarding marriage and adoption, in their relation to the family hierarchy, can be clearly understood. But a word first ^{regarding} ~~as to~~ this hierarchy, as it exists today. Theoretically the power of the head of the family is still supreme in the household. All must obey the head. Furthermore the females must obey the males — the wives, the husbands; and the younger members of the family are subject to the elder members. The children must not only obey the parents

and grandparents, but must observe among themselves the domestic law of seniority: thus the younger brothers should obey the elder brother, and the younger sister the elder sister. The rule of precedence is enforced gently, and is cheerfully obeyed even in small matters: for example, at meal-time, the elder boy is served first, the second son next, and so on, — an exception being made in the case of a very young child, who is not obliged to wait. This custom accounts for an amusing popular term often applied in jest to a second son, "Master Cold-Rice" (Hiameshi-San); — as the second son, having to wait

until both infants and elders have been served, is not likely to find his portion desirably hot when it reaches him. . . . Legally, the family can have but one responsible head. It may be the grandfather, the father, or the eldest son; and it is generally the eldest son, because according to a custom of Chinese origin, the old folks usually resign their active authority as soon as the eldest son is able to ^{take} charge of affairs.

The subordination of young to old, and of females to males, - in fact the whole existing constitution of the modern family, - suggests a great deal

in regard to the probably stricter organiza-
 -tion of the patriarchal family, whose
 chief was at once ruler and priest,
 with almost unlimited powers. The
 organization was primarily, and still
 remains, religious: the marital
 bond did not constitute the
 family; and the relation of the
 parent to the household depended
 upon his or her relation to the
 family as a religious body. Today
 also, the girl adopted into a
 household as wife ranks only
 as an adopted child: marriage
 signifies adoption. She is called
 "flower-daughter" (hana-yomé).
 In like manner, and for the
 same reasons, the young man
 received into a household as a
 husband of one of the daughters,

ranked merely as an adopted son.

The adopted bride or bridegroom is necessarily subject to the elders, and may be dismissed by their decision.

As for the adopted husband, his position is both delicate and difficult, — as an old Japanese proverb bears

witness : — Konuka san-gō

aréba, mukoyoshi to naruna

("While you have even three gō* of rice-bran left, do not become a son-in-law."). Jacob does not have to wait for

Rachel : he is given to Rachel on demand ; and his service

* A gō is something more than a pint.

then begins. And after twice seven years of service, Jacob may be sent away. In that event his children do not any more belong to him, but to the family. His adoption may have had nothing to do with affection; and his dismissal may have nothing to do with misconduct. Such matters, however they may be settled in law, are really decided by family-interests — interests relating to the maintenance of the house and of its cult. *

* Recent legislation has been in favour of the nikkojoshi; but, as a rule, the law is seldom resorted to except by men dismissed from the family for misconduct, and anxious to make profit by its dismissal.

Ameyko

It should not be forgotten that, although a daughter-in-law or a son-in-law could in former times be dismissed almost at will, the question of marriage in the old Japanese family was a matter of religious importance, — marriage being one of the chief duties of filial piety. This was also the case in the early Greek and Roman family; and the marriage ceremony was performed, as it is now performed in Japan, not at a temple, but in the house. It was a rite of the family

religion, — the rite by which the
 bride was adopted into the cult
 in the supposed presence of the
 ancestral spirits. Among the
 primitive Japanese there was
 probably no corresponding ceremony
 ; but after the establishment
 of the domestic cult, the marriage
 ceremony became a religious rite,
 and this it still remains. Or-
 -dinary marriages are not, however,
 performed before the household
 shrine or in front of the ancestral
 tablets, except under certain
 circumstances. The rule, as
 regards such ordinary marriages,
 seems to be that if the parents
 of the bridegroom are yet alive,
 this is not done ; but if they

are dead, then the bridegroom leads his bride before their mortuary tables, where she makes obeisance.

Harrington Among the nobility, in former times at least, the marriage ceremony appears to have been more distinctly religious, - judging from the following curious relation in the book Ohōrei-Hikoki, or "Record of Ceremonies" * :- "At the wedding of the great, the bridal-chamber is composed of three rooms thrown into one [by removal of the sliding-screens ordinarily separating them], and newly decorated. . . . The shrine ^{for the image} of the family-god is placed upon a shelf adjoining the sleeping-place."

* The translation is Mr. Medford's. There are no "images" of the family-god; and I suppose that the family-shrine is meant, with its ancestral tablets.

It is noteworthy, also, that Imperial marriages are always officially announced to the ancestors; and that the marriage of the heir-apparent, or other male offspring of the Imperial house, is performed before the Kashiko-dokoro, or imperial temple of the ancestors, which stands within the palace-grounds. * As a general rule it would appear that the evolution of the marriage-ceremony in Japan chiefly followed Chinese precedent; and in the Chinese patriarchal family, the ceremony is in its own way quite as much

* This was the case at the marriage of the present Crown-Prince.

of a religious rite as the early Greek or Roman marriage. And though the relation of the Japanese rite to the family cult is less marked, it becomes sufficiently clear upon investigation. The alternate drinking of rice-wine, by bridegroom and bride, from the same vessels, corresponds in a sort to the Roman confarreatio. By the wedding-rite the bride is adopted into the family religion. She is adopted not only by the living, but by the dead; - she must hereafter revere the ancestors of her husband as her own ancestors; and should there be no elders in the household, it

will become her duty to make the offerings, as representative of her husband. With the fall of her own family she has nothing more to do; and the funeral ceremonies performed upon her departure from the parental roof, — the solemn sweeping-out of the house-rooms, the lighting of the death-fire before the gate, — are significant of this religious separation.

Dani

#1 line

Speaking of the Greek and Roman marriage, M. de Coulanges observes: — "Une telle religion ne pouvait pas admettre

la polygamie". As relating to the highly-developed domestic cult of those communities considered by the author of La Cité Antique, his statement will scarcely be called in question. But as regards ancestor-worship in general, it would be incorrect; - since polygamy or polygyny, and even polyandry may coëxist with such forms of ancestor-worship. The Western-Aryan societies, in the epoch studied by M. de Coulanges, were practically monogamic. The ancient Japanese society was polygynous; and polygyny persisted, after the establishment of the domestic cult.

In early times, the marital relation itself would seem to have been indefinite. No distinction was made between the wife and the concubines: "they were classed together as 'women'." * Probably under Chinese influence the distinction was afterwards sharply drawn; and with the progress of civilization, the general tendency was toward monogamy, although the ruling classes remained polygynous. In the 54th article of Iyegasu's legacy, this phase of the social condition is clearly expressed, — a condition which prevailed down to the present era: —

* Sato: The Revival of Pure Shintau.

2 la.

"

- The position a wife holds towards a concubine is the same as that of a lord to his vassal. The Emperor has twelve imperial concubines. The princes may have eight concubines. Officers of the highest class may have five mistresses. A samurai may have two handmaids. All below this are ordinary married men."

Quoted by the
— text.

3 la.

This would suggest that ^{concubinage} polygamy had long been (with some possible exceptions) an exclusive privilege; and that it should have persisted down to the period of the abolition of the dominions and of the military class, is sufficiently explained by the military character of the ancient society.* Though it is untrue that domestic ancestor-worship cannot coëxist with polyamy or polygyny (Mr. Spencer's term is the matrilineal), it is at least true that such worship is favoured by the monogamic relation, and tends therefore to establish it, — since monogamy ^{itself} ensures

* See especially Herbert Spencer's chapters on "The Family," in Vol. I., Principles of Sociology, § 315.

to the family succession a stability
 that no other relation can offer.
 We may say that, although the
 old Japanese society was not strictly
 monogamic, the natural tendency
 was towards monogamy, as
 the condition best according
 with the religion of the family,
 and with the moral feeling of
 the masses.

line }
 }
 }

Dakota

— Once that the domestic ancestor-cult had become universally established, the question of marriage, as a duty of filial piety, could not be judiciously left to the will of the young people themselves. It was a matter to be decided by the family, not by the children; for mutual inclination could not be suffered to interfere with the requirements of the household religion. It was not a question of affection, but of religious duty; and to think otherwise was impious. Affection might and ought to spring up from the relation. But any affection powerful enough to

endanger the cohesion of the family,
 would be condemned. A wife might
 therefore be divorced because her
 husband ^{had} become too much attached
 to her; — an adopted husband
 might be divorced because of
 his power & exercise, through
 affection, too great an influence
 upon the daughter of the house.
 Other causes would probably be
 found for the divorce in either
 case — but they would not be
 difficult to find.

For the same reason
 that concubinal affection could be
 tolerated only within limits, the natural
 rights of parenthood (as we under-
 -stand them) were necessarily
 restricted in the old Japanese
 household. Marriage being

for the purpose of obtaining heirs to perpetuate the cult, the children were regarded as belonging to the family rather than to the father and mother. Hence, in case of divorcing the son's wife, or the adopted son-in-law, - or of disinheriting the married son, - the children would be retained by the family. For the natural right of the young parents was considered subordinate to the religious rights of the house. In opposition to those rights, no other rights could be tolerated. Practically, of course, according to more or less fortunate circumstances, the individual might enjoy freedom under the paternal

roof; but theoretically and legally there was no freedom in the old Japanese family for any member of it, — not excepting even its acknowledged chief, whose responsibilities were great. Every person, from the youngest child up to the grandfather was subject to somebody else; and every act of domestic life was regulated by traditional custom.

Ward Like the Greeks or Roman father, the patriarch of the Japanese family appears to have had in early times powers of life and death over all members of the household.

In the ruder ages the father might
 either kill or sell his children;
 and afterwards, among the ruling-
 -classes his powers remained al-
 -most unlimited until modern
 times. Allowing for certain local
 exceptions, explicable by tradition, or
 class-exceptions, explicable by condi-
 -tions of servitude, it may be
 said that ^{originally} the Japanese paterfamilias
 was at once ruler, priest, and
 magistrate within the family.
 He could compel his children to
 marry or forbid them to marry;—
 he could disinherit or repudiate
 them; he could ordain the pro-
 -fession or calling which they
 were to follow;—and his
 power extended to all members

of the family, and to the household dependants. At different epochs limits were placed to the exercise of this power, in the case of the ordinary people; but in the military class, the patria potestas was almost unrestricted. In its extreme form, the paternal power controlled every thing, — the right to life and liberty, — the right to marry, or to keep the wife or husband already espoused, — the right to one's own children, — the right to hold property, — the right to hold office, — the right to choose or follow an occupation. The family was a despotism.

It should not be forgotten, however, that the absolutism prevailing in the patriarchal family has its justification in a religious belief, — in the conviction that every thing should be sacrificed for the sake of the end, and every member of the family should be ready to give up even life, if necessary, to assure the perpetuity of the succession. Remembering this, it becomes easy to understand why, even in communities otherwise advanced in civilization, it should have seemed right that a father could kill or sell his children. The crime of a son might result in the extinction of a cult through the ruin of the family, — especially,

in a militant society like that of Japan, where the entire family was held responsible for the acts of each of its members, so that a capital offense would involve the penalty of death on the whole of the household, including the children. Again, the sale of a daughter, in time of extreme need, might save a house from ruin; and filial piety exacted submission & such sacrifice for the sake of the cult.

$\frac{1}{2}$ line

As in the Aryan family,* property descended by right of primogeniture from

* The laws of succession in Old Japan differed considerably according to class, place, and sex; the entire subject has not yet been fully treated; - and only a few safe general statements can be ventured at the present time.

father & son; — the eldest-son,
 even in cases where the other
 property was to be divided among
 the children, always inheriting
 the homestead. The homestead
 property was, however, family
 property; and it passed to
 the eldest son as representative
 , not as individual. Generally,
 speaking, sons could not hold
 property, without the father's
 consent, during such time as
 he retained his headship. As
 a rule, — to which there were
 various exceptions, — a daughter
 could not inherit; and in
 the case of an only daughter,
 for whom a husband had been
 adopted, the homestead property
 would pass to the adopted

husbands, because (until within recent times) a woman could not become the head of a family. This was the case also in the Western Syrian household, in ancestral-worshipping times.

~~Pope~~

To modern thinking, the position of woman in the old Japanese family appears to have been the reverse of happy. As a child she was subject, not only to the elders, but to all the ^{male} adults of the household. Adopted into another household as wife, she merely passed into a similar state of subjection, unalleviated by the affection which parental and fraternal ties assured her in the ancestral home. Her retention in the family of her husband did not depend upon

his affection, but upon the will of the majority, and especially, of the elders. Divorced, she could not claim her children: they belonged to the family of the husband. In any event, her duties as wife were more trying than those of a hired servant. Only in old age could she hope to exercise some authority; but even in old age she was under tutelage. Throughout her entire life she was in tutelage. "A woman can have no house of her own in the Three Universes," declared an old Japanese proverb. Neither could she have a cult of her own: there was no special cult for the women of a family — no ancestral rites distinct from

that of the husband. And the higher
 the rank of the family in which
 she entered by marriage, the more
 difficult would be her position. For
 a woman of the aristocratic class
 no freedom existed: she could not
 even pass beyond her own gate
 except in a palanquin (kago) or
 under escort; — and her existence
 as a wife was likely to be
 embittered by the presence of
 concubines in the house.

#178 }
 line

— Such was the patriarchal
 family in old times; — yet it is
 probable that conditions were
 really better than the laws or
 the customs would suggest. The

race is a joyous and kindly one; and it discovered, long centuries ago, many ways of smoothing the difficulties of life, and of modifying the harsher exactions of law and custom. The great powers of the family-head were probably but seldom exercised in cruel directions. He might have legal rights of the most formidable character; but these were qualified by reason of his responsibilities, and were not likely to be used against communal judgment. It must be remembered that the individual was not legally considered in former times: the

family only was recognized; and
 the head of it legally existed only
 as representative. Should he,
 err, the whole body were liable
 to suffer the penalty of his error.
 Furthermore, every extreme exercise
 of his authority involved propor-
 -tional responsibility. He
 could divorce his wife, or compel
 his son to divorce the adopted
 daughter-in-law; but in either
 case he would have to account
 for this action to the family of
 the divorced; - and the divorce-
 -regime, especially in the Samurai
 class, was greatly restrained
 by the fear of family resentment;
 the unjust dismissal of a wife
 being counted as an serious insult

to her husband. He might disinherit
an only son; but in that event
he would be obliged to adopt a
kinsman.

He might kill or
sell either son or daughter; but
unless he belonged to some outcast
class, he would have to justify
his action to the community.*

He might be reckless in his man-
agement of the family property;
but in that case an appeal to
communal authority was possible,
and the appeal might result in
his deposition. So far as we

* Samraji fathers might kill a daughter
convicted of unchastity, or kill a son
guilty of any action calculated to disgrace
the family name. But they would not
sell a child. The sale of daughters
was practiced only by the abject classes,
or by families of other castes reduced to
desperate straits. A girl might, however,
sell herself for the sake of her family.

82 182

are able to judge from the remains of
old Japanese law which have been
studied, it would seem to have been
the general rule that the family-head
could not sell or alienate the estate.
Though the family-rule was despotic,
it was the rule of a body rather
than of a chief; the family-
-head really exercising authority
in the name of the rest. . . In
this sense, the family still remains
a despotism; but the powers of
its legal head are now checked,
from within as well as from
without, by later custom. The
acts of adoption, disinheritance,
marriage, or divorce are decided
usually by general consent; and
the decision of the household and
kindred is required in the taking
of any important step to the
disadvantage of the individual.

Banker

Of course the old family organization had certain advantages which largely compensated the individual for his state of subjection. It was a society of mutual help; and it was not less powerful to give aid, than to enforce obedience. Every member could do something to assist another member in case of need: each had a right to the protection of all. This remains true of the family today. In a well-conducted household, where every act is performed according to the old forms of courtesy and kindness, — where no harsh word is ever spoken, — where the young look up to the aged with

184

affectionate respect, — where those
whose years have incapacitated
for more active duty, take upon
themselves the care of the chil-
-dren, and render priceless ser-
-vice in teaching and training
,— an ideal condition has been
realized. The daily life of
such a home, — in which the
endeavour of each is to make
existence as pleasant as possible
for all, — in which the bond
of union is really love and
gratitude, — represents religion
in the best and purest sense;
and the place is holy...

#1 (lin)

— It remains to speak of the dependants in the ancient family. Though the fact has not ^{been yet} fully established, it is probable that the first domestics were slaves or serfs; and the condition of servants in later times, — especially of those in families of the ruling classes, — was much like that of slaves in the ^{early} Greek and Roman families. Though necessarily treated as inferiors, they were regarded as members of the household; they were trusted familiars, permitted to share in the pleasures of the family, and to be present at most of its reunions. They could legally be dealt with harshly; but there is little doubt that, as a rule, they

186

were treated kindly, — absolute loyalty being expected from them. The best indication of their status in past times is furnished by yet surviving customs. Though the power of the family over the servant no longer exists in law or in fact, the pleasant features of the old relation continue; and they are of no little interest. The family takes a sincere interest in the welfare of its domestics, — almost such interest as would be shown in the case of poorer kindred. Formerly the family furnishing servants, & a household of higher rank, stood to the latter in the relation of vassal & liege-lord; as between the

Two there existed a real bond of
loyalty and kindness. The occu-
-pation of servant was then here-
-ditary; - children were trained for
the duty from an early age. After
the man-servant or maid-servant
had arrived at a certain age,
permission to marry was accorded
; as the relation of service then
ceased, but not the bond of
loyalty. The children of the
married servants would be sent,
when old enough, to work in
the house of the master, and
would leave it only when the
time also came for them to
marry. Relations of this kind
still exist between certain aris-
-tocratic families and former
-vassal-families, and conserve

some charming traditions and customs of here & day, service, unchanged for hundreds of years.

~~Was~~ In feudal times, of course, the bond between master and servant was of the most serious kind; — the latter being expected, in case of need, to sacrifice life and all else for the sake of the master or of the master's household. This also was the loyalty demanded of the Greek and Roman domestic — before there had yet come into existence that inhuman form of servitude which reduces the wretched to the condition of a beast of burden; — and the relation was partly a

57 184

religious one. There does not seem
to have been in ancient Japan any
custom corresponding to that, described
by M. de Coulanges, of adopting
the Greek or Roman servant into
the household cult. But as
the Japanese vassal-families
furnishing domestic were, as
vassals, necessarily attached
to the clan-cult of their
lord, the relation of the
servant to the family was
to some extent a religious
bond.

#11111

The reader will be able to understand, from the facts of this chapter, to what extent the individual was sacrificed to the family, as a religious body. From servant to master — up through all degrees of the household hierarchy, — the law of duty was the same: obedience absolute to custom and tradition. The ancestral cult permitted no individual freedom: nobody could live according to his or her pleasure; every one had to live according to rule. The individual did not even have a legal existence; — the family was the unit of society. Even its patriarch existed in law as representative only, — responsible both to the living and the dead. His public responsibility, however,

was not determined merely by civil
law. It was determined
by another religious bond, —
that of the ancestral cult
of the clan or tribe; — and
this public form of ancestor-
-worship was even more ex-
-acting than the religion
of the home.

~~---~~