

the true self is revealed as a self-other relation along with Watsuji's basic philosophical notion of Japanese personhood as *ningen* existing in the *aida* or interpersonal "betweenness" of a *fūdo* or "climate" of space.

### Doi Takeo's *Amae* Psychology and Kuki Shūzō's Aesthetic of *Iki*

Doi Takeo (1971, 89) points out that his *amae* psychology has been directly influenced by the aesthetics of *iki* (chic) formulated by the modern Japanese philosopher Kuki Shūzō (1888–1941). The very title of Doi's book *The Structure of Amae* (*Amae no kōzō*, 1971) at once reflects the title of Kuki's major work, *The Structure of Iki* (*Iki no kōzō*, 1930). In particular, Doi's idea that the social nature of Japanese selfhood is a function of *amae* can itself be traced back to Kuki's (1930, 50–57) much earlier hermeneutic analysis of such linguistically overlapping terms as *amae*, *amaeru*, and *amami* in their relation to the Edo period aesthetic ideal of *iki*. It will be seen that Kuki elucidates the structure of his aesthetic ideal of *iki* or "chic" in terms of a polar contrast between two opposing value qualities, *amami* (sweetness) and *shibumi* (astringency), whereby *shibumi* designates a "negative" value moving in the direction of elegant restraint in avoidance of social contact, and *amami* / *amae* is a "positive" value moving in the direction of interpersonal relationships. The upshot is that for Kuki, as later for Doi, the notion of *amami* / *amae* is established as the basic explanatory principle underlying Japanese group-consciousness. But while Kuki highlights primarily the aesthetic and erotic dimensions of *amae* in the course of analyzing the structure of *iki* as a norm for intersexual relationships, Doi instead brings to light the psychological content of *amae* as an infantile dependency drive.

Born into a wealthy aristocratic family, "Count Kuki" traveled to Germany in 1922 where he studied philosophy under Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger, afterwards going to Paris where he hired the young Jean Paul Sartre as his private language tutor while also studying modern French philosophy with Henri Bergson, finally returning to Japan in 1927, at which time he joined Nishida Kitarō as a professor in the Department of Philosophy at Kyoto University. In 1926, while still living in France, Kuki finished a manuscript entitled *The Essence of Iki* (*Iki no honshitsu*), the rough draft of what would later become his highly original work *The Structure of Iki* (*Iki no kōzō*), first published in 1930. Kuki's *The Structure of Iki*, like Doi's *The Structure of Amae* (*Amae no kōzō*, 1971), has become one of the standard *nihonjinron* texts

purporting to disclose the fundamental characteristic of Japanese uniqueness and identity. Just as some have discerned the essence of "Japaneseness" (*nihonrashisa*) in *amae* (dependency), *aware* (pathos), *aidagara* (relationship, betweenness), *ningen* (person), *kanjin* (contextuality), *tate* (verticality), *ma* (interval, space), *ie* (family, household), *ki* (spirit, mood, feeling), *wa* (harmony), *sunao* (gentleness), or *shitashimi* (intimacy), so Kuki sees the quintessence of Japaneseness in his concept of *iki* (chic). Like other key terms in the literature of *nihonjinron*, including Doi's concept of *amae*, Kuki's notion of *iki* underscores the social, relational, and contextual nature of selfhood in Japanese group-consciousness. However, Kuki's aesthetic notion of *iki* is distinguished by virtue of the fact that it specifically focuses upon the erotic character of "intersexual" (*iseiteki*) relationships between persons in society. For while traditional Japanese aesthetic ideals like *yūgen* (mystery), *wabi* (poverty), *sabi* (aloneness), and *shibui* (elegant restraint) are embodied by the contemplative Zen hermit in the tranquil solitude of nature, Kuki's moral-aesthetic ideal of *iki* is instead embodied by the amorous *geisha*, the flirtatious courtesan (*tayu*), and the sophisticated dandy (*tsūjin*) who inhabited the urban "floating world" (*ukiyo*) of the sprawling Yoshiwara pleasure quarters during Edo period bordello culture, although his characterizations are no less apposite with regard to the "love motel," "sex *manga*," "water trade" (*mizu shōbai*), and "soap land/Turko bath" culture of present-day Tokyo.

While in the second chapter Kuki (1930, 28) analyzes the triadic structure of *iki* in terms of seductive coquetry (*bitai*), the gallant's pride (*ikuji*), and detached resignation (*akirame*), in chapter 3 he further goes on to clarify the dyadic structure of *iki* in terms of a series of paired antonyms, including *shibumi* (astringency)/*amami* (sweetness); *jōhin* (refinement)/*gehin* (crudeness); and *jimi* (plain)/*hade* (gaudy). Especially in a section entitled "Shibumi/Amami" (1930, 50–57) he proceeds to underscore the paradoxical structure of *iki* as an aesthetic, moral, and existential lifestyle which is mediated by two formerly opposed values, "astringency" (*shibumi*) and "sweetness" (*amami*). As clarified by Kuki's schematic chart on the structure of *iki* appearing in the same section, while the sweetness of *amami* is a "positive" (*sekkyokuteki*) value directed toward the "gaudy" (*hade*), the astringency of *shibumi* is a "negative" (*shōkyokuteki*) value of "elegant restraint" directed toward the "plain" and "somber" (*jimi*) (1930, 57).

In his own book called *The Structure of Amae*, psychiatrist Doi Takeo provides an extensive discussion on the nature of *amae* mentality in relation to the dyadic *amami/shibumi* or "sweetness/astringency" tension constitutive of *iki* as described by Kuki Shūzō's work *The Structure of Iki*. Doi writes:

In *Iki no kōzō*, an excellent work by Kuki Shūzō which analyzes *iki* in detail, the author defines *iki* as "sophisticated" and then established its relationship to *amae* mentality. . . . He explains that *iki*, along with *amami* and *shibumi*, are special intersexual modes of existence . . . considering *amami* as the normal state, one finally arrives, by means of *iki*, at the point of *shibumi*, whereupon one then exercises restraint in relationships with others. (1971, 89)

As further clarified by Doi, the word *amae*, which is etymologically related to both the adjective *amai* or "sweet," and the noun *amami* or "sweetness," is itself a nominative meaning "dependency wish" or "drive to dependence." The verbal form, *amaeru*, means "to play the baby to," "to act like a spoiled child," "to coax," or "to indulge upon another's love." In terms of the *amami/shibumi* contrast, while *shibumi* is a "negative" quality which moves in the direction of restraint in order to avoid social contact, *amami* or *amae* is a "positive" quality which moves in the direction of establishing interpersonal communication within the intimacy of a social group. Kuki writes: "*Amami* (sweetness) expresses the positive quality in this contrast in that between a person being indulged (*amaeru-sha*) and a person indulging (*amaerareru-sha*), there is always a positive communication opened up" (1930, 51). For Kuki, *amae* or *amami* functions similarly to the *bitai* component of *iki* insofar as it denotes a sweet, flirtatious, and seductive type of coquettish behavior associated especially with intimate amorous relations between the sexes. As an example he cites various colloquial expressions using *amae* in an erotic sense like "A woman is most desirable when she *amaeru*" (*amaeru sugata iro fukashi*) (1930, 53). According to Kuki, then, there is an inner tension within the polarized structure of *iki*: on the one side, *shibumi*, like *akirame*, has a negative value which moves towards detachment from an object or person; whereas on the other side, *amae* and *amami*, like *bitai*, have a positive value which moves towards an intimate union with an object or person. In the social psychology of Doi Takeo, it is precisely this *amae/amami* aspect of *iki* which comes to function as the psychological key to interpersonal communication in Japan just as it is the basic explanatory mechanism for the social character of Japanese selfhood and the group-centered nature of Japanese culture. However, while the *amami* component in Kuki's aesthetic principle of *iki* emphasizes the specifically erotic, amorous, and sexual nature of interpersonal relationships in Japanese group-consciousness, Doi's psychological principle of *amae* or "dependency drive" focuses upon the infantile, compulsive, and regressive character of social interaction in various *oyabun-kobun* or "parent-

child" relations operating within the "familial household" (*ie*) structure of Japanese groupism. Hence, with its complex of aesthetic, erotic, and infantile overtones, the principle of *amae* is understood by Doi as the wish to depend upon an object or the desire to identify subject and object, thereby functioning as the basic psychological drive for dependence upon others in society.

### *Amae and the Twofold Structure of Japanese Selfhood*

In his sequel work entitled *Omote to Ura* (Front and Back, 1985), which has since been translated into English as *The Anatomy of Self: The Individual Versus Society* (1986), Doi Takeo further develops his *amae* model of the Japanese self in terms of the dual aspects of inward human feelings (*honne, ura, uchi, ninjō*) versus the outer aspect of social norms (*tatema, omote, soto, giri*), both of which correspond to the directional coordinates of the "individual" versus "society." First of all, he develops the Japanese self through the polar categories of *omote* and *ura*, meaning "front" and "back," or in its Latin equivalents, *recto* and *verso*. According to Doi, the *omote-ura* or "front-back" distinction can also be understood in terms of the *soto-uchi* or "outside-inside": "I think it can be said that *omote* and *ura* correspond to the distinction between *soto* and *uchi* that is understood in Japan especially in the consciousness of human relationships" (1985, 11). Doi then goes on to restate the *omote-ura* (front-back) or *soto-uchi* (outside-inside) structure of Japanese selfhood in terms of the distinction of *tatema-honne* (front-stage/back-stage), defined as the split between "personal reactions" and "social institutions" (1985, 25-42). The opposition between *giri-ninjō* or "social obligation" and "human feeling" in Japanese social ethics is also understood by Doi in terms of this "outside-inside" model of Japanese selfhood. Hence the Japanese self described as a nexus of infantile dependency relations in *The Structure of Amae* is now revealed as having a "dual consciousness" articulated through such well-known contrastive terms like *omote-ura*, *soto-uchi*, and *tatema-honne*, all of which generally signify the distinction between "public-private." Again, he states that such distinctions as *omote-ura*, *soto-uchi*, and *tatema-honne* all represent the "double-sidedness" (*nimensei*), or as it were, the "twofold" (*futae, nijū*) aspect of the Japanese self in its dependency relationships with others (1985, 17). The *omote* and *ura* or front and back sides of the Japanese self are metaphorically located in the heart and face, as expressed by Doi when he writes: "It should also be stated that in classical Japanese *omote* (front) signifies *kao*

(face) and *ura* (back) denotes *kokoro* (heart)" (1985, 11). While *omote* (front) symbolized by the face represents the social self on the outside, *ura* (back) symbolized by *kokoro* or the heart signifies the emotional self on the inside of the twofold Japanese self.

Finally, it should be clarified just how the twofold structure of Japanese selfhood is related to Doi's key psychological principle of *amae*. According to Doi, the Japanese self is divided into "front" (*omote*) and "back" (*ura*), "outside" (*soto*) and "inside" (*uchi*), or "personal feeling" (*honno*) and "social institutions" (*tatema*) according to the restraint versus expression of *amae*, the infantile dependency wish. Doi concisely explains Japanese selfhood as a dual consciousness of "outside/inside" (*omote/ura*) in relation to his *amae* principle as follows: "For example, when it is said that to presume upon others through *amae* on the outside (*soto*) is not good but that it is acceptable if one is inside (*uchi*), this is the logic of *omote* and *ura*" (1985, 19). Thus, the Japanese self in its relation to others has two sides, *soto* or "outside" where the dependency needs of *amae* are subject to the constraints of social rituals, conventions, and institutions, and *uchi* or "inside" where *amae* can be freely expressed in the privacy of one's home with family and friends. That is to say, while the infantile coaxing attitude of *amae* or the prerogative to presume and depend upon the benevolence of others is appropriate on the "inside" (*uchi*), on the "outside" (*soto*) one must instead conform to the established social norms of restraint as expressed by the term *enryō* (reserve), meaning "ritualized hesitation or deference." Competent social navigation in Japanese culture therefore requires the basic skill called *kejime* (discrimination), the ability to "discriminate" between that behavior which is appropriate to outside versus inside, front versus back, or public versus private. It can be said that Doi's articulation of the twofold outside/inside (*omote/ura*) structure of Japanese interpersonal selfhood in relation to the restraint versus expression of *amae* has itself been significantly influenced by Kuki Shūzō's (1930, 50–57) dyadic analysis of the intersexual aesthetic ideal of *iki* (chic) in terms of the polar tension between *amami* (sweetness) as a positive value which seeks intimate human communication with others, and *shibumi* (astringency) or the negative value of "elegant restraint" which functions to establish distance from others. However, as will be shown in the final comparative sections of this work, Doi's psychological model of the twofold Japanese self as a dialectic between *honno* (personal reactions) and *tatema* (social institutions) has also been directly influenced by G. H. Mead's communication model of the bipolar social self as a dialectic between the I or individual pole and the Me or institutional pole.

### Summary

While in modern Japanese philosophy Watsuji Tetsurō has developed a model of the twofold Japanese self as *ningen* through a "self-other" (*ji-ta*) dialectic based on his *aidagara* principle of interpersonal "betweenness," and Nishida Kitarō has articulated a twofold model of the Japanese "social self" (*shakaiteki jiko*) through a dialectic of "I and Thou" based on his principle of *basho* or "place" as the spatial locus of self-other relations, so in modern Japanese psychology Doi Takeo has set forth an explicit twofold model of Japanese selfhood through a dialectic between "inside/outside" (*uchi/soto*) based on his underlying principle of *amae*, the intrapsychic "dependency drive." It has also been seen how psychiatrist Kimura Bin (1972) has attempted to synthesize the social psychology of Doi with modern Japanese philosophy so that Watsuji's Zen/Confucian *ningen* model of self as a "betweenness" (*aida*) of persons in a *fūdo* or spatial climate, and Nishida's Zen idea of the true self in a *basho* or spatial locus where both self and other arise through mutual encounter, are now to be understood as a psychological function of Doi's *amae* principle of dependency relationships. In the final analysis it can be said that the general aim of all the various theories described above is to undercut the conventional dichotomy of individual versus society and to clarify the nondual structure of Japanese selfhood as a twofold individual-society interaction.